

**National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education
Institutional Report
Indiana University Southeast
Prepared May 2004 for Simulated Accreditation Visit June 2004**

Gloria Murray
Dean, School of Education
IU Southeast
4201 Grant Line Road
New Albany, IN 47150
www.ius.edu/education

Table of Contents

I.	Overview of the Institution.....	6
	The Indiana University (IU) Context.....	6
	Indiana University Southeast (IUS) Campus Profile.....	6
	Education Unit.....	7
II.	Conceptual Framework.....	10
	Description of Development and Changes.....	11
	Discussion of the Framework.....	11
	Shared Vision.....	11
	Coherence.....	11
	Professional Commitments and Dispositions.....	12
	Commitment to Diversity.....	12
	Commitment to Technology.....	13
	Candidate Proficiencies Aligned with Professional and State Standards.....	13
III.	Evidence for Meeting Each Standard.....	15
	Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions.....	15
	Element 1: Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates.....	15
	Element 2: Content Knowledge for Other Professional School Personnel.....	22
	Element 3: Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates.....	24
	Element 4: Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates.....	29
	Element 5: Professional Knowledge and Skills for Other School Personnel.....	31
	Element 6: Dispositions for All Candidates.....	32
	Element 7: Student Learning for Teacher Candidates.....	33
	Element 8: Student Learning for Other Professional School Personnel.....	34
	Standard 2: Program Assessment and Unit Capacity.....	35
	Element 1: Assessment System.....	36
	Element 2: Data Collection, Analysis and Evaluation.....	41
	Element 3: Use of Data for Program Improvement.....	45
	Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice.....	48
	Element 1: Collaboration Between Unit and School Partners.....	48
	Element 2: Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice.....	49
	Element 3: Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions to Help All Students Learn.....	54
	Standard 4: Diversity.....	59
	Element 1: Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences.....	60
	Element 2: Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty.....	67
	Element 3: Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates.....	70
	Element 4: Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools.....	71
	Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development.....	72

Element 1: Qualified Faculty.....	72
Element 2: Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching.....	75
Element 3: Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship.....	76
Element 4: Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service.....	77
Element 5: Collaboration.....	78
Element 6: Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance.....	80
Element 7: Unit Facilitation of Professional Development.....	81
Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources.....	82
Element 1: Unit Leadership and Authority.....	83
Element 2: Unit Budget.....	86
Element 3: Personnel.....	87
Element 4: Unit Facilities.....	89
Element 5: Unit Resources Including Technology.....	90

Index of Tables

Table 1:	IU Southeast School of Education Candidates Currently Enrolled in Spring 2004 Semester
Table 2:	ETS Institutional Summary Report: Regular Teacher Preparation Program and ETS Institutional Summary Report: School Leadership Series
Table 3:	Sample Comments from Elementary and Secondary Candidate Survey after Student Teaching on Strengths and Weaknesses of Program and Suggestions Related to Content Knowledge
Table 4:	2004 Employer Survey Results (selected items)
Table 5:	Sample of Graduate Course Utilization of ISTE Technology Standards
Table 6:	Sample Pedagogical Content Knowledge Courses for Advanced and Other School Personnel
Table 7:	Sample Methods Courses Requiring Application of Pedagogy
Table 8:	Incorporation of Candidate Data into Program Revisions and Conceptual Framework
Table 9:	SOE Data Review
Table 10:	Timeline for Data Collection
Table 11:	Field-Based Summary 2002-2004
Table 12:	Secondary Education Field Placements
Table 13:	Diversity of Full-Time SOE Faculty
Table 14:	Diversity of Part-Time SOE Faculty
Table 15:	Resident Faculty Members' Rank and Degree by Program
Table 16:	Credentials, Rank, Degree, Teaching Experience Outside the USA, & Total Yrs. Professional Experience of Full-Time Faculty and Advisors
Table 17:	Highest Degrees Held by Adjunct Faculty
Table 18:	Scholarship

Table 19: School of Education Faculty Presentations 2002-2004

Table 20: Sample of SOE Collaborations

Table 21: SOE Base Budgets

Table 22: IUS Budget by School—Six-Year History

Table 23: Number of Field Placements

Table 24: Full-Time Faculty Positions Since Fall 2000

I. Overview of the Institution

The Indiana University (IU) Context

Created in 1820 by an Act of the General Assembly, Indiana University is one of the oldest state universities in the Midwest, and, with more than 100,000 students on eight campuses, it remains one of the largest institutions of higher education in the United States. The eight campuses comprising Indiana University are Bloomington, Indiana University East (IUE), Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI), Indiana University Kokomo (IUK), Indiana University South Bend (IUSB), Indiana University Northwest (IUN) and Indiana University Southeast (IUS). Other significant IU program sites include IUSB's Elkhart Center and IUPUI's Columbus Center.

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 mission of Indiana University Southeast is to provide a challenging, innovative and supportive learning community committed to the intellectual and social growth of its students, to the cultural and economic well-being of southern Indiana and the greater Louisville metropolitan area, and to the advancement of knowledge in the context of a global society.

Indiana University Southeast offers 38 bachelor's degrees, 6 master's degree programs and 9 associate's degree programs. Since we first began awarding degrees in 1968, approximately 15,000 people have graduated from IUS--the great majority of whom return to our local community to live and work. In addition, we now have alumni living in each of the 50 states and in several foreign countries. Over 180 full-time faculty members, who hold degrees from leading universities throughout the nation, provide our students with up-to-date, high-quality courses and programs of study. In addition, our students' education is enhanced through our modern campus facilities on a beautiful 177-acre tract at the foot of the "knobs" area of Southern Indiana. A new \$10 million renovation and expansion of our Life Sciences Building was completed in 2001, and a new \$15 million library is scheduled to open early 2005.

IUS, a commuter campus with no residential housing, had an enrollment during the 2002-2003 academic year of 6716 full- and part-time students. The student body consists of approximately 62.8% female, 37.2 %males and 5.4% minority. The undergraduate median age is 23 and the median age for graduates is 31. While IUS has traditionally served the relatively small towns and rural areas of southeastern Indiana, an increasing number of candidates reside in metropolitan Louisville and attend IUS through a reciprocal tuition agreement between Kentucky and Indiana. Kentucky students increased from 486 in Fall 1998 to 1,220 in Fall 2001, a 150% increase.

Indiana University Southeast (IUS) is organized into campus-based schools that include Arts and Letters, Business, Continuing Studies, Education, Natural Sciences, Nursing, and Social Sciences. The Indiana University Southeast Bulletin 2003-2005 further describes the programs offered within each School.

Education Unit

The mission of Indiana University Southeast School of Education is to “develop high quality, caring professionals who stimulate continuous renewal of schools within a multicultural society” (adopted 2001). Indiana University Southeast School of Education (SOE) prepares candidates to work in schools as teachers and other professional school personnel through the following programs: Bachelor of Science in Education with majors in Elementary Education, Special Education, and Secondary Education with majors in Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, or Social Studies. The Masters of Science in Education includes concentrations in Elementary Education, Secondary Education and School Counseling. The Unit currently prepares candidates for initial licensing under the Indiana Professional Standards Board (IPSB) licensing patterns, “Rules 46/47.” All programs of the Unit will be licensing under the new “Rules 2002” effective July 1, 2006, with some licensing areas currently under the new rules.

The Education Unit consists of six programs with one coordinator serving each program: undergraduate Elementary Education, undergraduate Secondary Education, undergraduate and graduate Special Education, master’s of Elementary and Secondary education, School Counseling, and Educational Leadership. The Transition to Teaching (T2T) initiative is coordinated by the respective elementary, secondary, or special education coordinators. All functions and processes of the Unit are governed by the Unit faculty and administered by the coordinators and dean. Dean Gloria Murray provides oversight of the Unit.

Table 1. IU Southeast School of Education Candidates Currently Enrolled in Spring 2004 Semester

Program Name	Award Level	Program Level (ITP or ADV)	Number of Candidates	Agency or Association Reviewing Program (State, SPA, or Other)	Program Review Submitted (Yes or No)	Current Status (First Review, Rejoining, Complete)
Computer Education	BS* MS*	ITP ADV	4 8	State	Yes	Approved
Exceptional Needs/ Mild Intervention	BS MS	ITP ADV	15	State	Yes	Approved
Foreign Language (Sp, Fr, Ger)	BS* MS*	ITP ADV	6	State	Yes	Approved
Generalist (Ele)	BS	ITP	216	State	Yes	Approved
Gifted Education	MS*	ADV	15	State	Yes	Approved
Journalism	BS* MS*	ITP ADV	1	State	Yes	Approved
Language Arts	BS	ITP	95	State	Yes	Approved
Mathematics	BS	ITP	35	State	Yes	Approved

Reading	MS*	ADV	20	State	Yes	Approved
Science (LS, PS, E/S, Chem, Phy)	BS	ITP	33	State	Yes	Approved
Social Studies (Econ, GP, GC, HP, Psy, Soc)	BS	ITP	79	State	Yes	Approved
Theatre Arts	BS* MS*	ITP ADV	0	State	Yes	Approved
Building Level Administrator	MS*	ADV	56	State	Yes	Approved
School Counselor	MS	ADV	62	State	Yes	Approved
M.S. Elementary	MS	ADV	259	State	Yes	Approved
M.S. Secondary	MS	ADV	115	State	Yes	Approved

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

Note: Licensing areas were initially approved under 'Rules 46-47' and moved to the new licensing framework. Gifted Education was IPSB approved Summer 03.

The School of Education (SOE) enrollment for Spring 2004 was 1138 students consisting of 504 full- and part-time undergraduates and 634 full- and part-time graduate students (336 Kentucky resident students). Kentucky students represented 30% of the SOE students in Spring 2004. The SOE enrollment for Spring 2004 included 41 African American students, 2 Hispanics, 1 American Indians, and 5 Asian students.

In 2001-2002, all Secondary (35), Elementary and Special Education (93) candidates successfully completed student teaching. For 2002-2003, 49 (98%) of Secondary Education and 113 (100%) of Elementary candidates successfully met all standards for student teaching. The IPSB 2002-2003 report documented 63 enrollees in the first year internship program and no documented failures (5 had no information provided).

The 2003-2004 undergraduate Elementary Education program consists of 10 full-time faculty, and 22 (9 as field supervisors) faculty who teach part-time in the Unit with 216 program candidates. The undergraduate Secondary Education program consists of 6 full-time faculty, 7 (4 as field supervisors) faculty who teach part-time in the Unit with 271 program candidates. The Special Education program consists of two full-time faculty members and 9 adjuncts with 15 program candidates. The advanced programs include 4 full-time faculty in the MS of Elementary and Secondary Education, 3 full-time faculty in the Educational Leadership program, and 2 full-time faculty in the Counseling program with 32 adjuncts and 374 program candidates. Faculty members teach across initial or advanced levels in which they have expertise (computer education, early childhood, curriculum, social issues) while assigned to specific program teams.

The Unit has transitioned to NCATE 2002 standards and the Indiana Professional Standards Board 2001 content and developmental standards. The Unit also complies with Kentucky Statutes for the preparation of Kentucky candidates qualifying under the "Memorandum of Understanding between Indiana and Kentucky Regarding Tuition Reciprocity 1997-2005."

Changes Since the 1999 Visit

The time since our last NCATE/IPSB 1999 visit has been a remarkable period of growth and change. Changes in programs, personnel, and structure mark the steady improvement of the unit since the 1999 visit. The changes are listed below, with more details being presented in the other sections of this report and in the documents room.

1. Approved a new School of Education Strategic Plan: April 2003
2. Implemented a new Diversity Plan November: 2002
3. Increased student diversity from 3.9% in 1999 to 4.8% in 2003
4. Added four minority faculty
5. Hired a new Dean in 2002
6. Increased the faculty from 18 full-time to 28 full-time faculty
7. Experienced enrollment growth from 956 students in fall 1999 to 1138 students spring 2004
8. Implemented the state mandated alternative teaching license Transition to Teaching Program
9. Adopted the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards for the Master's in Elementary and Secondary Education
10. Refined the Mission statement in 2001
11. Approved the Conceptual Framework in 2001
12. Upgraded and reconfigured undergraduate programs to insure consistency with new outcomes based performance of IPSB
13. Established the Unit Assessment System which was accepted by IPSB in 2002
14. Upgraded the H340 field placements to include 15 hours in Jefferson County Public Schools
15. Upgraded the Education Computer Lab to include more Education related software and increased the number of computer stations
16. Hired a new faculty member to improve the unit's performance with technology
17. Developed new matrices to insure that the new programs are consistent with standards and expectations of NCATE, IPSB and other professional associations
18. Provided input into the design of the new Education Curriculum Lab that will be housed in the new library
19. Added a new science classroom for our Elementary and Secondary Education Program
20. Received approval and support to have an assessment coordinator
21. Received approval and support to hire a full-time data coordinator
22. Established the Council on Preparing Education Professional fall 2003
23. Began the Diversity in Education Course that includes a two week study in Ecuador
24. Participated in the Transforming School Counseling Initiative with The Education Trust, Inc at the companion level
25. Redesigned and renamed the quality teams to align with NCATE standards
26. Instituted a Gifted and Talented license and a Computer Technology license
27. Revised the middle school license
28. Adoption of a university new Student Information System (People Soft)
29. Instituted a new SOE awards program

30. Added a diversity course: New M300 Teaching in a Pluralistic Society course for Elementary candidates
31. Participated in campus Strategic Planning (started fall 2003)
32. Received a National Writing Project Grant
33. Established the Beginning Teacher Mentor Training Program
34. Received more than \$500,000 in external and internal grants
35. Increased the number of university partnerships with district schools

II. Conceptual Framework

The “Educators Engaged in Growth” Unit Conceptual Framework (CF) and underlying knowledge base are aligned with the IUS Campus and SOE mission statements. The IUS campus mission calls for a “challenging, innovative, supportive learning community, committed to the intellectual and social growth of students” (IUS Bulletin, 2003-2005 p. 7). The Unit supports the campus mission in a significant way. The SOE believes that teachers and other school personnel must be well educated to provide effective education to multiple generations of youth in our service area.

“Educators Engaged in Growth,” is used by the Unit CF to denote both commitment and reflective action. This phrase highlights the proactive expectations established for Unit candidates: to engage in life-long professional growth aimed at bringing about renewal of schools within a multicultural society. The CF incorporates the SOE Themes, SOE Disposition Statements, and program assessment.

The SOE framework outlines four themes that embody the Unit beliefs, goals, and dispositions. Each theme incorporates a set of assumptions about learning, teaching, and professional competence and signifies commitment to professional education at Indiana University Southeast. These themes are:

- High Quality Educators
- Caring Professionals
- Continuous Renewal of Schools
- Multicultural Society

High quality educators are shaped and reshaped by their continuous preparation, educational practices and teaching environment. Teacher education initiatives at IUS reflect high expectations regarding current knowledge bases about teaching and learning, an understanding of the complexity of teaching as contingent on students’ needs and instructional goals, and are continually shaped and reshaped by the changing diversity in society. The full CF document, complete with referenced knowledge bases describes this endeavor (A).

The creation of the Executive Summary of the Unit Conceptual Framework provides an abbreviated description of the Conceptual Framework, and is useful when working with new adjuncts and other stakeholder groups requiring more concise information about

the mission and themes of the Unit. The CF is further delineated in the Long-Range Strategic Plan (A), 5-Year Unit Assessment Plan (B) and Diversity Plan (C).

Description of Development and Changes

The current CF was adopted September 19, 2001. The Framework articulates our professional commitments to knowledge, professional practices, teaching competence, and student learning. The CF is reviewed and evaluated each year by the Program Assessment and Unit Evaluation Quality Team (PAUE) to ensure that the document continues to reflect the UAS design and implementation. The most recent study of the Conceptual Framework in 2003-04 led to a modification to include English as a New Language (ENL) within the diversity theme. Each program will collaborate with stakeholder groups in 2004-05 to ensure that ENL is addressed in all programs. The Conceptual Framework Timeline further describes the description and development of changes (E).

Discussion of the Framework

The Unit Conceptual Framework (CF) establishes a benchmark for high-quality, challenging and innovative programs. Unit programs provide opportunities for students to gain skills, knowledge and dispositions for growth and success as our candidates strive to meet the changing needs in our communities. The CF guides and focuses faculty and candidates through candidate performance, assessment, field experiences, diversity, faculty performance and continued development, and Unit governance. The conceptual framework ensures the Unit of a 1) shared vision, 2) system of cohesion, 3) commitment to professional dispositions, 4) support for learning of all students, 5) understanding of technology's role in school reform, and 6) assessment to ensure high standards of excellence.

Shared Vision. The Conceptual Framework is a shared vision developed and reviewed with our professional community 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. In these roles, stakeholder groups come together to help create and analyze appropriate preparation for candidates within their respective programs.

Coherence. The Conceptual Framework provides a system to ensure coherence among curriculum, instruction, field experiences, clinical practice and assessment as candidates progress through programs. The CF is thoroughly integrated into the UAS design and implementation and mapped to standards adopted by the Indiana Professional Standards Board. The CF is consistent with the overarching standards set by learned societies and supported by a strong knowledge base for best practices. The coherence of the CF is continuously monitored by the Unit through its program teams, advisory boards, and quality teams. The CF theme 1B further describes how coherence is accomplished (F).

Professional Commitments and Dispositions. The CF clearly outlines the dispositions that faculty value in teachers and other professional school personnel. The SOE firmly believes that high quality educators cannot separate sound educational decision making from the dispositions associated with “caring.” IUS educators are caregivers, models, and mentors and must treat students with respect, set good examples, and support positive social behavior. The IUS SOE strives to create educators who are nurturers, who do not doubt the capacity of their students and respect the cultures in their community.

The values found in the theme of caring are crucial to educators engaged in growth. The common threads that run through this theme include the role educators play in the lives of their students, in the welfare of the community, and in the ethics of personal and professional accountability. High quality school personnel must also exhibit the second theme of the SOE mission, ‘caring professionals.’ A high quality educator, who is effective in and out of the classroom with students, other professionals, parents and the community, will demonstrate the types of attributes of a caring professional. High quality is meaningless without affective attributes.

The following SOE dispositions are incorporated and assessed in each program. The following dispositions (adopted in 2001) are assessed behaviorally at various points in each program to ensure that the Unit prepares high quality educators who:

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

Commitment to Diversity. One of the four themes embedded in the mission statement and articulated in the CF is ‘multicultural society.’ This theme reflects the unit’s commitment to preparing candidates to support learning for all students and integrates the concept of diversity across curriculum, instruction, field experiences, clinical practices, assessments and evaluations. Preparing teachers to work in a multicultural society is clearly not as simple as identifying a definable learning style for each group and inventing assignments. The Unit encourages candidates to explore the interconnectedness between issues of race, class, and gender; power and privilege; and equity and equality.

The Unit helps prospective teachers deconstruct the “magic bullet” myth and learn that pedagogical knowledge, like other forms of knowledge, must be socially constructed to take into account the specific group of students and other contexts, such as location

and resources. The high quality, caring professionals who focus on stimulating continuous renewal of schools cannot be successful unless they are mindful of our multicultural, diverse society. Programs have incorporated diversity into their program standards.

The Unit defines diversity as the multiplicity of identities, such as culture, race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, language, gender, religion, sexual orientation, geographic origin, and exceptionalities in accordance with NCATE (2000). The Multicultural Society theme stresses the central human values of social justice, equal opportunity, and respect for the dignity of all, regardless of backgrounds and individual characteristics. All students of all backgrounds bring talents and strengths to their learning and as educators we need to find ways to build on them.

This fourth theme is operationalized at IUS in the SOE through a five-year diversity plan that includes program curricula, diverse field experiences, and faculty and staff development. The CF theme 4 (G) and the Diversity Plan (H) further describe the efforts and accomplishments the Unit has undertaken since the last NCATE visit.

Commitment to Technology. School renewal, as defined by the vision of the Conceptual Framework, includes a commitment to preparing candidates who are able to use instructional technology to help all students learn and for educators to be professionally productive. Instructional technology is integrated through curriculum, instruction, field experiences, clinical practice, assessments, and evaluations, as defined in the Conceptual Framework theme 3C. Instructional Technology offers much potential for school renewal efforts. Not only is the integration of information technology into children's lives inevitable, but it is also critical to their future. Educators must be prepared to make appropriate decisions about the use of technology. Accessibility to information and resources, individualization for student learning needs, ability to receive specific and immediate feedback, ability to experience real-world problems in the classroom and the potential to extend learning beyond the classroom are all initiatives that hold promise for school reforms.

Teaching faculty receive professional development in the use of Instructional Technology. Instructional Technology is integrated through standards for curriculum, field and clinical experiences, assessments and evaluations.

Candidate Proficiencies Aligned with Professional and State Standards. The mission statement begins with the phrase 'high quality' professionals. High quality is defined in the CF in Theme 1A (I) within the context of assessment of candidates for meeting high standards as set forth through professional, state, and institutional standards.

High Quality Educators, the first theme of the CF, is defined as commitment to best professional practices (as identified in standards) and to candidate and program assessment. High quality is supported by a knowledge base of professional practices outlined 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 IPSB. In addition to INTASC standards, Special Education candidates meet IPSB Exceptional Needs content standards consistent with those of the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC, 2001), whereas candidates in the Master's in Elementary and Secondary programs 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, 1998), while Counseling uses the American School Counseling Association (ASCA) standards as guidelines. Program standards align and incorporate IPSB's developmental standards with guidelines from learned societies.

Based on the standards identified by learned societies and other professional organizations, the SOE has identified two particular areas that, when woven together, create a high quality educator who represents our mission and vision. The first area describes effective educators who know and can teach their content in a changing world whose challenges can be met only through school renewal. The second area is assessing candidate performance. Performance based assessment describes what educators should know and be able to do. High Quality Educators know and can teach content standards representative of both general and discipline-specific teaching knowledge, and apply best practices differentially when working with students with different learning needs. Program standards delineate key aspects of professional practice and incorporate planning and preparation, creating a multicultural learning environment, effective instruction, leadership qualities, and professional responsibilities. Our SOE programs are improved by establishing benchmarks of high expectations against which candidates' performances are measured. The CF describes an assessment system that provides feedback to candidates at multiple points as they prepare to become high quality educators.

In summary, the Unit Conceptual Framework provides the basis for the Unit's intellectual philosophy that distinguishes IUS graduates from other institutions. The framework establishes a shared vision for the Unit's efforts in preparing educators to work in P-12 schools. Candidates preparation is based on clear conceptions of teaching and schooling identified in the themes of the Conceptual Framework. They understand the articulation between on-campus programming and field-based learning. There are well-defined standards of practice and performance to guide and evaluate coursework and clinical work. The CF provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, and field experiences as well as guides the faculty in directions of scholarship, service, and unit accountability.

The Unit Conceptual Framework portrays an image of educators as caring intellectuals rather than technicians, and knowledge generators rather than simply 'implementers.' American society and its schools are undergoing rapid transformation and change. The Indiana University Southeast School of Education Conceptual Framework must stay current with these changes. The CF is not viewed as permanent and was designed to

undergo continuous development through our established system of management. The Unit is “engaged in growth.”

III. Evidence of Meeting Each Standard

Standard I: 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

The School of Education Mission Statement and Conceptual Framework provide the structure for preparing educational professionals at Indiana University Southeast. All programs in the SOE adhere to the four themes of the Framework (high quality, caring professional, continuous renewal of schools, and multicultural society). This structure is supported by the IPSB content and developmental standards and content standards from national professional organizations such as NCTM, NCTE, ISLLC, and ASCA. Content knowledge, skills and disposition development begin with general education coursework. Professional and pedagogical course work and field experiences build on this foundation.

Over the last several years, all SOE programs were restructured to meet IPSB new content and development standards. Rules 46-47 and Rules 2002 programs are running simultaneously to accommodate candidates who have proceeded slowly but can complete Rules 46-47 before the cut off date. All candidates entering initial programs after June 2002 are required to meet new curricular requirements aligned with new licensure patterns (1.A). Candidates in the initial programs prior to June 2002 follow the requirements for licensure identified in previous bulletins provided they finish all requirements, including PRAXIS II tests by June 30, 2006. The 2006-2007 academic year is the first year that all candidates will complete the new or revised programs. Therefore, all programs described have not been offered in their entirety to date. Rules 2002 programs are being phased in and Rules 46-47 are being phased out.

Element 1: Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

Candidates for initial certification must know their content in the subject area they plan to teach and demonstrate their ability to explain and apply principles and concepts important to their disciplines. Continuous assessment of candidates' performance, using multiple measures, insures standards are met and that candidates know their subject matter. Data from multiple measures are utilized by the unit to inform candidates and other stakeholders and to make unit and program improvements thus providing a feedback loop from program requirements to data collection and analysis, to suggestions, and ultimately unit and program improvements (1.1.a). Prior to admission

to the SOE and continuing thereafter, content knowledge of initial teacher candidates is assessed as candidates complete general education requirements and SOE requirements. Employing the principles of high quality teaching is addressed directly in theme one of the Conceptual Framework. A high quality educator is one who understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structure of the discipline(s) they teach and create educational experiences that make these aspects meaningful.

Preparing educators is a campus-wide effort. Candidates gain knowledge, skills and dispositions through the General Education Program. Candidates must complete certain courses from the General Education Program before applying to the School of Education. However, like the unit, General Education courses at IUS are under revision. General Education Goals were approved by the campus and a new set of courses are under review by a General Education Committee (1.1.b). The new general education requirements will go into effect for all matriculating students entering fall 2005.

Initial Programs

Candidates in the initial programs are assessed based on the unit's Conceptual Framework (CF) and the IPSB content and developmental standards. Because IPSB initial program performance standards are based on national program standards, all unit programs and assessments relate to state and national standards. Candidates in initial programs demonstrate their knowledge of the subject matter they plan to teach by meeting programs' expectations for specific grades in required course; grade point averages in groups of courses, including overall GPA; and passing scores on the PPST. Additionally, candidates' ability to apply their subject matter in a real world contexts is evaluated during field experiences.

Acceptance (Decision Point 1) into Teacher Education requires minimum overall GPA of 2.5 for Elementary Education and Special Education and 2.75 for Secondary Education. The minimum GPAs must be maintained in order for initial candidates to remain in good standing, complete program coursework, and earn a bachelors degree. Though the programs differ, all require candidates to perform adequately in courses in mathematics, English, natural science and social science. Specifics regarding GPA requirements for each initial program are detailed on their advising check sheets (1.1.c.). Because candidates in Elementary and Special Education are being prepared to teach a broad range of subject matter, they must achieve a minimum GPA of 2.5 in subject matter "blocks," including social studies, mathematics, science and language arts.

Content knowledge is further evidenced by successfully completing PRAXIS I & II. Entering candidates must score 176 for Reading, 175 for Math, and 172 for Writing for PRAXIS I. The unit's pass rate consistently averaged 99 percent or higher as reported through Title II (1.1.d.) Table 1 indicates the pass rates of our candidates since 1999. It is our belief that a teacher candidate gains in-depth knowledge from the general education requirements, their content specializations and professional education experiences in order to become high quality caring professionals.

Table 2. ETS Institutional Summary Report: Regular Teacher Preparation Program

Date	Program Completers	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%)

Date	Aggregate Academic Content	Summary Totals and Pass Rate	Elem Ed	Reading
1999-2000 ***	97% *(98%)	98% *(92%)	100% *(100%)	N/A
2000-2001	99% *(99%)	99% *(95%)	100% *(100%)	N/A
2001-2002	99% *(98%)	93% *(94%)	100% *(99%)	100% *(100%)
2002-2003 ***	97% *(98%)	96% *(96%)	100% *(100%)	100% *(100%)

- * Statewide pass rate in ()
- ** Used in Passing Rate Calculations
- *** Recalculated report (2004)

ETS Institutional Summary Report: School Leadership Series

Date	Test Completers	Highest Score	Lowest Score	Median	Average Range
2002-2003	25	188 *(198)	165 *(134)	178 *(177)	171-182 *(172-181)

*All examinees' scores

From program entry through graduation and licensure, validation of content knowledge for teacher candidates is done through a Unit Assessment System (UAS) that has been developed and serves as the mechanism for measuring content knowledge in multiple ways, both internal and external to the institution. Data are collected and analyzed throughout and beyond the candidate's completion of the education program. Course syllabi validate that appropriate content knowledge is included in the programs and that it is related to the conceptual framework and state standards.

Evidence of professional education content is found in the EDUC H340 Education and American Culture, a pre-requisite to Elementary Education and Special Education and Secondary Education programs. The candidate must receive an acceptable recommendation from the H340 instructor to be unconditionally admitted to either program. H340 instructors rate the candidate on content knowledge (classroom discussions, research paper and tests); on dispositions; and a 30 hour field experience. This information is used in Decision Point 1 summative evaluation.

Candidates enrolled in the alternative certification Transition to Teaching (T2T) Program in Elementary or Secondary Education complete state mandated guidelines for admission as evidence of their content knowledge in coursework taken. There is a second Transition to Teaching Program for Special Education that is not state mandated. Entry in all T2T programs requires passing scores on PRAXIS I. Only PRAXI 1 is needed for Elementary. PRAXIS 2 is completed toward end of program. Candidates must pass PRAXIS II before being recommended for licensure, with Secondary candidates having to achieve passing scores before program acceptance (1.1.e). Secondary T2T candidates complete an 18 credit hour program and Elementary Program candidates complete a 24 credit hour program. Special Education T2T candidates complete a 45-credit hour program. Secondary T2T candidates are integrated into the regular secondary program, completing all requirements and demonstrating knowledge of content while completing field experiences, coursework and portfolio entries. Elementary Transition to Teaching candidates are in a cohort and complete their course work together.

Special Education T2T candidates share some of the same coursework as Elementary candidates in addition with specialized content courses. The programs began with their first cohort spring 2003 with one secondary science candidate, six elementary candidates, and twelve special education candidates. Except for special education, this first group completed their coursework and field experiences a year later. Evidence of content knowledge is documented through the PRAXIS I and II scores of this group. The average PRAXIS 1 score for this group was 179, seven points greater the qualifying score. The average exiting GPA for this group (except special education) of alternative licensing candidates was 3.93 (1.1.f).

Evidence of content knowledge may be found in student teaching evaluations, candidate portfolios, lesson and unit plans developed in various methods courses. Elementary candidates, as part of their methods courses, must develop unit and daily lesson plans which are scored using a rubric (1.1.g.). Decision Point 2 for the Elementary, Special and Secondary candidate is a formative review and includes an assessment of content knowledge (using GPA), portfolio development (secondary candidates only), dispositions rating, and an interview (elementary). Secondary candidates must have an overall GPA of 2.75 in professional education courses and 2.75 in each course in the licensing area(s) evidencing mastery of content knowledge. It is at this transition point that Secondary Program candidates are recommended for student teaching.

During student teaching, candidates demonstrate content knowledge in the classroom and are assessed and evaluated by university and classroom supervisors. Supervisors evaluate candidates on their dispositions, lessons and teaching skills using content and development standards based on IPSB, professional standards and the conceptual framework themes. Because these evaluations by supervisors serve as critical evidence of content knowledge of our candidates, an analysis of certain items is informative.

The Secondary Program offers student teaching in the spring semester. Analysis of the content knowledge item on the spring 2002 Secondary Student Teaching Evaluation form (which dealt with candidates' knowledge of subject matter) completed by university supervisors and classroom cooperating teacher rated over 92% of the students teachers at the basic (acceptable) and proficient (exemplary) level. In 2003, 91% were at the basic (acceptable) and proficient (exemplary) level. Supporting data, including those for Special Education are also available (1.1.h).

The Elementary Program offers student teaching each semester (fall & spring). A similar analysis was done on the Elementary Program supervising teacher survey. When asked about the performance of their 2002 student teacher candidates, 90% of school supervisors said they strongly agreed or agreed that IUS students were prepared to teach content. In fall 2002, the supervisors reported that 95 % of the candidates were prepared to teach their content and in spring 2003, 95% of supervising teachers reported that candidates were prepared to teach their content. Further evidence of content mastery by our candidates is the pass rates of our candidates on PRAXIS II. Every initial license candidates must pass PRAXIS II for licensure. SOE candidates have consistently averaged 98 percent passing rate or higher since 1999.

All initial level candidates' progress in their programs is documented through the assessment system and in particular through portfolio assessment. Candidates document their progress toward IPSB standards and other professional standards through their portfolio entries. Portfolios for elementary candidates are evaluated beginning with Decision point II and secondary candidates receive a first review of their portfolio at Decision Point I. Special Education candidates complete experiences specific portfolios in each field experience (1.1.i)

Initial license candidates complete a program evaluation at the end of student teaching which provides information on their perception of how well they were prepared to make subject matter meaningful to students. Table 2 provides sample of comments made by Elementary candidates who completed student teaching fall 2003 and Secondary candidates who completed student teaching for spring 2003 indicate satisfaction with their program in terms of content knowledge. Desire to have classroom management was a constant in both programs. Elementary and Secondary programs are addressing classroom management (1.1.j).

Table 3. Sample Comments from Elementary and Secondary Candidate Survey after Student Teaching on Strengths and Weaknesses of Program and Suggestions Related to Content Knowledge

Program	Comments
Elementary	<p><u>Strengths:</u> Indepth use of the standards, good practices in methods, great content knowledge, lots of lesson plans that made me research topic I was teaching, state standards, objectives and procedures, good demonstration of content area and standards, lesson plan structure, short term and mini-unit planning, my lessons were strong and I felt comfortable knowing they always checked with standards, coverage of state standards, etc.</p> <p><u>Weaknesses:</u> how to keep a grade book, writing realistic lesson plans for a classroom, planning books, too lofty at times, no experience in computing and taking grades, more planning on lesson plan books, quick easy lesson plans for every day use, how to plan in a plan book and make small plans that reflect the larger plan, etc.</p> <p><u>Suggestions:</u> Leadership and management courses would be helpful before student teaching, classes should be offered in classroom management, more assessment techniques, more instruction on exact teaching methods to reach different learning styles, more courses on how to pull and successfully utilize teaching resources, reduce the number of lesson plans required, student teaching was too long and it was too long to go without income, class on portfolio, how to better prepare for first year teaching position, more observation in the middle school for those getting middle school endorsements, more on how to reach the high and low achieving students, etc.</p>
Secondary	<p><u>Strengths:</u> H340 was an appropriate beginning to the program, good introduction to teaching; P250 we got a lot important information, good look into the psyche of students, provided background on various theories --theories I never heard of and didn't think I would use again, but to my surprise, every theory has come up again in every education class; General Methods was the best education class in the program, very informative, great lesson planning and classroom development, I thought it was very thorough; Reading Methods extremely real and practical, we learned a lot about different reading methods and literature circles, introduces the importance of reading in all subject areas; Specific Methods modules were helpful, having a unit prepared for student teaching.</p>

Weaknesses: H340 I wish I would have know about a portfolio in this class, practicum hours were excessive; P250 more hands on, more special education observations; General Methods more on special education and curriculum design, more on classroom management; Reading Methods too many topics to be addressed for such a short class, seemed a little disorganized; Specific Methods more focus on classroom management, did not deal with a lot of specific classroom applications.

Suggestions: Need more advisors, more practicum/real classroom time, more class offerings, too much course work in General Methods/Reading methods; needs to be split up, interview portfolios need to be emphasized more, need to start the portfolio sooner in program, would like to know more about Kentucky standards, males are singled out in the education program.

Employer surveys were sent to principals of schools where 2002 graduates had completed their first year of teaching under the IPSB induction program. Administrators were asked to provide information on how well our graduates know their content. While the sample was small (24 of 41 returned) these reports indicated that candidates know their content. Administrators agreed or strongly agreed that 87.5% of our candidates know and can teach their subject. They also agreed or strongly agreed that 100% of our candidates were prepared to plan lessons based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals. This survey is further evidence of the mastery of content of our initial license graduates (I.I.k).

Advanced Programs

All advanced degree programs for teaching and other school personnel programs and assessments are structured using CF themes and other national/professional content standards. Advanced programs include a Masters (MS) in Elementary or Secondary Education or Counseling. Non-degree licensure programs in Education Leadership, Special Education, Gifted and Talented, Computer Technology and Reading are also offered (1.1.1.).

The performance-based system for the MS program was operationalized in August 2002. The 2.5 undergraduate GPA admission requirement ensures the unit that advanced candidates know the content for which they teach. Candidates in the MS are evaluated at three points within their programs to insure they maintain appropriate content knowledge.

Each advanced program also utilizes Summative Decision Points. The first evaluation is a written reflective writing assessment completed no later than 18 hours into the program at the conclusion of the required core courses. The sample is used to assess candidate reflective communications skills.

The core courses are designed to address the National Board of Professional Teaching standards and the focus includes an in depth study of the content taught as well as pedagogy directed towards learning for all students. Specifically directed at advanced levels of planning and teaching instructional strategies is J500 (Instruction in the Context of Curriculum). J500 introduces the candidate to the concept of Teacher as Researcher in which candidates use technology applications to study the content curriculum they teach. Candidates study state and national content standards and work as "critical friends" in collaborative learning groups to design and delivery effective content to their students. There is also a strong technology component embedded into this course. A Teacher as Researcher website brings a total of nearly 200 teacher research initiatives together in one location. The Teacher as Researcher project is assessed no later than 30 hours into the program at Summative Decision Point 3 in which candidates must analyze their teaching for effectiveness. J500 is a key course to the Teacher as Researcher concept embedded into the MS program and the course design has been presented and published (1.1.m)

Testing in the Classroom (P507) is also required within the first 18 hours and links assessment to content standards. Candidates must show evidence of their abilities to assess student learning as part of the the Teacher as Researcher project required at the 30 hours assessment level of their program. Education and Social Issues (H520) brings a diversity focus to the content in which candidates teach through various course requirements directed at integrating multiculturalism into the content fields. Psychology in Teaching (P510), focusing on human growth and development, addresses instructional and motivational strategies aimed at effective teaching of content knowledge. Candidates have six years to complete their program. Candidate data for the MS program is in the early stages of collection and analyses. Exemplars are being collected and archived for analyses. Based on the first disposition writing samples (Summative Decision Point 2 and 3), the MS in Elementary and Secondary Team is studying recommendations from Office of Institutional Research and Analysis to assess reflective analysis of dispositions and standards within each of the four core courses rather than requiring writing after all courses are completed (1.1.n). A survey conducted fall 2002 of graduate students indicated that 95 % agreed that they had been adequately prepared to be a high quality educator.

Element 2: Content Knowledge for Other Professional School Personnel

The SOE also insures content knowledge for other school professionals. The unit offers a MS in Counseling and a certification program in Educational Leadership. Candidates demonstrate their content knowledge as they move through the transition points. Each transition point is summative and candidates must be recommended to continue to the next level in the program.

School Counseling develops counselors who can work in a school environment and addresses IPSB standards, the SOE Conceptual Framework themes and follows the standards set by the American School Counselor Association (ASCA). The program

consists of cohorts of 14 candidates and requires a minimum of 48 semester hours of credit for candidates not holding a master's degree and a minimum of 36 credit hours for those with a Masters. Candidates applying to counseling must have Bachelors degree and 2.75 GPA or a masters and 3.0 GPA as evidence of the strength of content knowledge. To proceed through Decision Point 2, candidates are assessed on their pre-requisite pre-core courses of the MS program. Prior to recommendation of candidates for practicum, candidates must complete course work on the learning process and the learning systems of the school. In G585 Contemporary Issues in Counseling, candidates, among many other assignments, complete a school classroom guidance unit and in G542 Organization and Development of Counseling Programs a strategy proposal for school improvement. Content knowledge about the learning systems of the school include completion of a school analysis paper, program budget in G524 and a grant application in G562 School Counseling. The program has four decision points where candidates are assessed on performance in course work. Candidates must complete clinical practice projects that include formal research, action research and assessment of learning environments and curriculum development (see research projects in documents room). Candidates complete between 300-600 hours of practicum experience and assessed by university and field placement supervisors.

Educational Leadership is aligned to the SOE conceptual framework themes, ISLLC, and IPSB Content Standards. Like the counseling program, candidates are assessed at four transition points and must be recommended to continue to the next level of the program. Candidates demonstrate their mastery of content by meeting certain criteria for admission. A 3.0 GPA, letters of recommendation, an 500 word essay on "Why You Want to be an Administrator?" are required. Applicants for the Kentucky certification in Education Leadership must have three years teaching experience and Indiana applicants must have five years. Candidates demonstrate mastery of content knowledge through course work and at summative decision points (summative decision points matrix). For example, Standard 2 of the Education Leadership program focuses on developing the instructional leader. Candidates demonstrate mastery of this standard in Legal Perspectives on Education (A608) where they must identify legal barriers to student learning, in Organization Context of Education (Aa653/S655) candidates complete a clinical supervision project that address effective instruction, In Supervision in Elementary and Secondary Education (E536/S655) candidates evaluate an devise school improvement and professional development plans, and in A653 they design a program to demonstrate their knowledge of the change process (1.2.a). Candidates complete a 100 hour practicum field experience that addresses each school leadership standard and develop a comprehensive portfolio containing evidence of the experience and skills in specific areas (see student portfolio). Scoring rubrics are used by district and university supervisors to evaluate proficiency in meeting standards during the practicum. Candidates are required to receive a passing score on the SLLA. For three consecutive years, 100% of the candidates of the education leadership program have passed the SLLA examination, further evidence of candidate knowledge of content (1.2.b).

Element 3: Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

Initial

The unit assures that the teacher candidates have a broad knowledge of instructional strategies. The need for candidates to possess pedagogical content knowledge is an overriding part of our Conceptual Framework; therefore, candidates acquire an understanding of pedagogy, the use of technology and knowledge for working with the diverse needs of all students. The first theme for example, high quality educator, means that the initial teacher candidate understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structure of the discipline(s) he/she teaches and creates educational experiences that make these aspects meaningful for students. Candidates acquire the fundamental components of pedagogical content knowledge as they successfully meet the objectives of each professional education course and related clinical experience. The unit insures that candidates can present content in a clear and meaningful way and through the integration of technology. Candidates are also required to complete PRAXIS II prior to or during student teaching.

To assure pedagogical knowledge specific to the content areas, all initial candidates complete a methods course for each content area and level for which they plan to be licensed. It is in the methods courses that candidates learn about state, institutional, and national standards; professional organizations; assessment techniques; lesson planning; classroom management; use of technology; learning styles; and teaching methods applicable to their content area. Elementary level candidates are prepared to teach all subjects and complete methods course in each of the subject areas taught at the elementary level. In addition to specific content, i.e. social studies and math methods, Elementary Candidates are required to complete courses that address concepts in literacy and reading methods in Reading Methods 1 (E340) and Reading Methods 2 (E341). Secondary candidates take Reading Methods (M464) where they assess reading interest, administer the CLOZE test with students during practicum experience, and provide remediation. The Secondary Reading Methods course is done in conjunction with general methods.

Elementary education candidates take methods courses in social studies, mathematics, science, and reading. They also take a W300 Writing for the Elementary Teacher (1.3.a). Secondary take General Methods (M314)) and a specific methods course which addresses pedagogical content for their teaching area. A grade of 2.75 or better must be achieved in these courses. The conceptual framework, the INTASC standards, IPSE content and development standards are mapped to the content of the methods courses to ensure programs are standards-based and performance driven and that pedagogical content is addressed (1.3.b).

All initial teacher candidates must take H340 prior to admission to an initial level program. It is in this course that candidates are first introduced to pedagogical content. Candidates learn knowledge of the educational system, its social impact, historical and philosophic and future implications. Significant time is given to discussion and learning

about ethnic, minority, and cultural dimensions of education. Candidates spend 30 hours observing classroom instruction and may also work with students. Candidates are placed in area schools by the Student Services Office. Candidates complete a reflective log that includes their perspective of the pedagogical strategies used by the classroom teacher. The classroom teacher completes an evaluation on the candidate on the potential of the candidate to be a teacher. Candidates learn about the SOE conceptual framework, portfolio development, assessment system, and the standards that guide the programs. Introductory knowledge about the teaching profession is also addressed in this course (1.3.c.).

Initial Elementary candidates acquire knowledge of diverse cultures through their general education courses. A new required multicultural course for elementary candidates was piloted spring 2004 and will be in place fall 2004. Strategies for meeting the needs of diverse learners are also addressed in both general and specific method courses (1.3.d.). Candidates are expected to integrate, apply, and evaluate learning theory and knowledge of human development as they relate to delivery of specific content and assessments of student progress (1.3.e).

Early and continuous field experience is a hallmark of the SOE initial program. Candidates are required to develop a portfolio with several components related to standards including a video of their teaching, an analysis of student learning, and a self-assessment of their teaching performance as documented in portfolios.

Candidates are assessed on pedagogical knowledge during their student teaching. Candidates and cooperating classroom teacher use evaluation forms to guide and establish expectations. Student teacher supervisors complete an evaluation that assesses the preparation of each candidate on content and pedagogy knowledge. During student teaching candidates are evaluated on curriculum development, classroom management, planning use of resources, critical reflective skills and knowledge of student development. The unit and candidates receive summative assessment information following successful completion of student teaching (1.3.f). The Employer Survey is also used to examine 2003 first year teachers on their pedagogical content knowledge. Several items were identified that specifically relate to pedagogical content knowledge. Of the 24 respondents, strongly agreed or agreed that our first year teachers were prepared in pedagogical content.

Table 4. 2004 Employer Survey Results (selected items)

Item	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Understand how students differ in their approaches to learning	11	9	3	1
Demonstrate the ability to create instructional opportunities adapted to diverse learners	11	8	3	2
Demonstrate how to use a variety of instructional strategies	11	11	1	1

The unit is committed to the use of technology in course offerings. Facilitating student learning through the integration of technology begins with Computers in Education W200). This course has adopted technology standards based on ISTE standards. Candidates are given the opportunity to have hands-on experience with educational software such as Inspiration, Publisher, Power Point, Front Page, Excel, Access, Bryce or KidPix (1.3.g.). Elementary and Secondary candidates must use technology in their general and specific methods courses to facilitate student learning. Lesson plans for secondary candidates must demonstrate ability to use technology effectively with schools. For example, Elementary candidates assigned to Galena Elementary School in their Language Arts/Reading course must do a pre and post assessment of students to determine the level of student learning. Candidates are expected to use their computer skills throughout the program and expected to provide evidence they use information and instructional technologies in the portfolios (1.3.h.). Candidates have access to updated PC labs with education software aligned with best practices located in the school of education computer lab. The unit received several technology grants that involved training candidates, faculty and classroom teachers on the use of PDA for assessment. Technology funds were used to purchase video conferencing material and pilot projects training candidates and P-12 teachers on the use of this technology. A technology survey asking initial and advanced candidates to rate their technology preparation provided evidence how prepared our initial candidates are in the integrating of technology into instruction. Responses indicate that at least 48 % believed that they were well prepared, at least 53 % felt somewhat prepared and about 6.5% felt not prepared. The two items that candidates felt least prepared to do was assess individual P-12 student learning and analyze achievement data for groups of P-12 students. This is consistent with the comment "need to teach teachers how to analyze data and use it to plan instruction and provide interventions" that was made on the Employers Survey. Table 5 provides further evidence of how technology is integrated into coursework.

Table 5. Sample Of Graduate Course Utilization Of ISTE Technology Standards

ISTE STANDARD	COURSE #	TECHNOLOGY ACTIVITY
#1 Technology Operations and Concepts	P515	Utilizes Powerpoint, overhead projector, document camera, and VCR with TV in the lecture presentations and class activities. Instructor uses Oncourse to upload course announcements, materials, hand-outs, reading supplements and earned points and feedback to student performance in the form of narrative comments.
	P507	Making reliable paper and pencil tests. Test construction has an impact on the reliability of a test. Use of white space, font type & size, and format issues are taught. Effective use of Microsoft Word is demonstrated and taught. Students must construct a classroom test using desktop publishing.
	E518	Teacher Research Oncourse is being used for Online Gradebook, Syllabus, and many other important Rubric documents and formats for the course.

#2 Planning and Deigning Learning Environments and Experiences	A608	Class conducted in computer lab to demonstrate use of online resources available through the library. Candidates must use web based resources for Current Issues and for Position Paper. Must include copy of article for Current Issues and cite at least one source for Position Paper. Assessed in scoring rubric.
	P570	Supplemental readings materials were uploaded onto Oncourse. This helped the Instructor manage candidates' learning by having readings available online.
#3 Teaching, Learning and the Curriculum	H520	Search websites for multicultural teaching practices.
	P515	Candidates were encouraged to surf the Internet about issues on Child Development (e.g. cloning, child abuse, etc.) and get updated data about these topics.
#4 Assessment and Evaluation	E536	Use school district and state education sites to find data to be used by candidates in the final exam as they analyze data and evaluate a school improvement plan.
#5 Productivity and Professional Practice	P507 P407	All candidate assignments are created with word processing or desktop publishing. Powerpoint presentations are used by candidates and instructor.
#6 Social, Ethical, Legal, and Human Issues	A608	Copyright issues are discussed and a handout is provided.

Taken from Graduate Mapping of Technology Standards 2003-2004.

Advanced Programs

All advanced teaching programs require coursework, practicum, internship or projects related to teaching in the content area. Advanced candidates have established a strong knowledge base of pedagogical knowledge and skills on which to build. Advanced candidates learn and apply institutional, state and national standards; lesson planning, use of technology, learning styles and other teaching strategies applicable to their content area. Table 6 provides a list of programs and courses where pedagogical content is addressed. Candidates adding new specialization to their certification (i.e. gifted or reading) are also required to demonstrate knowledge of pedagogical knowledge and skills.

Table 6. Sample Pedagogical Content Knowledge Courses for Advanced and Other School Personnel

MS Elementary & Secondary	P510 Psychology in Teaching J500 Instruction in the Context of Curriculum H520 Education and Social Issues
Special Education	M550 Practicum in Special Education K590E Methods for High Incidence
Gifted and Talented	W552 Curriculum for the Gifted and

	Talented
Kindergarten License	E506 Curriculum in Early Childhood
Reading License	E545 Advanced Study of Teaching Reading in Elementary School or S514 Teaching Reading in the Secondary Schools L535 Adolescent Literature X525 Practicum in Reading
Educational Technology	W540 Computer Based Teaching Methods R341/F500 Multimedia in Instructional Design

Candidates at the advanced level seeking a MS increase their pedagogical knowledge through a required core block of courses and a wide range of choices of coursework to meet program requirements that are aligned with the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPT) (1.3.i.). Candidates in the MS programs learn to meet the needs of diverse learners in required courses. In Instruction in the Context of Curriculum (J500) candidates recognize individual differences in their students and adjust their practice accordingly. Candidates are assessed on this when they complete the teacher researcher project. In Education and Social Issues (H520), candidates address culturally responsive teaching, needs of second language students and what teachers need to know to as it relates to a students' cultural background. Education leadership candidates are required to do several assignments in School Community Relations (A510) and Practicum in School Administration (A695) to address the power structure and community resources. In Supervision of Elementary and Secondary Instruction (E536/S655) candidates must reflect upon and describe their role as leaders in ensuring that all children learn. They also interview an elected official to learn more about the community. Standard 8 of the Educational Leadership program requires candidates to be able to demonstrate an understanding of diverse lives of students, parents, families and stakeholders in schools and society. Pedagogical content knowledge of this standard is assessed through assignments such as development of a Diversity Booklet in Introduction to Educational Leadership (A500), analysis of a publication for bias, and a cultural conversations exercise. Counseling candidates are required to complete (G575) Multicultural Counseling (G575). Counseling candidates review the ACA Standards for Multicultural Counseling and do a final reflection paper.

Candidates in advanced programs also demonstrate competencies in technology. For example Education Leadership candidates complete several projects utilizing technology. Power Point presentations, Excel spread sheets, researching web based publications, and at least five hours using technology in administration are required (1.3.j.). Counseling candidates use technology in completing public relations and strategy projects (Many assignments are submitted over the internet in G524, G542, G562 using ONCOURSE).

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

Significant effort is made to insure that candidates understand and can apply knowledge to implement instruction. Evidence for exhibition of skills that demonstrate considerations for school, family and community can be found in portfolios, work samples, self reflections, and in field experience evaluations. Assessment of professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills of initial programs are based on the IPSB content and developmental standards. Candidates show their ability to combine content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge and to reflect and create learning experiences that facilitate learning for all students through field experiences and coursework.

Initial Programs

The Elementary program is designed in “blocks” in a prescribed order. The courses develop the knowledge, dispositions, and skills required for entry into the profession. The first block introduces the candidate to the profession of teaching and provides opportunities for the candidate to examine their beliefs and assumptions about learning and teaching. Candidates learn also how children develop their early concepts and beliefs from home environments and community settings. Elementary candidates spend a number of hours working with children in classroom throughout the program. For example, in E339 Methods of Teaching Language Arts (E339) Methods of Teaching Reading I (E340), candidates work with JCPS Farnsley Middle School students on student writing portfolio (1.4.a.).

All professional methods courses require Elementary and Secondary candidates to plan and some of these implement lessons in the P-12 classroom. Every general methods and specific methods course requires lesson and unit planning that meet individual needs of students (1.4.b). Evidence of how candidates master application of professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills can be found for example in Elementary General Methods (M310) or Secondary General Methods (M314) where candidates must demonstrate an understanding of cultural diversity. In M310 candidates complete four lesson plans. Candidates do a self-evaluation, share lesson plans with instructor prior to teaching, and are observed by the instructor when the lesson is taught. Lesson plans must include: a) adequately addressing of components of required format, b) use of developmentally appropriate activities, c) reflection relevant to content selected, d) reflection on knowledge of a variety of teaching strategies, and e) utilization appropriate mechanics (neatness, grammar, etc.). M314 requires five lesson plans using a certain format to include objectives, developmentally appropriate activities, assessment, feedback and reflection. Table 7 indicates a sample of courses that include lesson planning as a tool to demonstrate application of professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills.

Table 7. Sample Methods Courses Requiring Application of Pedagogy

Course	Number of Lessons or unit plans required
M314 Secondary General Methods	6 lessons – teach 5
M457 Methods of Teaching Senior High/Junior High/Middle School Math	10 day unit and teach 2 lessons
M310 Elementary General Methods	4 lessons – teach four
E340 Methods of Teaching Reading	8 lessons
E 339 Methods of Teaching Language Arts	8 lessons
E341 Methods of Teaching Reading II	12 lesson for tutoring a child
K205 Introduction to Exceptional Children	1 lesson
M470 Kindergarten I Practicum	7 lessons
E328 Science in Elementary Schools	1 unit
M452 Methods of Teaching Senior High/Junior High/ Middle School English	2 units and 1 mini lesson
M446 Special Methods in Teaching Science in Secondary Schools	1 lesson 1 unit
E325 Social Studies in Elementary School	1 unit/kit 2 lessons
E337 Classroom Learning Environment	1 unit

Initial level candidates are exposed to socio-economic and diverse populations during their field experiences and expect to teach using appropriate pedagogy for diverse learners. Placement in schools is concurrent with content and pedagogical courses. Candidates also observe, interview, and visit different departments/personnel to gain a greater understanding of the overall working of the school, community and the culture. Candidates teach a variety of lessons in classrooms within the schools they are placed. Candidates apply and are assessed on professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills during their student teaching to meet the needs of all learners. Candidates must also meet diversity assessment criteria for lesson planning. Concern for the amount of knowledge and experience Elementary candidates have with diverse population resulted in a new course Teaching in a Pluralistic Society (M300) that was piloted spring 2004 and will be implemented as a requirement fall 2004.

The Recent Employer survey of initial program graduates provided information regarding candidates' professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. Principals indicated that 100 % of our first year teachers were prepared to plan lessons based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals. The only concern registered was that "our graduates from the elementary program did not have sufficient instruction in appropriate penmanship [printing], both in ability to teach and model an effective method. They were also lacking in knowledge about how to

teach young learners the correct procedures for holding tools (pencils, scissor) and positioning paper and body to write effectively.”

Advanced Programs

The unit insures that advanced teacher candidates understand the professional knowledge of their fields based on NBPTS which serves as the basis for assessment. The Teacher as Researcher model also serves as a basis for evaluation of the candidates' professional knowledge. Candidates who complete the required project for the Teacher as Researcher model demonstrate their ability to use current research to inform their practice, use technology in their practices, and support student learning through their professional services.

Teachers recognize individual differences in their students and adjust their practice accordingly. Course syllabi validate that professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills are included. Assessment of candidate work in J500 and P510 indicates that they have knowledge of their students and families and use strategies based on standards. For example in the MS core course J500, candidates are required to do a situation analysis describing the factors that impact the school setting and influence the curriculum (1.4.c.). Professional pedagogy is difficult to separate from pedagogical content. Many of the same courses in Table 6 apply here but at a more advanced level.

In Child Development (P515) candidates are involved in developing a webpage as an ongoing project and in Computer in Secondary Classroom (S533) there is opportunity to integrate technology into assignments. A technology survey conducted with initial and advanced students indicated that at least 86% felt that they were well prepared or somewhat prepared to integrate technology into their teaching. Six percent did not feel prepared, and 8 %did not respond. Advanced candidates felt least prepared to a) use presentation tools such as HyperStudio, Power Point etc. and b)to use a creativity tool for photos, movies, virtual reality, programming, drawing (1.4.d.).

Element 5: Professional Knowledge and Skills for Other School Personnel

Candidates in other school personnel programs collect and analyze data related to their work, reflect on practice and use research and technology to improve student learning. Candidates get to know their students and then use journals, case studies, and action research to reflect on their practice. Counseling candidates learn about families and communities through the school analysis paper completed in Practicum in Counseling (G524), family analysis in multicultural class, and community contacts in Internship in Counseling (G550). Counseling candidates use current research to write their Strategy Proposal in Organization and Development of Counseling Programs (G542) and to complete it in School Counseling Interventions, Consultation, and Program Development (G562). The project requires candidates to use research based strategies, counseling interventions, and best practices strategies to complete the project (see display in document room). Counseling candidates get to know their students as they work with them on intervention projects, practice group counseling and individual

counseling session (1.5.a.).

Education leadership candidates use current research to inform practice when they address current issues and write a position paper in their A608 course and in A500 where they must write a school vision on best practices (1.5.b.). In E536/S655 they research the instructional issues related to diverse learners as defined by NCLB.

Element 6: Dispositions for All Candidates

Candidates in all initial and advanced programs must demonstrate the dispositions as identified in the Conceptual Framework and the disposition adopted by the faculty (1.6.a). The unit's Conceptual Framework reflects the dispositions that the education faculty believe are important for all educational professionals. All candidates, both at the initial and advanced levels, address professional dispositions. Dispositions are addressed in the standards and in course work. Candidates are advised of these professional expectations in materials distributed upon admission and through courses. Over the course of the candidates program, both faculty and supervising classroom teachers provide assessments of their professional dispositions.

Dispositions are part of the criteria for summative decisions for all programs. Disposition data are used by Elementary Program and Special Education at Decision Points 2, 3; Secondary Program at Decision Point 1, 2, 3, and 4; MS at 1, 2, 4; Education Leadership at 2 and 4; and the Counseling Program uses dispositions at summative decision points 3 and 4. Candidates must submit artifacts that show dispositions in reflections, philosophy, diversity, professional development and collaboration in their portfolio. Dispositions have always been addressed during field experiences and student teaching. Faculty look for evidence of dispositions that might be problematic. Any assessment that indicates a major concern is addressed first by the candidate's advisor. If the concern continues the program faculty will meet to discuss and develop a remediation plan which is monitored by faculty.

Initial Programs

All initial candidates must meet certain SOE requirements related to dispositions such as a Criminal Background check, recommendations from H340 instructors, and formative reviews at summative decision points. Prior to the first field experience in H340 initial candidates must read and sign a code of conduct document (1.6.b). In H340 candidates write paper that articulates their beliefs about teaching and learning. Classroom teachers evaluate candidate dispositions on: a) respect for legal and ethical norms and values of education; b) exhibits personal management behaviors; and c) exhibits enthusiasm for teaching (1.6.c). Reflective journals and field experience logs are reviewed for dispositions. Dispositions are evaluated at the end of general methods for elementary candidates. Elementary candidates are interviewed by an advisor and dispositions are reviewed at Decision Point 3. The Elementary Supervisor Teacher Survey asks about the professional dispositions of candidates. Comments from the elementary supervisors are divided into two categories, strengths and weaknesses. A

sample of the comments about our candidates included: “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” Weakness included: “needs to arrive a little earlier for the day and be prepared, appropriate dress, saying yes instead of yeah.” (1.6.c.).

Advanced Programs

Candidates in advanced programs are required to be certified and experienced teachers for education leadership, MS, and counseling and therefore meeting appropriate dispositions was already a certification and employment requirement.

The first dispositional evaluation for counselors is Counseling Theories and Techniques (G503) followed by feedback in Laboratory in Counseling (G523) individually to each student. Individual conferences continue in third semester to go over dispositions.

Education leadership candidates are introduced to dispositions and standards in A500 and A510. Educational leadership candidates learn about the Kentucky and Indiana Code of Ethics in the School Law course and must complete a portfolio based on ISLLC standards (1.6.d). If there is a concern, it is addressed by the coordinator. Candidates in the MS are introduced to dispositions in through their core courses. Follow-up survey of graduates provided evidence of candidate dispositions. Participants were asked to assess themselves on the dispositions. Findings indicate that 69 out of 100 were able to identify disposition areas in which growth occurred. According to the respondents, growth occurred primarily in collaboration, database decision-making, and diversity. Of those responding to the question of how self-assessing contribute to their understanding of SOE dispositions, 31 said it did not help, 27 said it increased their awareness/importance and 10 said it helped them see growth (1.6.e).

Element 7: Student Learning for Teacher Candidates

The unit strives to prepare candidates who can impact student learning. Candidates are expected to have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to support meaningful learning experiences for all students. These expectations are addressed in the Conceptual Framework and assessed throughout the program in coursework and field experiences. Candidates learn to assess student learning, use these assessments in planning and adjusting instruction based upon developmental levels and prior experience.

Candidates learn to develop appropriate student assessment, monitor student learning and positively affect the learning of all students. Candidates understand that student learning is connected to their own knowledge of content, pedagogy and professional practice.

Initial Programs

During student teaching and some field experiences candidates are assessed on the degree to which they can demonstrate achievement of positive student growth.

Candidates are assessed on how well then can address the needs of all learners.

Consequently, diversity is embedded in all experiences, from coursework to field experiences. Candidates are presented with information about diversity beginning in H340 and continue to learn about children's diverse experiences due to gender, ethnicity, disability and other learning needs (1.7.a.).

Elementary candidates assess and analyze student learning in Reading II (E341) where they diagnose an elementary student with reading difficulties. The candidate then develops and implements a plan to improve the student's reading (1.7.b.). In Math Methods (E343) elementary candidates use interviews to determine student understanding of math concepts. Candidates then employ an observation check sheet to determine student understanding of taught math concepts. In Language Arts (E339) /Reading Methods I (E340) and Social Studies (E325) candidates develop a rubric to assess the objectives of their lesson plans. They use the rubric in evaluating the students' learning. They share their results with the cooperating elementary teacher. In Social Studies(E325) and Language Arts Methods (E339) candidates have the opportunity to work with students in both elementary and middle school. Candidates in these courses assess student learning and are able to determine the impact of their teaching on the students. Candidates work with middle school students on developing their writing portfolio and at the elementary school they focus on technology growth. Special Education candidates in their early field experiences are assessed on how their decisions impact student learning. During student teaching they complete a portfolio activity requiring them to give a lesson-by lesson accounting of how their students are performing.

Advanced Teaching Candidates

Candidates in the MS program are required to extend and refine their skills in using student data to improve instruction, and student learning. The Teacher as Researcher model requires the candidate to identify an issue, research it, remediate and reflect on how to improve instruction in their classroom (1.7.c.). In Methods and Materials for the Gifted and Talented (W553), candidates assess and analyze the effectiveness of instruction, make changes, reflect and assess results (1.7.d.). Candidates must write a reflection paper on the impact of the changes on student learning. In Testing in the Classroom (P507) candidates are required to create a minimum of 4 assessments tools/procedures that can be used in their classrooms (1.7.e.). In Education and Psychology of the Gifted and Talented (W551) and W553 advanced candidates create curriculum units which include criteria judging the impact of teaching on student learning.

Element 8: Student Learning for Other Professional School Personnel

Other school personnel candidates understand that their work has the potential to impact larger groups of students. They also are made aware of how their roles help create a positive learning environment. In the Education Leadership Program candidates study school data and write a school improvement plan (1.8.a.). In E536/S655 they are required to analyze test results and determine effective

instructional strategies (1.8.b.). Counseling program candidates consider the developmental levels and obtain experience in empirically based decisions. In Internship in Counseling (G550), candidates develop assessments based on individual intervention and prepare an individual counseling case report (1.8.c.). In G532 Group Counseling Candidates develop a case plan for a students and video tape the interventions. In School Counseling (G562), candidates identify an advocacy project, design a strategy, implement it and assess the results. Evidence that candidates have impact on student learning and other outcomes is found in case studies, work samples, and advocacy projects.

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 School of Education's Unit Assessment System (UAS) demonstrates the Unit's process to collect, organize, maintain, analyze and utilize information that serves to evaluate and improve the Unit and its programs. The development of the assessment system has evolved over several years and continues to be modified.

The Unit, in 2001-2002, developed the overview of the assessment system through collaboration with its external and internal education partners. The Unit redesigned the Conceptual Framework (CF) to reflect the changes mandated by the adoption of IPSB state-approved standards. Standards were mapped to identify what program changes would be needed to ensure compliance. Faculty were trained in assessment practices as performance-based assessments were prepared, piloted, and refined. Programs collaborated with stakeholders to validate assessments and strategies for preparing all stakeholders for the performance-bases system. Descriptions and timelines were prepared to show how data from candidate assessments would be reviewed systematically by stakeholder groups. An SOE faculty member was designated to manage the UAS.

The following two years have involved refinement and modifications to the UAS. By the end of 2002-2003, programs were reporting changes to ensure that candidates would experience a fair, accurate, and consistent system of assessment that would also accurately document program effectiveness. Working closely with the campus Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA), an electronic data collection and retrieval system enables us to directly load the data into MS Excel for analyses.

During 2003-2004 the Unit continued to refine and streamline the system. A UAS timeline was prepared to document how the system would be maintained to ensure that appropriate assessment initiatives would be addressed at designated times. The Unit is currently investigating other electronic means for storing data that will align more closely

with our assessment system. However, the electronic support we have received from OIRA has moved us closer to an electronic system that meets our current needs.

With the support of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Dean of the SOE was able to appoint an Assessment Coordinator in 2001-2002. The coordinator is a faculty member who is released from teaching responsibilities to direct the work of the UAS and chair the Program Assessment and Unit Evaluation Team (PAUE). IUS has also appointed a campus assessment committee to develop, implement, and monitor campus assessment. Members of the committee include faculty from the schools on campus, and representatives from OIRA.

Element 1: Assessment System

The Unit assessment system has been developed in close alignment with the SOE Conceptual Framework (CF). The four themes identified in the CF (high quality educators, caring professionals, continuous renewal of schools, and multicultural society) embody the standards and principles of IPSB, INTASC, National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the learned societies. Program standards align and incorporate IPSB's developmental standards with guidelines from learned societies. The full CF document details how the standards addressed by these professional groups are utilized by the SOE program standards and assessment measures (2.1.a).

Mapping standards was one of the first initiatives of the Unit's self study to determine where standards were covered in existing programs and where additional coursework and assessments would be needed to ensure that all standards were appropriately addressed. The Unit Assessment Report 2002 documents the first level of development of the UAS (2.1.b.). Additional mappings were created as programs began utilizing their mapped standards and identified areas for needed modifications. Modifications were made based on changes in standards from the state IPSB licensing framework, when new faculty and stakeholder groups brought in new initiatives for program inclusion, and as the program assessment feedback loops called for modifications in the UAS. The updated mappings are compiled in the Mapped Standards Document and kept current with needed changes (2.1.c.). The Unit also engaged in backmapping activities (2.1.d) in 2003 to review how standards relate to transition point reviews in each program.

Adherence to standards is monitored through various mechanisms. Program teams are expected to ensure compliance with program standards. The CF guides the monitoring of high quality through candidate performance and programs within the Unit. Other documents, such as the SOE Strategic Plan 2003-2007 (2.1.e.) also ensure adherence.

The Unit, in collaboration with its professional community, has developed an assessment system to reflect the CF. Each program works with stakeholder groups to ensure the Unit that INTASC and IPSB standards are fully assessed. The assessment system is now maintained and modified with input and guidance from the Unit's

professional community that includes: IUS SOE and content faculty and administrators, adjunct faculty, staff, and students; K-12 teachers and administrators; and members of the community at large.

The first level of responsibility for monitoring the UAS resides with the School of Education faculty and professional staff. Faculty and professional staff meet monthly during the academic year through program team meetings (coordinators and program faculty/staff), council meetings (program coordinators and SOE dean), faculty meetings (faculty, professional staff and dean), and staff meetings (clerical and professional staff and dean). Program teams implement Unit assessment initiatives as they pertain to individual programs and oversee the preparation of documentation for Unit compliance when requested to do so. Program teams include assessment initiatives in their Annual Program Goals documentation that tracks progress achieved around these goals (2.1.f).

Proposed changes in individual program assessments are brought to SOE Council meetings by respective coordinators to jointly determine how the program assessment issue complies with the operating UAS. Discussions also assist the program coordinator in determining if a program assessment change will require additional approvals involving the cross-discipline IUS Academic Policy Committee and IUS Faculty Senate and/or approval from the IU system-wide Teacher Education Council. All three undergraduate programs had modifications in 2003 that required review through the IU system as well as the Graduate Studies addition of Gifted Education as an approved IUS licensing area.

The second level of responsibility for monitoring the UAS involves the SOE NCATE Quality Teams (Curriculum Development, Field Experiences and Clinical Practice, Diversity, Program Assessment and Evaluation (PAUE), Faculty Performance and Development/Student Support and Recognition, and Governance and Resources). Quality teams are generally composed of SOE faculty and staff and convene monthly to monitor NCATE standards. The PAUE team monitors standard two, assessment system and unit evaluation. The PAUE team requests assessment compliance documentation and alerts programs when concerns are identified. Roles and responsibilities are established for the oversight of each quality team (2.1.g.) and annual goals are documented to track accomplishments (2.1.h.).

Each of the six program teams maintains a Program Advisory Group composed of stakeholders specific to the academic 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 assessment issues relevant to specific programs such as to review program data, hear and respond to proposed program or Unit assessment changes, and to provide validation regarding proposed changes to assessing student progress. Program team faculty dialogue with their advisory groups and take overviews of these discussions back to program teams for further study and review.

For example, at the spring 2004 meeting of the Special Education Advisory Group meeting, members raised issues regarding PRAXIS scores of applicants for the Special Education T2T program. Program goals for 2004-2005 will include: 1) determining what other higher education units are doing to prepare T2T candidates for testing, 2) orienting candidates to developmental resources on campus, 3) encouraging continuation of the testing preparation pilot at IUS, 4) engaging 'passing' T2T candidates to mentor candidates before taking the tests and 5) initiating a dialogue about allowing students to enroll and finish courses without requiring the testing.

Others from the professional community are convened by program teams at various times in the year for such purposes as to validate proposed assessment instruments or to strengthen rater reliability among evaluators. For example, the undergraduate Elementary Education Team brought together several content faculty to prepare the design and implementation for their new required diversity course.

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 NAACP and Metro United Way and adjunct faculty. The recently formed Council on the Preparation of Education Professionals (COPEP) committee ensures additional campus-wide involvement in the assessment process. Agendas for these meetings include discussions to keep our communities informed about our assessment initiatives while providing avenues for top-level administrators to address new issues impacting their learning communities that need to be brought to the attention of the SOE along with possible school reform initiatives. These dialogues among various stakeholder groups in our professional community help ensure that the assessment system provides valid assessment measures for monitoring candidate performance and alerts the Unit of changes taking shape within our learning communities.

The Unit maintains an electronic database of stakeholder groups and minutes of meetings (2.1.i.). Technology (i.e., website, email and fax) is increasingly used to keep our stakeholder groups informed. Stakeholder members who show interest and commitment are invited annually to continue their participation on the advisory committee and those who decline or do not participate in scheduled meetings are removed from the list and others with a similar affiliation/role are added. Efforts are made to maintain stakeholder groups with a variety of affiliations and representation. Increased diversity representation was undertaken as part of the Unit's strategic plan in 2003-2004. The Diversity Quality Team established a separate diversity board to review issues revolving around our diversity theme of the Unit. Special Education added two members of color and an adult with a disability to its advising group membership. Graduate Studies included a minority administrator from the Louisville area and two graduate students representing diverse backgrounds.

The Unit utilizes a comprehensive evaluation system to monitor individual candidate performance and to improve SOE programs. Performance-based assessments describe what educators should know and be able to do. Candidate performance emphasizes

specific abilities and skills rather than the accumulation of course credit or other input measures. Formative and summative assessments, based on program standards, are used evaluate candidate performance within coursework as well as at transition programs prior to field and clinical practice. Dispositions are assessed formatively within courses and at various summative decision points.

Formative assessments are used to inform individual candidates of their performance in specific coursework. Formative assessments are linked to program standards and situated in real-world problems or activities that are intended to be highly relevant to authentic experiences of educators in the field. Formative assessments are prepared and administered by individual faculty within programs who hold expertise in the area of instruction and/or by teams of faculty when several sections of a course are taught by multiple instructors, or when the assessment represents 'high stakes' with regard to candidate assessment. The assessment tasks embedded within formative instruction are further intended to prepare candidates for transition summative decision point evaluation. Instructors are encouraged to clearly describe within the syllabus how the content of the course is related to standards and how these standards will be assessed. Many faculty also utilize scoring guides and rubrics to ensure that formative assessments are transparent. Rubrics provide candidates with additional clarification on formative assessments (2.1.j.).

Summative assessments of individual candidates are conducted at transition points in each initial and advanced program, following clearly established criteria set by each program within the Unit. Summative candidate assessments are completed upon entering the program, within the program at transition points including prior to clinical practice, and at the conclusion of the program (2.1.k.).

Scoring rubrics are used in all initial and advanced programs to assess summative decision points. Decisions about candidate performance at the summative level are considered 'high stakes' and result in candidates moving forward in the program, requiring additional remediation prior to advancing, or resulting in discontinuation in the program. Rubrics document candidate progress in each program at each summative assessment point (2.1.l.).

Candidate performance data, documented formatively within courses and at summative decision points are derived from a wide variety of sources such as projects, essays, tests that demonstrate subject content mastery, portfolios, audio and video tapes of field and clinical experiences, reflections, and other evidence of proficiencies, including licensure tests. Authentic assessments are used to clearly link practice to school settings and include assessment of textbooks and materials; critical analyses of teaching events, effectively writing descriptive case studies and vignettes; assessments of student developmental learning related to needs; and making appropriate field and clinical decisions based on knowledge of curriculum and student standards; meet the needs of individual students, and demonstrate appropriate pedagogy to affect student learning.

Reflective thinking is an example of high quality performance and is used extensively by the Unit. Reflection is valued as a retrospective analysis, synthesis, and evaluation of experiences that lead to informed changes in practice and enables educators to frame and reframe learning, and formulate new plans of action. Reflection is used in portfolio assessments, research assignments, essay writing, journal keeping, discussion groups, and debate. Candidates' abilities to 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 personal successes and areas of needed growth at various points in their programs.

The Unit values portfolios as both a process and product. Portfolio development provides candidates with opportunities to explore, extend, and reflect on their own and their students' learning. The portfolio, utilized for review at various stages in the candidate's professional development, stimulates and strengthens reflection and practice. Assessment and evaluation are dynamic, ongoing processes that can be meaningfully and authentically assessed through portfolios. Programs using portfolios view them as learner-specific documents which, when viewed against criteria for evaluation, give evidence of self-reflection, professional growth, and development towards becoming educational professionals. Some programs require portfolio artifacts from several semesters while others use a series of portfolios, each tailored to the content of the field experience to which it is affiliated.

Specific summative decisions, based on multiple assessments about candidate performance, are documented at admission into programs, at appropriate transition points, and at program completion (2.1.m.). Levels of criteria for assessments are monitored for strengths and weaknesses and modifications or changes made when deemed necessary by the program.

Assessment measures are used to determine admission, continuation in, and completion of programs and are analyzed as predictors of candidate success. These assessment measures include assessments of dispositions as well as candidate data on standardized tests, grades, and grade point averages. Program assessments undergo pilot testing, revisions and field trials.

Each initial and advanced program compiles benchmark descriptions and exemplars of candidate performances that serve as standards of comparison for judging and evaluating quality performance. Valid and reliable assessments are required to systematically evaluate how well students' performances match program expectations. Each program collects samples of candidate work to document quality levels of performance standards. Some programs utilize candidate exemplars, with permission from candidates, to share with other candidates. Other programs archive various samples of assessments for training purposes.

The Unit takes effective steps to eliminate sources of bias in performance assessments and works to establish fairness, accuracy, and consistency of its assessment procedures. Assessments used as summative decision points are monitored by program teams to ensure consistency and fairness. Rater training is utilized when multiple raters engage in “high-stakes” decision making. Each program has worked to train raters to ensure consistent, reliable ratings for high-stakes summative decision-making assessments with participating faculty and when using raters from P-12 settings. For example, the cooperating teachers for the undergraduate Elementary Education program are trained each semester in the use of the assessment instruments that include discussions about ratings and observations of teaching videos. The undergraduate Secondary Education program provides similar training each spring. At the advanced level, graduate faculty reviewers have met numerous times this academic year to compare and contrast ratings given for candidate writing at Summative Decision Points 2 and 3, leading to proposed changes for evaluation of candidates at these points. Rater training initiatives are documented by PAUE to ensure the Unit that programs take steps to ensure that candidate assessments are fair, accurate and consistent with the assessment procedures (2.1.n.).

Table 8: Incorporation of Candidate Data into Program Revisions and Conceptual Framework

STEPS	PROGRAM AND UNIT ACTION
Step One	Examine cross-candidate data
Step Two	Draw implications for Conceptual Framework and/or program from data
Step Three	Draft revisions of Conceptual Framework and/or draft changes for program curriculum, experiences, or assessment with input from program faculty
Step Four	Seek program stakeholder input as appropriate to impact of change
Step Five	Engage stakeholder input & revise CF or program changes
Step Six	Per policies of the SOE, campus, IU system, and IPSB, seek approval through appropriate governing bodies and submit needed revised assessment procedures to PAUE
Step Seven	Upon approval, adjust data system to reflect changes and note changes in annual program report
Step Eight	Inform candidates, stakeholder groups and other IUS units that disseminate candidate-level information and revise printed materials as needed

Element 2: Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

Each program has clearly established decision points and assessment criteria: (1) an initial summative decision point for admission to the program, (2) summative decision point(s) for assessing progress of candidates within the program, and (3) a final

decision point prior to completion of the program. Candidates in all programs must successfully progress through earlier decision points to be considered for the final summative decision to license and/or grant a degree.

Assigned members of program teams review these at each decision point to ensure that all standards have been achieved. Data are documented on uniform rubrics that delineate the level of meeting standards established for the review. Initial and advanced programs use one of two processes to make summative judgments: 1) a formula is used to aggregate data or sub-ratings, or 2) a committee composed of members from the program team, and sometimes advisory group members from outside the SOE, to make 'holistic judgments' of the aggregated data or sub-ratings.

Data collected at various points within programs, including dispositional data, is also aggregated across programs. The Unit has a common language of terms used on rubrics for decisions made at summative decision points and for disposition evaluation. The rating system was recently modified following a lengthy review of how the ratings were being interpreted by each program and discussions with advisory groups (2.2.a).

Table 9: SOE Data Review

STEPS	PROGRAM AND UNIT ACTION
Step One	Data collected.
Step Two	Programs may choose to do spring review of data with faculty and advisory groups
	June 30 all raw data must be submitted to OIRA to generate data reports.
Step Three	Data reviewed by each program at Summer Retreat during the planning period.
Step Four	Advisory Groups meet in September to review reports and make program recommendations.
Step Five	Programs report at November SOE Faculty Meeting and to the COPEP at their fall meeting.
Step Six	Program Assessment reports due November 10 to Campus Assessment Committee.

Data reviewed in 2002-2003 included: 1) candidate portfolio analyses, 2) rater reliability, 3) standardized scores, 4) dispositions analyses, and 5) other candidate and program assessments (2.2.b). Data are compiled and analyzed to determine overall program success and areas of needed attention. Advisory groups, convened by program teams, engage in assessment reviews and provide input and guidance to program teams. (The newly formed Council for Preparatory Education Professionals committee will also review assessment data and its pertinence to other academic content areas across campus engaged in teacher preparation.)

Rubrics continue to be revised and validated through stakeholder involvement to provide clear descriptors and documentation of the quality of performance expected by candidates. SOE and campus workshops provide faculty with opportunities to improve their understanding of performance assessment and criterion-based rubrics for evaluating writing performance.

Multiple assessments are conducted involving both internal and external sources. Summaries of program and Unit data are shared and discussed with the full faculty in the Fall semester and with stakeholder groups annually. External survey results are shared with appropriate program, quality team, and advisory groups.

In addition to individual candidate data assessed formatively and summatively by programs, additional data continues to be used to inform the Unit regarding quality of programs and candidates. Candidate data regarding PRAXIS results are aggregated annually. Routinely administered assessment instruments created within the Unit and administered in varying venues and formats include data regarding advising sessions, alumni, current students, employers, P-12 supervisors, and recent graduates (2.2.c.).

Program teams and quality teams also compile additional assessment data to further support quality of programs. Recent examples of additional data analyses include a technology survey, diversity surveys, dispositions survey, diversity focus group documentation, and advising session surveys (2.2.d.).

Each initial and advanced program has worked with stakeholder groups to prepare and plan dissemination of printed documents and packets of materials outlining all elements of the new assessment system. Candidates are informed about the assessment system under which they will be evaluated in pre-admission literature about a program, at pre-admission advising sessions, and in documentation regarding summative decision points given to candidates at various times in their programs. Presentations are made in introductory education courses, such as H340 and the first year seminar, and in coursework at other key points in initial and advanced programs to inform candidates of standards and assessment measures. Standards are also included in course syllabi. The IUS Bulletin (2.2.e.) and program handbooks (2.2.f.) inform candidates about program standards. Candidates can also access this information on the IUS SOE website with links to specific information such as the CF, mapping of standards, examples of portfolio entries, etc.

If a candidate is accepted on probation or under conditions, the program team reviews her/his interim progress. Candidates receive feedback, in the form of written or verbal individual conferencing, regarding progress at major summative decision points. The Unit has procedures, including remediation and due process, when denying candidate continuance in the program based on a cumulative record of weak and/or inappropriate performance. Program assessment forms include areas for comments on attainment of specific standards, and care is taken to provide annotated information in all cases where performance is assessed as unsatisfactory. Summative decision-point data are stored electronically for each candidate and are available for subsequent use by Unit

teams to track the progress of individual candidates. The Unit provides a mechanism and formal procedures for candidates to petition and appeal decisions at the course and program levels (2.2.g.).

Candidate complaints, such as one regarding teaching faculty (when the accusation does not violate university policies) are handled by program coordinators. The Unit is reviewing a standard form to be used for program complaints. The PAUE has worked on a standard complaint form that could be used by all program students to document such complaints (2.2.h.). The draft has been forwarded to the Governance and Resources Quality Team for 2004-2005 review.

The Dean's office maintains the file of candidate complaints. Programs often review student complaints and provide overviews to their respective program teams as well as to inform advisory groups (2.2.i.).

The Unit has developed a coherent, sequential assessment system that permits systematically collected data on individual candidates to be compiled and analyzed. Modifications continue to be identified for better reporting purposes. Ongoing adjustments in programs assessment at the initial and advanced levels continues as data collection initiatives listed above, from both internal and external sources, continue to inform the Unit regarding program effectiveness.

Several programs have experienced data overload and are making modifications to address this area. Candidates report the need for better communication regarding program changes. The unit continues to review new systems that could interface with the IU Student Information System and allow candidates to access their own information.

Each program records candidate data on electronic scantron forms created for program-specific formative and all program summative data collection and analyses. (Rubrics, rating sheets, and other data are also compiled on hard copies when it is advantageous for a program to do so.)

Data are secured through the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment and confidentially maintained via passwords and delineated by using candidate ID numbers. Designated clerical personnel are trained to enter and retrieve program data. Access to candidate data is limited to Unit program key personnel, the Unit Assessment Coordinator, the SOE records officer, and two individuals from OIRA. OIRA provides data analyses to programs annually, and more frequently when asked to do so. Individual candidate files are confidentially maintained in the SOE Records Office.

The Unit requests data reports from the Office of Research and Assessment (OIRA) database to document the proportion of candidates who have moved through summative decision points and the ratings that were given. Electronically stored, data can be manipulated electronically and aggregated in various ways to illustrate what is occurring with the various Unit Programs. The Unit Assessment Coordinator is in direct

and routine contact with the OIRA office and alerts programs and the Dean's Office when issues and concerns are made.

A recent example of how data are analyzed with the assistance of OIRA involved the reporting of disposition evaluations used by programs within the Unit for PAUE analyses. A concern was expressed by OIRA when the report was generated regarding consistency of ratings that will need to be addressed (2.2.j.).

Program teams also request electronic reports from the OIRA and examine data collected from individual summative decision points for patterns of strengths and weaknesses in programs. At the request of program teams, OIRA produces reports containing individual summative decision point data, which are examined for patterns of strengths and weaknesses in the program. Analyses of the electronic data are reported to the 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 to make the change and then take the change to the appropriate body for approval.

OIRA is assisting programs to document more effectively the assessment of standards at specific decision points. Capstone field experience data are particularly powerful providers of feedback on performance in field contexts but also present challenges regarding reliability of assessments. Programs have and continue to work closely with P-12 stakeholder groups to ensure reliable measures from field and clinical practices.

Element 3: Use of Data for Program Improvement

The Unit regularly and systematically uses data, including candidate and graduate performance information to evaluate courses, programs and clinical experiences. Candidate assessment is reviewed annually by the Unit. Programs in the Unit seek stakeholders' responses to their candidate assessment data. Programs and stakeholder groups analyze assessment data and propose changes. Programs are required to show evidence of how changes have been incorporated into program standards and assessments. Programs document (through meeting minutes and SOE faculty meetings) the rationale and stakeholder involvement in program changes based on assessment data.

Data from 2002-2003 that were collected and analyzed by program stakeholder groups and reviewed by the Unit faculty include:

- Elementary Education changed questions on the student teacher and supervising teacher survey. Based on data analyses, the Elementary program eliminated the use of the W131 grade because it was already used as part of the evaluative criteria at an earlier summative point. Data collected from a review of syllabi indicated that diversity was not consistently addressed in the program which led to the formation of a new course on diversity.
- Two years of data from student teaching candidates, indicating a need for more information and knowledge about classroom management, resulted in

- the first mid-semester seminar for all secondary student teachers on classroom management techniques that took place spring 2004.
- Special Education has included additional preparation in supervising paraprofessionals, using assistive technology, and a stronger emphasis on behavior management in K205. The Special Education program used data from the fellowship project to revise portfolio requirements.
 - The Counseling program has worked with internship supervisors to develop a rubric for scoring all of the individual counseling tapes that will now be used in a three-course sequence in the program, with higher levels of expectation. There was a discrepancy between evaluations of individual counseling tapes by practicum and internship supervisors. To deal with this the four evaluators devised a rubric that could be used for both field experiences but would require a higher level of competency for internship. The rubric received its first use in spring of 04 and there was a much closer correlation of scores.
 - The Educational Leadership program is disaggregating data from ETS Leadership Series Institutional Report and obtaining data from stakeholders related to ISLLC standards and Summative Decision Point II and III revisions. The program created clearer quality ratings for performance-based activities, established application deadlines to better monitor applicants, and condensed information/application packets to make the assessment process more easily understood by candidates.
 - The M.S. in Elementary and Secondary Education program reviewed disposition and professional engagement studies surveys.

The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment has worked closely with the unit in the preparation and modifications to the electronically scannable forms for each program in the Unit and produces candidate and program data reports in response to requests from the assessment coordinator and/or program coordinators.

A full-time UAS database person was hired for the SOE in 2003, replacing the part-time position created in 2001. The database person works under the direction of the SOE Assessment Coordinator. The Assessment Coordinator oversees and meets monthly with the PAUE team, meets monthly with the dean, and makes monthly reports to the faculty/staff regarding the monitoring, reviewing, and revising of the UAS. The Assessment Coordinator serves on the Campus Assessment Committee (chairing in 2003-2004) whose responsibility is to direct and monitor campus-wide assessment initiatives.

The IU system is in the process of converting data from the old IUIS system to SIS (Student Information System), which utilizes a vendor-delivered data management program called Peoplesoft. Phase-out of the current, free-standing academic advising/degree audit program called IU Care is slated for December 2004. Candidates have traditionally been able to view in IU Care academic coursework and test scores (PPSTs) but there was no mechanism established for summative decision points due to the new Peoplesoft transition. Within Peoplesoft, academic units will have an additional option in which requirements other than coursework can be tracked (2.3.a.).

The electronic campus-wide database collection system continues to entail a great deal of planning and is engaged in a continuous cycle of review and revisions. The challenges at this point include aligning SOE documentation with the campus initiative and a change to a new campus-wide Student Information System that will necessitate modifications to the assessment system. An electronic institutional database permits programs to more efficiently conduct and monitor summative decision making. The greatest challenge is maintaining accurate documentation of the assessments and completing the feedback loop used for program reviews and changes.

Table 10. Timeline for Data Collection

Assessment Type	Elementary Program	Secondary Program	Special Education	Educational Leadership	School Counseling	MS in Elem/Sec
Advisory Groups	Annually	Annually	Annually	Annually	Annually	Annually
Alumni	Biannually	Biannually	Biannually	Biannually	Biannually	Biannually
Current Students	Each Semester	Each Semester	Each Semester	Each Semester	Each Semester	Each Semester
Employers	Biannually	Biannually	Biannually	Biannually	Biannually	Biannually
P-12 Supervisors	Each Semester	Annually	Annually	Biannually	Biannually	N/A*
Recent Alumni	Annually	Annually	Annually	Annually	Annually	Annually

* No field placement for MS program candidates who are not seeking an additional license.

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

Field experiences and clinical practice are designed as increasingly intensive school-based learning opportunities that are developed, delivered, and evaluated by the Unit through collaboration with our professional community. These SOE school-based

experiences are aligned to Conceptual Framework (CF) themes (high quality, caring professional, school renewal, multicultural society), and to respective program standards. Candidates demonstrate competence in the professional roles for which they are preparing.

A Field and Clinical Experiences Quality Team was added to the SOE quality team structure in 2003 to bring more attention to the monitoring of field experiences by the Unit. This team includes field placement coordinators, a representative from each program team, and a K-12 representative.

Element 1: Collaboration Between Unit and School Partners

The Unit considers field and clinical experiences of the highest importance and works diligently to ensure that collaboration is maintained between the University and school partners. The Unit provides knowledge and expertise on adherence to state and national standards adopted by programs within the Unit. Our school partners validate the effectiveness of placement policies, field requirements, and assessment measures used to develop high quality learning experiences for both our candidates and their P-12 students. Contracts are maintained in the Field Office, in which the responsibilities of the partnership between the University and P-12 schools are detailed (3.1.a.).

Systematic collaboration with school partners for both initial and advanced programs is accomplished through program advisory meetings, which include P-12 teachers, administrators, counselors, etc. as well as Unit and content faculty. Advisory group meetings offer opportunities for discussions on field and clinical design, requirements, and assessments of skills and dispositions as they relate to indicators outlined in the Conceptual Framework.

The Dean also convenes advisory meetings with district-level administrators such as superintendents and curriculum directors. Unit program coordinators and deans from the IUS content fields also attend and engage in issues related to field and clinical experiences. Minutes from these meetings describe the collaboration and strengthening of relationships with our school partners (3.1.b.).

The two Field and Career Placement and Graduate Licensing Advisors work jointly with school administrators designated by their corporations to place IUS SOE candidates in school settings. Designated administrators work collaboratively with the Field Experience Office to ensure that candidates are assigned to appropriate placements for the licenses they seek, and with highly qualified, caring professionals. School administrators also contact the field office if concerns arise.

Each of the two full-time advisors is assigned to an undergraduate program and serves on program teams (undergraduate Elementary/Special Education and Secondary). Both are assigned to the Masters of Science program team. Serving as members of program and quality teams facilitates better communication between programs and the field office. Descriptions of advisor involvement and collaboration within the Unit can be found in SOE Quality Team minutes (3.1.c.) and other program minutes (3.1.d.).

The undergraduate Elementary Education team assigns faculty to methods courses with field-based experiences. Individual faculty maintain close relationships with specific schools selected to model best practices, including technology, in that specific method area. The undergraduate Secondary Education program collaborates with school partners in various ways regarding field experiences. At the end of M480 Secondary Student Teaching, cooperating teachers are asked to provide written feedback on the program including student teaching. Some Secondary faculty work with specific schools for both the M301 field experience and with student teachers. The relationship they have developed with teachers and administrators in these schools encourages honest and timely feedback. Advanced programs use similar mechanisms to ensure collaboration with school partnerships.

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

Clinical practices are designed to provide opportunities for candidates to demonstrate proficiencies in the professional roles for which they are prepared. Candidates experience a wide variety of field-based learning experiences designed and sequenced for candidates in their respective initial or advanced programs. The clinical faculty assigned by the SOE and schools are accomplished school professionals who understand the importance of, and have the ability to, effectively communicate with candidates regarding instruction, supervision and assessment.

Clinical practice includes entry and exit requirements that are monitored by program teams to ensure that candidates are placed in clinical experiences with the appropriate knowledge, skills and dispositions for that experience. Information and other technology proficiencies are demonstrated by candidates as part of the assessment process. The Overview of Field Experiences document describes the progression of each program's field and clinical experiences (3.2.a.) and is further described in program handbooks (3.2.b.).

Initial Programs

Early field experiences are designed to develop and assess candidates' proficiencies. 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. Initial programs provide well-designed opportunities for candidates to interact with teachers, administrators, university supervisors and other candidates regarding the profession for which they are preparing. Candidates' interactions with P-12 personnel, peers, and P-12 students provide practice and evaluation opportunities relating to professional dispositions.

All initial candidates are placed in urban, diverse settings in the Louisville/Jefferson County School area for the course Education and American Culture (H340). This field experience includes opportunities for candidates to understand the role of schools in society, and to observe exemplary practices involving motivation, management, assessment, and content-specific teaching.

The next sequence of field experiences (EDUC M201) begins to develop candidates' teaching knowledge and skills, and is connected with courses in Educational Psychology and Child or Adolescent Development. In M201, Elementary and Special Education candidates study and apply motivation, classroom management, and assessment while tutoring and working with small groups. Secondary candidates in M201 spend 30 hours in a middle school or junior high setting reflecting on physical, emotional, social and cognitive development and observing in special needs resource rooms. Candidates at this level are assessed on their abilities to provide high quality instruction and appropriate professional dispositions when working with students at developmental level/s for which they are preparing.

The next level of field experiences for the Elementary and Special Education candidate focuses on general methods (M310, M311) and involves 30 hours of experience that includes visits to diverse school sites. Lessons are prepared and presented as part of an integrated unit followed by a 30-hour specific methods (M301), which includes field experiences involving language arts/reading, social studies, science and mathematics. At this summative decision point (SDP 2 for Elementary and Special Education; SDP 1 for Secondary), candidates demonstrate their abilities to practice teaching in specific content areas. Elementary Education candidates 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. The Secondary Education methods (M301) includes 40 hours of teaching activities, with 5 hours in a special needs classroom.

Permission to student teach is Summative Decision Point 3 for Elementary, Secondary, and Special Education. Student teaching is the culminating experience for the baccalaureate and post-baccalaureate Transition to Teaching (T2T) candidates. Student teaching builds upon individual and small group experiences until full responsibilities are undertaken. Candidates at this level become members of

instructional teams in the schools and are active participants in professional decisions. Elementary Education includes a 16-week experience with 8 weeks of full responsibilities. Special Education has 2 placements, each 8 weeks in duration. Secondary Education includes 10 weeks of student teaching with 7 weeks of full responsibilities. Student teaching candidates collect and analyze data and demonstrate effectiveness in improving student learning.

Portfolios are used to collect candidate data and provide an overview of individual candidate effectiveness. Artifacts represent specific program standards. For example, the resource unit in Elementary Education general methods is used to document the attainment of planning and preparation, while the behavior guidance video during the field placement for math/science represents program standards related to caring professions (3.2.c.).

Teaching candidates in the Transition to Teach (T2T) programs experience a similar progression from observation to full teaching responsibilities, but these experiences are more compact and intensive in design. For example, Elementary Education T2T candidates begin with a 45-hour practicum in educational psychology, followed by a 45-hour observation/teaching (in rural, suburban and urban settings). In the semester before student teaching, candidates complete 15 hours of tutoring in literacy and assessment, and then 10 weeks of standard student teaching. Similar field experiences are in place for the Secondary T2T program that include the middle school setting and resource room requirements. T2T candidates are required to meet the same program standards, including dispositions, as set forth in the initial programs (3.2.d.).

Special Education undergraduate students also begin with the H340 requirement that includes observation in an urban setting. Upon successful completion of Summative Decision Point 2, candidates progress to the M470 practicum where they are placed in special needs classrooms to begin to learn to plan and teach appropriate instruction for a range of developmental levels for which they are seeking a license. T2T special education students who are not full-time teachers complete M470 with additional activities related to the characteristics of students, age appropriate activities, case conferences, an aide interview, and behavioral intervention. T2T candidates who are already teaching full-time are evaluated through M470 in their abilities with aide training, data-based decision making, student goal setting, community resources, and family communication (3.2.e.).

Advanced Programs

Candidates preparing for new roles, such as Counseling and Educational Leadership, complete practicum and internship experiences as part of their preparation programs. Licensed teachers who are continuing their education in advanced programs use their own classrooms for field-based learning experiences.

Candidates in the MS in Elementary and Secondary Education program complete a Teacher as Researcher project in their classrooms no later than 30 hours into the

program at Summative Decision Point 3. The project assesses the candidate's ability to effectively reflect on planning and instruction as described in pre- and post-assessments, teaching/learning activities, and classroom video analyses (3.2.f.).

Candidates in the School Counseling program complete a 100-hour field experience (G524) in the second year of the program that involves individual counseling cases, group counseling experiences, and a school data report. The third year culminating experience (G550) involves a 300-600 hour school experience that includes the assessment of a diversity case, an ENL case, group counseling and a school improvement data analyses project (3.2.g.).

The Educational Leadership licensing program includes a 100-hour field experience (A695) at the conclusion of at least five of the required graduate-level courses. The practicum includes assessing evidence of meeting a range of nine areas of proficiencies pertinent to the role of school principal and linked to program standards. A clinical supervision project and a professional development project in E536/S655 require field work in the candidate's school (3.2.h.).

Educators adding other teaching licenses to an initial license also complete field experiences appropriate to the developmental level and content to the license. Further information regarding other field placements can be found in the Field Experience Overview document.

Field and clinical experiences at IUS are designed for program candidates to demonstrate their application of well-designed theory into the context of high quality school settings. High quality placements include clinical faculty in the schools who demonstrate caring dispositions and support effective teaching for all learners. Candidates are evaluated by clinical and University faculty on their knowledge, skills and dispositions for high quality performance, dispositions of caring professionals, and best practices that support school renewal for all learners. Some of the Unit's best field practices were highlighted at the 2004 Share Fair (3.2.i).

The Unit strengthens the high quality of school partners through various initiatives often directed at supporting our theme of 'school renewal.' Various collaborative grants, conducted with P-12 teachers in our service area and SOE and content faculty, have served to forge stronger partnerships and strengthen field experiences for our candidates. The Ameritech Electronic Enhancement of Supervision Project (EESP) provided practitioner and faculty with new understandings of the capabilities and limitations of using technology to provide better communication between area rural schools and IUS. The IPSB Reaching Standards by Retaining Teachers grant piloted mentor teaching in Scott County to prepare master teachers to work more effectively with novice special education teachers. The Indiana Commission on Higher Education Middle School Grant provided training on middle school content standards with New Albany/Floyd County teachers. The National Writing Project advanced the writing and language arts skills of area K-12 teachers. Numerous other school reform initiatives have taken place between the SOE faculty and area schools (3.2.j.).

Initial candidates apply information technology skills developed in earlier required technology coursework (W200) to show evidences of strengthening instructional strategies and student learning in field-based placements. Specific technology assignments in field placements are assessed through the completion of program standards. Candidates are evaluated on technology skills through the assessment of program standards. During student teaching, initial candidates integrate technology into their teaching activities. A recent candidate survey, conducted with all initial program completers following their student teaching clinical experience, indicated that 90% or higher reported they were well prepared or somewhat prepared on 10 of the 12 technology indicators. Over 50% of the initial candidates indicated they believed they were well prepared on 6 or more of the 12 indicators (3.2.k.).

Advanced program coursework embeds technology skills and assessments within program requirements. Candidates who believe they lack appropriate technology skills can include several advanced technology courses as part of their coursework (R531, E533/S533, F500).

Clinical faculty are accomplished school professionals, licensed in the area for which they are assigned to supervise and jointly selected by the Unit and partnering schools. As programs have moved to performance-based assessments, clinical faculty (both University and P-12) have been retrained for their roles as mentors and supervisors who are expected to provide regular and continuing support and evaluation for student teachers and other interns as they move forward through the assessment system. Initial programs collect and maintain information on each cooperating teacher regarding degrees, years of experience, and license level.

Table 11. Field-Based Summary 2002-2004

Program	Course	Hours	Field-Based Learning Experiences
Elem and Elem T2T	H340	30 hrs., elementary and secondary	One 15 hr. placement, must be an urban setting, overview of American schooling, observation and assisting teacher, attend board meeting.
	M201	30 hrs. in one setting.	Overview of American schooling: observation, tutoring, small group work, prep. of instructional materials. Study motivation, intelligence, classroom management, measurement and education. E-mailed shared log work with at least 4 children.
	M310 M311	30 hrs with 6 visit to diverse schlsite	Teach 4 lessons prepared from integrated unit, lessons evaluated by supervisor, teacher and instructor.
	M301	30 hrs. for total practicum.	Teaching with small groups, diagnostic, teach coop. learning, demonstrate classroom management skills. Use literacy strategies matched to reading styles. Assess student writing. Support decisions with data. Inst. Technology requirement. Use rubrics.
Elem and ElemT2T	M301	30 hours.	Teaching with small groups, diagnostic.
	M301	30 hours.	Solo teach 10 lessons. Strong emphasis on classroom management (standard 2),5 math lessons, 5 science lessons (interview 2 students), observation form includes rating for mastery of each objective.

Program	Course	Hours	Field-Based Learning Experiences
T2T	M425	16 weeks	Full responsibilities for 8 weeks, other endorsements 10 weeks *Elementary, 5-6 weeks full-time teaching. 6 weeks other, endorsement w/4 weeks full-time teaching.
	Practicum M500	Math/English-45 hr Observation-45hr Visit schools-15 hr Interviews-30 hr Board Mtngs -2 hr	Intensive practice teaching in Math/English.
	M500 Std. Tchng	6 weeks diagnostic reading. 10 weeks student teaching (6 full time).	Intensive practice in diagnostic reading and student teaching.
Sec UG	H340	2 15-hr placements	Must be urban setting (one of two placements). Not in candidate's former school.
	M201	30 hr in a junior high or middle school	Interview 2 regular classroom teachers. Interview 1 special education teacher. Teach at least 3 lessons. Observe in a special education resource room for at least 2 class periods. Complete a reflective writing assignment on junior high/middle school that focuses on physical, emotional, social and cognitive development as well as on middle school philosophy, curriculum, and organization. Complete and turn in log sheets on the field experience
Sec T2T	M500	30 hours in a junior high or middle school.	Interview 2 regular classroom teachers. Interview 1 special education teacher. Teach at least 3 lessons. Observe in a special education resource room for at least 2 class periods. Complete a reflective writing assignment on junior high/middle school that focuses on physical, emotional, social and cognitive development as well as on middle school philosophy, curriculum, and organization. Complete and turn in log sheets on the field experience.
Sec UG T2T	M301	40 hours	30 in teaching activities, 5 in spec ed. Resource room . Observe, evaluate, & critique. Keep a log of activities and critiques. Prepare and teach. 5 lessons.
		40 hours	30 in teaching activities, 5 in spec ed. Resource room. *Observe, evaluate, & critique. Keep a log of activities and critiques. Prepare and teach. 5 lessons.
Sec UG	M480	10 weeks.	Completion of portfolio. Candidate responsible for one course preparation. By 2 nd week of student teaching, responsible for two preparations. Assumes all teaching duties of Classroom Supervising Teacher for at least 7 weeks. Lesson plans for teaching must be written, approved by supervising teacher. Preparation of daily journal. Videotape of at least one class. Completion of 'Getting to Know Your Placement School.'
Sec T2T	M500	10 weeks.	Completion of portfolio. Candidate responsible for one course preparation. By 2 nd week of student teaching, responsible for two preparations. Assumes all teaching duties of Classroom Supervising Teacher for at least 7 weeks. Lesson plans for teaching must be written, approved by supervising teacher. Preparation of daily journal. Videotape of at least one class. Completion of 'Getting to Know Your Placement School.'

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

Entry and exit criteria ensure the schools and the Unit that only high quality candidates with appropriate knowledge, skills and dispositions are placed in school settings. Each

program has entry and exit criteria, generally as part of summative decision points, for field experiences and clinical practice (3.3.a.).

The assessments during field-based experiences, at both the initial and advanced levels, are designed to evaluate multiple indicators of the candidate's performance and ability to impact student learning. These are documented at the clinical level through evaluations completed by P12 educators and IUS faculty (3.3.b.). Candidates also self assess their skills and abilities and have additional opportunities to receive feedback and engage in dialogue with other candidates and supervisors.

Multiple assessments and raters necessitate rater training to ensure consistency. Supervising teachers at the initial level are being 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 meetings and ad hoc meetings. The undergraduate Elementary Education program and field office conducts a 2-hour orientation/training session at the beginning of each semester for University supervisors and cooperating teachers to review assessment documentation through videos, handbooks, discussions and sample ratings. Special Education meets individually with field supervisors and utilizes a program website as a supplement. The undergraduate Secondary team also provides training opportunities for clarification and understanding (3.3.c.).

Initial Programs

H340 is an introductory course to education and is open to enrollment by any student at IUS who has completed ENG W131 (Writing I). The majority of students in H340 have declared education as their academic objective, but other academic areas are also generally represented in enrollment, thus providing diverse exposure to disciplines for those who later become candidates in the SOE initial programs. Students in H340 are evaluated on field experience by a classroom teacher and by the instructor of the course on cumulative academic performance and the practicum. This final evaluation is incorporated into the first Summative Decision Point process for the Elementary, Special Education, and Secondary programs.

The undergraduate Elementary Education program includes H340 evaluations in the decision making regarding Summative Decision Point 1. Summative Decision Point 2 is made following general methods. Summative Decision Point 3 is made prior to student teaching through a review of evaluations of M301 and other factors.

The Secondary Education program uses the feedback from the H340 and M201 field experiences at Summative Decision Point 1. The feedback from the teachers and the instructors play an important role in determining whether candidates will be admitted to the Secondary Education Program and/or under what conditions. Feedback from teachers and instructors in the M301 field experience associated with General Methods plays an important role in determining if candidates will pass Summative Decision Point 2 and be allowed to enroll in specific methods and student teaching. Feedback from

cooperating teachers and university supervisors plays an important role in determining if candidates will pass M480 Secondary Student Teaching and Summative Decision Point 4.

Advanced Programs

The MS in Elementary and Secondary Education bases Summative Decision Point 3 on the application of teacher research into the classroom teaching of the candidate. Educational Leadership candidates must successfully complete (3.0 or higher) at least five of the courses before being approved for the practicum (A695) which is Decision Point 2. During the Practicum candidates must demonstrate competencies linked to the program standards and are assessed as part of Decision Point 3. Counseling uses Summative Decision Point 3 at completion of the practicum and Decision Point 4 at the completion of the internship.

If a candidate is performing inadequately in a field experience, a due process procedure involving P-12 educators and IUS faculty is initiated. Handbooks prepared with P-12 input and maintained on the IUS SOE website also provide further information about supervising and evaluation of candidates for P-12 practitioners and administrators who are not directly involved in the advisory group process of creating and refining assessment instruments. Programs are cognizant of the importance of clinical faculty evaluations and use handbooks, other documents, and meetings to keep P-12 partners informed regarding specific field experience design, delivery, and evaluation (3.3.d.).

Lines of communication are continuously explored for effective means of providing feedback and support among the University and K-12 clinical faculty and their assigned field candidates. These initiatives involve face-to-face, pre- and post-lesson discussions and verbal reflections with clinical faculty (K-12 and university), written communication through midterm and final evaluations, and opportunities for candidates to collaboratively share and reflect on field and clinical teaching and their impact on student learning. This feedback supports the CF for high quality, caring professionals, school renewal, and multicultural society.

The undergraduate Elementary Team holds 7-8 teaching seminars each semester to engage student teachers in reflection and provide them with procedural information (3.3.e.). The undergraduate Secondary Education program holds an orientation each spring for student teaching candidates, classroom supervisors and University supervisors and less formal on-site building-level meetings several times during the semester with undergraduate Secondary Education candidates assigned to particular secondary schools.

Feedback to candidates in the field is provided through observation, conferencing, group discussion, e-mail and other technologies. University faculty in initial programs meet individually with candidates at various times in their programs and also use interviews to review individual portfolios.

The advanced level also provides feedback to candidates through various mechanisms. Advisors are available for candidates to meet with at their convenience. Counseling provides an effective feedback opportunity from peers when interns return to campus to present school-based learning projects and new Counseling students attend and interact with them.

The Special Education program has engaged in several initiatives using grant sources to pilot the use of technology to improve communication strategies with field placement students and their supervisors. Feedback from the field pointed out inequities in levels of technology, vastly different administrative structures that can support or thwart innovation, and barriers created by school duties.

Anonymous candidate feedback is also provided through data collection at the completion of clinical practice at the undergraduate level. Surveys consistently show that candidates highly value faculty and supervising teachers for their honest communication, support and openness to experimentation (3.3.f.).

Candidates in the initial and advanced programs have numerous opportunities to reflect upon and evaluate their abilities to work successfully with all children. Candidates are placed in field and clinical practices where they have opportunities to work with students with exceptionalities as well as with student populations that represent diversity in race, gender and socioeconomic levels.

The Unit has increased candidates' opportunities to experience diversity in field placement as a result of changing demographics in Southern Indiana and newly formed connections with the urban Louisville area. The 2000 Census data indicates that two of the counties in our service area -- Clark and Floyd -- increased in non-white population by 50% between 1990 and 2000. More partnerships are also being forged with schools in the Louisville area that have higher diversity levels. All candidates are now required to complete part of the initial field experience (in H340) in the Louisville urban area. Tuition reciprocity for students from Kentucky has resulted in an increase in the experience of diversity at both the initial and advanced levels. Formalized collaborative and cooperative learning groups provide additional opportunities for the sharing of diverse experiences.

Continued interest will be placed on the diversity of field experiences through the newly added English as a New Language concept to the Conceptual Framework. Programs and quality teams have begun to examine current placements to identify diverse placements that also provide candidates with an understanding of how ENL is addressed in area schools.

All Secondary Education candidates must successfully complete four field experiences. The majority of these experiences are in three local school systems: Greater Clark County Schools (GC), Kentucky's Jefferson County Public Schools (JCPS), and New Albany/Floyd County Consolidated Schools (NA/FC). At least one placement must be

in a JCPS school to ensure that the candidate has an urban experience. The data below are from the 2003-2004 school year.

TABLE 12. Secondary Education Field Placements

Junior High Schools	English Language Learners, #	Free & Reduced Lunches, %
<i>G Clark</i>		
River Valley	16	32
<i>JCPS</i>		
Barret	N/A	15.8
Farnsley	N/A	62.2
<i>NA/FC</i>		
Hazelwood	3	48
Scribner	4	37
Senior High Schools		
<i>G Clark</i>		
Charlestown	3	24
Jeffersonville	16	24
<i>JCPS</i>		
Butler	N/A	20.4
Doss	N/A	48.3
Manual	N/A	12.0
Male	N/A	9.9
Moore	N/A	42.3
Pleasure Ridge	N/A	29.7
<i>NA/FC</i>		
New Albany HS	9	34
Floyd Co HS	4	8
Averages	7.85 %	29.8 %

N/A = no information available

Students with exceptionalities are also on the increase. Indiana's incidence of students with disabilities is 16.95% of the school-aged population while schools in the IUS service area, such as New Albany/Floyd County and Clark County are reporting 18.53% and 21.07% respectively. Inclusion placements, now widely used in area schools, provide general education students with multiple opportunities to work with students with exceptional needs.

A recent employer survey, conducted with employers hiring first year 2002-2003 elementary and secondary education initial licensed teachers, reported that the majority

of these first year teachers were effective educators for a multicultural society, demonstrated the ability to create instructional opportunities adapted to diverse learners, and demonstrated positive relationships with parents and community. In a survey conducted at the advanced level in 2002, 93% of candidates self-reported they felt adequately prepared to be an effective educator in a multicultural society (3.3.g.).

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 School of Education is committed to preparing candidates to help all students learn. We accomplish this using multiple avenues. The Unit's mission statement clearly responds to the need to prepare candidates for a diverse world. The Unit's mission seeks to "develop high quality, caring professionals who will stimulate the continuous renewal of schools within a multicultural society." The Conceptual Framework details a commitment for responding to a diverse society. Supported by the state-approved IPSB standards that include the theme of diversity threaded through all standards, SOE programs provide learning experiences that enhance the awareness, knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary for working effectively in school settings with all learners. The mission and the conceptual framework further provide direction for a long-range commitment to diversity as outlined in the SOE Diversity Plan 2002-2006 embedded into the SOE Strategic Plan 2003-2007. (4.A.)

The SOE Diversity Plan is a commitment to and a structure for developing educators who demonstrate proficiencies representative of pluralistic perspectives. This is vital to improving teacher quality, expanding multicultural education, and increasing global awareness. The SOE Diversity Plan is based on several 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 educational.
- 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; each substantiated with objectives and aligned to INTASC, NCATE, IPSB, and various subject and content area standards.

Each objective is further corroborated by suggested strategies, assessment options, a timeline, and stakeholder and responsible parties. The goals cover four areas impacting the work of the Unit and include:

- 1) Curriculum and Instruction: All curriculum, instructional resources, and clinical experiences utilized by the SOE will reflect and support the development of the individual student with specific attention to the inclusion of diversity, pluralism, and multicultural and global perspectives and strategies.
- 2) Educational Access, Recruitment, Participation, and Retention: The SOE will examine, address, and remove all barriers within the SOE environment in order to create access, opportunity, and fairness for all students, faculty, and staff.
- 3) Culture, Climate, and Community Outreach: The SOE will improve the educational climate for students, staff, faculty and the surrounding community by fostering an environment that is pluralistic and inclusive.
- 4) Professional Development: All SOE faculty and staff will participate in continuous professional development on a variety of issues relating to multicultural education, diversity, and global awareness.

The SOE Diversity Plan is a result of ample consultation among the faculty and stakeholders. The Diversity Quality Team convened an advisory board, composed of a wide-ranging, diverse representation of the service area communities, to gather input into the design and implementation of the diversity initiatives in all these areas. This body meets regularly offering significant contribution to the Diversity Plan Objective 2.4. (4.B.).

As a result of the implementation of the Diversity Plan, the Unit has made significant overall progress in addressing diversity at the SOE and has also been able to contribute to the inclusion of a consistent diversity agenda in the IUS Strategic Plan.

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

Educational initiatives aimed at improving student learning are a critical issue in Indiana and at IUS. Curriculum and school-based experiences of candidates emphasize the importance of learning for all students. Indeed, the design, implementation, and candidate evaluation of every Unit program includes clear evidence of this commitment, which is supported through adherence to INTASC, state content and developmental standards, standards from learned societies, and the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards.

Diversity knowledge bases, as described in the CF, address a broad definition of diversity to include race, ethnicity, nationality, gender, socioeconomic status, exceptionalities, religion, and sexual orientation and geographical area. The knowledge base is articulated through program standards and evaluated through assessment measures to ensure that all candidates develop knowledge, skills, and dispositions on diversity. Where appropriate, candidates document on course syllabi the diversity concepts and assessment descriptions. Three of the eight professional dispositions (#

1, 2, and 3) which are used as expectations for all Unit candidates are specifically related to diversity.

Candidates are informed regarding the importance and value placed on knowledge, skills, and dispositions of diversity in a variety of formats. Information sessions held prior to admission to programs, stress the mission of the SOE and its importance in addressing a multicultural society. Candidates go through formative and summative assessment on diversity concepts; they are informed of these requirements when they enter the programs within course syllabi distributed at the beginning of each semester as well as through summative reviews at various points within programs (4.1.a.).

Program diversity initiatives, embedded in standards and assessments, are monitored and adapted through involvement with program stakeholder groups. Program teams are focusing efforts to increase the diversity of program stakeholder bodies to better insure that the knowledge, skills, and dispositions relating to diversity accurately reflect the needs of diverse populations within the communities we serve. For example, the Special Education Advising Committee now has two members of color and one member with a disability.

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, as evidenced in the Dean's Summary of Annual Reports on Diversity (4.1.b.).

Candidates learn to develop and teach lessons that incorporate diversity into curriculum. They establish a classroom climate that values the diversity of all learners including exceptionalities of all individuals. Many program courses include elements of diversity and assessments involving group projects, exams, presentations, and projects. The narrative below provides partial information on courses and the diversity emphasis. Course syllabi (4.1.c.) provide additional details.

Initial Programs

Once the campus fully implements new general education requirements, every IUS candidate in the initial programs will complete two 3-hour diversity courses. During their coursework, candidates are exposed to a variety of experiences designed to prepare them to work effectively with students in a multicultural and diverse society. At this point, there is a broad array of choices offered by the university to fulfill this requirement; however, the undergraduate Elementary Education Program has developed its own required diversity course (Teaching in a Pluralistic Society – M300) that also fulfills the general education expectations. This course was piloted in Spring 2004 and will be required for all undergraduate Elementary Education candidates beginning Fall 2004. M300 is designed to be interdisciplinary and involves team teaching with faculty from social studies education and content area faculty (Social Sciences and Arts and Letters) to strengthen candidate content knowledge base about diversity. The course emphasizes the importance of social issues concerning diversity from historical and sociological perspectives; it includes research and requires a service-learning

component, as outlined in the M300 syllabus (4.1.d.).

In addition to the diversity requirements, all candidates in the initial programs are expected to successfully complete the Education Psychology block (P250/P251/M201), which requires field experiences in a school with student population that has > 30% of students with special needs. This experience includes lectures and discussions on diverse learning styles and on gender issues in the classroom, research-based approaches to individualizing instructions, as well as readings and video presentations addressing Afro-centrism in schools. The preparation to respond to different learning styles is also addressed by the Computers in Education course (W200).

The Education & American Culture course (H340) is also intended to be taken early in the initial program of studies. The course presents the educational system, its social impact, and future implications viewed in historical and societal perspectives. Special attention is given to ethnic minority, cultural dimensions of education, poverty, and changing family patterns. The course includes in-class discussions on American educational history, societal influences and education, and landmark Supreme Court decisions, plus a research paper topic to foster inquiry into the complexities of and opportunities for meeting diverse educational needs of learners. The field experience required for the H340 course takes place in an urban school with >30% of diverse student population. Details of the class are outlined in the H340 syllabus (4.1.e.).

During the General Methods block (M310/M311/M301) candidates may choose a diversity assignment and complete one of two possible related activities. However, when preparing the required resource units, all candidates must indicate on all lesson plans how diversity is addressed and how the teaching strategies to be used in the classroom will assure the learning of all students. Additionally, research on children's literature based on the stories of diverse populations is used as a foundation for critiquing specific pieces of literature to be incorporated in the teaching.

The Social Studies/Language Arts block represents the following step in the undergraduate Elementary Program and provides the candidates with additional opportunities to reflect on diversity and prepare for effectively teaching a variety of students. The Language Arts (E339)/Reading (E340) courses incorporate students with special needs into the class activities, systematically use children's literature on topics related to diversity, and include information and assignments on ESL, ENL, and diverse learners. One section has an on-going work with Farnsley MS personnel and students in which teacher candidates are exposed to a more diverse student population.

Social Studies (E325) has diversity as a core element in the course curriculum. Readings and discussions, guest speakers, experiential activities, study trips, planning and teaching of instructional units are all related to diversity, pluralism, international perspectives, and social engagement. The candidates receive specific training in the use of cultural instructional kits created by the IUS Curriculum Cultural Resource Center, learn how to create their own cultural resources, develop an "adopt a country" project, engage in E-pals activities with classrooms from around the globe, develop

community service activities with diverse populations, and engage in other processes conducive to increasing their diversity and global awareness.

In various courses, the Secondary Education Program engages candidates in different experiences directed to facilitate the understanding of the importance of diversity in various courses. All the candidates are required to take two sociology courses: Social Problems (S163) and American Ethnic Diversity (S216), as well as, one anthropology course: Culture and Society (E105). These expose them to crucial societal issues affecting diverse populations.

P250/P251/M201 are the core educational psychology courses for Secondary Education majors. The courses content addresses diversity throughout both applying principles of psychology to education and adolescent development. Diversity topics are reflected in student reports and field experiences. Candidates study topics of special education and multicultural education by examining case studies exemplifying how people learn. The sections of classroom motivation and management also examine ways to meet different students' needs and the role of self-concept and individual identity. In field experience, students observe in a special education classroom and conduct an interview with a special education teacher. Log reflection sheets and class discussion of observations complement this learning process.

The secondary General Methods (M314) expands the curriculum spectrum in order to clearly meet the goals of diversity as embraced by the goals of the SOE. The candidates are exposed to children's books depicting many cultures and different lifestyles, and to literature pieces written by people from various cultures. The coursework introduces topics related to ESL/ELL needs and includes students from local high schools who have special needs.

Methods of Teaching Senior High/Junior High/Middle School Science (M446) and Mathematics (M470) mostly focus on the relationship between multiple intelligences with culture, ethnicity and gender. Math history allows for an interesting discovery of multicultural legacies in this discipline field. When planning for instructional units, candidates are expected to demonstrate that their lessons include diversity expectations.

By nature, Special Education embraces diversity as a core of the program. In order to broaden the candidates' perspectives on diversity, Education of Socially & Emotionally Disturbed (K343) and Academic & Behavior Assessment of Mild Handicapped Children (K345) have integrated more current issues related to diversity into the topics and performance activities of the courses. In Education of Children with LD (K352) the whole course is devoted to disabilities, looking at the relationship of these with culture. An exploration of ESL websites has been added in order to provide the candidates with more reference resources to assist them on individual basis. Dispositions and instructional skills are rigorously assessed during the Practicum (M470) and the Student Teaching (K480/488) by the faculty and by P-12 mentor teachers. As already

mentioned, the respect and attention to diversity is a fundamental element in the assessment of professional dispositions.

Advanced Programs

All candidates in the advanced MS program are required to take Education and Social Issues (H520). This course covers multiple diversities and the impact of these diversities on teaching and learning for the master teacher. Candidates learn to integrate multicultural curriculum into core content areas. They study specific cultures as well as how prejudice is manifested in schools and how teachers can address prejudice in order to create curriculum that supports learning for diverse individuals.

Candidates in the Counseling area of concentration are required to take H520 in addition to participating in a new counseling course designated to focus specifically on counseling issues with diverse populations. Candidates adding licensing areas such as reading, educational leadership, special education, and gifted education also accomplish additional standards relevant to these specific licensing areas. For example, candidates working on the gifted education license include curriculum and experiences to recognize that historically, students from diverse populations have been underrepresented in programs for the gifted. Coursework addresses the cognitive and affective needs of gifted students from various ethnic, racial, socioeconomic, and gender backgrounds. Candidates examine educational practices within their own communities and implement identification processes, program development, curriculum and assessments that support diversity.

Specific initiatives developed by course instructors exemplify the focus on addressing diversity in the advanced programs:

Instruction in Context of Curriculum (J500) has made of inclusion of diversity elements within the Teachers as Researcher Project a priority for master's degree candidates: each student must include at least 2 lessons pertaining to diversity related issues in the classroom.

Psychology in Teaching (P510), Child Development (P515) and Managing Classroom Behavior (P570) address characteristics, qualities, values, beliefs, and cultures of children from diverse backgrounds. Issues about interrelationships of SES, family background, culture, and other variables are discussed with the use of educational psychology concepts, principles, and theories. P515 focuses on differences and similarities in growth over cultures, time, and place. Specifically, candidates are encouraged to interview people (and learners) from diverse backgrounds and write papers on diverse human learning motivation, and to exchange classroom experiences about management of classroom behavior of students from diverse background. Candidates are required to work on a behavior management plan for students with cases of behavioral, cognitive and psychosocial differences.

In Testing in the Classroom (P507) candidates study methods to modify and adapt testing materials in order to meet students' needs using the concept that "fair is providing each person what he/she needs in order to have the opportunity to succeed".

Orientation to Counseling (G500), Organization and Development of Counseling Programs (G542), and School Counseling: Interventions, Consultation, and Program Development (G562) have expanded diversity content and assignments for the courses. Particularly, in G542 candidates do "Close the Gap" projects in their schools to focus on discrepancies between male/female, minority/majority, low SES/high SES students with regard to academic achievement; in Lab in Counseling (G523) there is a strong focus on the research, indicators, and contraindications for using the counseling techniques with diverse populations of youth; in the Intro to Group Counseling (G532) candidates learn techniques and activities specifically for the use and enhancement of multicultural populations.

Introduction to Educational Leadership (A500) and Organizational Context of Education (A653) continue to include all areas of diversity when planning for all courses and have added a "Diversity Booklet" and scenario response as course requirements. Candidates must develop a research and report on one area of diversity, and create a plan for ensuring that all cultures are valued at the school where they would become principals. The use of minority guest speakers is another strategy embedded in these courses.

In Legal Perspectives on Education (A608) candidates must find case studies that are related to "culture clashes" and reflect upon them. Instructors provide scenarios that demonstrate violations of diverse students' and parents' rights, such as cases involving bilingual, religious, disabled, and minority students as well as gender related discrimination. Also, landmark court cases with legal implications in regard to diverse populations are used for developing awareness and understanding of discrimination and examine the Civil Rights implications.

Practicum in Educational Leadership (A695) provides opportunities for candidates to do on the job training in urban school settings through shadowing experiences in diverse schools. Elementary School Supervision (E536) allows candidates to identify ways they would hire, work with, and supervise all the teachers in their building. Sensitivity to faculty with special considerations (especially physical), minority faculty members and any other particular situation is stressed.

The Unit periodically surveys diversity in course syllabi. A recent faculty survey regarding teaching concepts and practices addressing diversity indicated faculty are infusing diversity in their courses through lectures, activities, case studies, research, field experiences, and more teaching strategies. Banks models of multiculturalism were used to analyze the degree of curriculum transformation and infusion of multicultural concepts. Narrative answers in the Faculty Diversity Survey 2003-2004 (4.1.f.) show that:

- 58% of faculty use additive approach in teaching diversity
- 57% use transformational approach

53% use action approach
25 % incorporate the three approaches

In 2003-2004, English as a New Language (ENL) was added to the knowledge and concepts of the CF under the 'diversity' theme in support of the SOE Diversity Plan (Objective 2.4). An ad-hoc committee was structured with the purpose of encouraging the use of more field experiences with high ENL populations and to develop initiatives in this area. Programs are beginning to engage in discussions on how to address ENL within program standards in order to respond to school reform initiatives regarding English language acquisition.

The IUS Curriculum and Cultural Resources Center (CCR) has prepared dozens of Cultural Kits that faculty, candidates, and area teachers utilize for teaching and learning about diversity and global themes (SOE Diversity Plan Objective 1.3). SOE faculty members have participated through board membership for this center; one of them is currently president-elect of the CCR. Some candidates have served the CCR as interns, and all of them receive specific training on the use of these instructional kits according to diversity and content standards.

The commitment of the Unit to diversity and global awareness is clearly expressed by the encouragement and support of international experiences. The design and successful implementation of the Explorations on Diversity Education abroad program has opened new doors to dozens of candidates for a hands-on transformational experience in the area of diversity and global awareness. As evidenced in the syllabi for F401/F500 (4.1.g.), the Partnership with Ecuadorian Schools and Universities is in its third year, involving initial and advanced candidates in a summer abroad course. Candidates spend several weeks in Ecuador where they develop a powerful firsthand learning experience about culture, school system and environment, teaching models, and also about themselves as educators and as world citizens. The approach of the course is that of full immersion, teaching, research, and reflection. Service is also embedded in the experience, adding global citizenship as a valuable outcome of this course. Year round campaigns in support of literacy centers sponsored by UNESCO see the active involvement of candidates in gathering school supplies and equipment for Ecuador rural communities. On two opportunities SOE faculty have accompanied the Ecuadorian faculty member responsible for the course, bringing back additional knowledge and ideas of ways to implement efficient campus teaching and candidates' field placement assignments to strengthen diversity and international education. For example, the technology faculty member will accompany the Ecuadorian group in summer 2004 to better emphasize global, cultural, and diversity awareness opportunities in SOE technology courses (SOE Diversity Plan 2.6). Returning candidates have made presentations on their learning experience and research topics, on campus, at undergraduate research conferences, and at state and national professional meetings (4.1.h.).

Candidates at the initial and advanced level show evidence of dispositions related to diversity. Dispositions adopted in 2001 related to diversity include "respect the legal

and ethical norms and values of education,” “effectively interact and collaborate with others and foster similar behaviors among students,” and “are committed to diversity through equitable treatment and respect for all individuals.” “All students can learn, have strengths and are worthy of respect and self-direction”, is also one of the seven beliefs of the Special Education Program.

Candidates in the undergraduate program are evaluated on dispositions through formative instruments and during summative decision points in conjunction with the student teaching program portfolio review process. K-6 classroom mentors give midterm and final dispositions assessments to their respective student teachers. Candidates in the undergraduate secondary program are assessed on dispositions that value fairness and learning by all students in M201, M301, and M480 at the midterm and final evaluations. Candidates in the advanced level engage in self-assessment of dispositions at several points in their programs. Candidates working on other licensing areas are subject to dispositions reviews at various times in their programs as well.

Assessments of candidate proficiencies include data collection of candidates’ abilities to help all students learn. In particular, field experiences provide opportunities to observe candidates implementing strategies and interacting in a manner that is consistent with principles of cultural responsiveness. Candidates are provided feedback on their performances in the area of diversity directed at improving learning for all students at various points in the programs, including each summative decision point evaluation. Feedback on field observations, according to a rating scale and with comments of the candidate performance regarding diversity, is regularly utilized (4.1.i.).

Element 2: Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

Candidates have opportunities to interact in classroom settings on campus and in schools with faculty from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, language, exceptionalities and religious groups. Diversity in the faculty has increased since the last NCATE visit, allowing candidates greater opportunities to engage in learning facilitated by faculty who represent and articulate African American, Asian, and Latin American experiences. Candidates working with faculty members from varied background receive firsthand learning experience on the process of adapting to diversity in the classroom.

The SOE faculty is primarily made of European-Americans (85.7%) and African Americans (7.1%). European and African Americans represent the largest poverty groups in Indiana (63.5% and 27.6% respectively), as outlined in the Report on the Status of Minorities at Indiana University 2003 (4.2.a.). Faculty exemplify a wide range of socioeconomic background levels, some representing first generation college graduates with personal experiences involving childhood poverty.

Table 13. Diversity Of Full Time SOE Faculty

Category	Fall 1999		Fall 2000		Fall 2001		Fall 2002		Fall 2003	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Male	8	36.4	7	31.8	7	30.4	9	33.3	9	32.1
Female	14	63.6	15	68.2	16	69.6	18	66.7	19	67.9
TOTAL	22		22		23		27		28	

Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
African American	-	-	1	4.5	2	8.7	2	7.4	2	7.1
European American	22	100	20	90.9	20	87.0	23	85.2	24	85.7
Foreign Latin American	-	-	1	4.5	1	4.3	2	7.4	1	3.6
Foreign Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3.6

Total Minority & Int'l	0		2	9.1	3	13.0	4	14.8	4	14.3
------------------------	---	--	---	-----	---	------	---	------	---	------

Faculty vitae indicate that SOE faculty have P-12 teaching experiences in a wide range of U.S. schools (public and private, rural and urban, urban African American, urban Hispanic, and BIA schools). The SOE faculty represent a wide range of previous P-12 teaching experiences with exceptional needs students (HeadStart, gifted education, learning disabilities, and self-contained low functioning classrooms). Several faculty members have extensive teaching experiences, travel, and presentations outside the U.S. in Bulgaria, Canada, Central America, Ecuador, Japan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, and South Africa. All these experiences enhance the offering of multiple perspectives to the candidates (4.2.b.).

Faculty also include in annual reports and in tenure and promotion documentation how coursework engages candidates in the community. Many 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. For example, community speakers present current information about the service area communities through presentations on homelessness, refugees, area law enforcement on drug issues and other criminal activity engaged in by youth, and professionals involved in providing services to families of abuse (4.2.c.).

The faculty's expertise in the area of diversity is also evident in joint efforts with faculty from content fields. Examples of these endeavors are the Social Studies units of study that accompany an exhibit on the Native American Heritage implemented by Arts and Letters faculty and students, and a DVD based on local historical research about the Underground Railroad developed by Social Sciences faculty and SOE candidates in collaboration with community organization. The co-teaching experience related to the M300 course already described (4.1.d) is another positive example of concerted efforts with faculty from content fields.

Minority status of adjunct faculty is also monitored by the Diversity Quality Team. Efforts are made to identify high quality minority adjunct faculty (4.2.d.). For example,

one section of the required undergraduate course H340 and required graduate course, H520 Education and Social Issues, are instructed by African American females engaged in other full-time employment in school settings who teach as adjuncts on Saturdays and evenings for the SOE. However, the local demographics represent an objective restriction and a challenge in this respect.

Table 14. Diversity Of Part Time SOE Faculty

Category	Fall 1999		Fall 2000		Fall 2001		Fall 2002		Fall 2003	
Male	18	42.9%	19	48.7%	16	42.1%	14	36.8%	16	35.5%
Female	24	57.1%	20	51.3%	22	57.9	24	63.2%	29	64.5%
Native American	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
African American	2	4.8%	3	7.7%	1	2.6%	1	2.6%	2	4.4%
European American	40	95.2%	36	92.3%	37	97.4%	37	97.4%	43	95.6%
Foreign Latin American	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0%
Foreign Asian	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0%
Total Minority	2	4.8%	3	7.7%	1	2.6%	1	2.6%	2	4.4%

Diversity in higher education is a challenge faced by IUS; however, the SOE has made some significant improvements. Good faith efforts have been made to increase diverse faculty.

- Positions are advertised in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, local and area newspapers and national minority directories.
- Faculty candidate pools are reviewed by the Equity and Diversity Office to ensure that faculty interviews include diverse candidates, when possible.
- 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 hires before classes begin and during the first year of employment.
- The SOE assigns a faculty mentor within the unit to each new faculty to support teaching and instruction and guidance in preparing syllabi and other Unit documentation. (SOE Diversity Plan Objective 2.5).

Increasing efforts are made by the Unit in order to identify clinical faculty in school settings who can offer a broad range of diversity knowledge and experiences to assist candidates with effective learning for all students. Schools like Farnsley Middle School, Goldsmith Elementary School and Coldridge Taylor Elementary (Kentucky), 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, candidates observe and work with ESL instructors from different nationalities. Increasingly, student teachers are being placed in JCPS schools in order to better prepare them to work efficiently with diverse students and communities.

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 bachelor's degrees. Overall, 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%. This contributes to the lower level of minority teachers completing degrees in education in Indiana and subsequently to lower levels of clinical faculty available in schools with diversity knowledge or experience.

The reciprocity agreement with three counties in Kentucky has brought closer relationships between IUS and Jefferson County Public Schools and increased opportunities to place students 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. Details of JCPS field placements are outlined in 4.2.e.

Element 3: Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

The minority teacher education candidate diversity in our IUS School of Education continues to remain low, fluctuating within the last three academic years as follows: American Indian/Alaskan (ranges 1-6), Asian or Pacific Islander (ranges 2-6), Black (ranges 36-51), Hispanic (ranges 2-7), White (ranges 981-1137), Other Groups (ranges 1-7), Non US (ranges 2-4). However, an increase in the diversity of the student population has taken place as a result of reciprocity. Females consistently far outnumber males, and there is a wide range of socio-economic status among the candidates.

A number of good faith initiatives have taken place since the last NCATE visit to increase the diversity of teacher education candidates at IUS. Initiatives undertaken at the campus level by the Office of Equity and Diversity often involve SOE faculty and staff. A minority recruitment officer, appointed by the university, participates on the SOE Diversity Quality Team, and works intensively in this key area. At the SOE level efforts are made to attract more minority candidates from area high schools to IUS who can successfully complete program requirements for professional positions in schools (4.3.a.).

- The campus Whitney Young Scholars Program recruits academically talented, and economically disadvantaged seventh grade students in the Greater Louisville/Southern Indiana area. The program prepares middle school students for high school graduation and successful matriculation into post-secondary education institutions.
- The undergraduate Secondary Education Program has worked with high school students in Jeffersonville, Indiana, and Doss and Atherton High Schools in Louisville for several years. Secondary education faculty work with teachers to build curriculum and educational experiences to expose area students to the

work of teaching in the hopes that minority students in these schools will express interest in an education at IUS in teaching (SOE Diversity Plan Objective 2.1.3.).

- The Field Experience and Clinical Practice Team explored the PLATO system and other learning tools to assist low-scoring candidates with preparation for PRAXIS testing.
- The campus Mentoring Program was designed to help students successfully matriculate and adjust to campus life at IUS. The Mentoring Program pairs students with volunteer mentors who guide them through their first year experience and beyond. Mentors are faculty, staff and alumni who seek to establish positive relationships with students (4.3.b.).
- Focus groups involving minority students were convened by IUS in the spring of 2002, and by the SOE in the spring of 2004. The focus groups provided several suggestions for strengthening the climate for minority students at IUS. This feedback is currently being studied. The MS in Elementary and Secondary Education program conducted a Minority Graduate Student Focus Group with eight African American graduate candidates in which candidates reported (4.3.c.) that the climate for African Americans in graduate studies at IUS was positive. Examples of suggestions included having more group activities for graduate students so that minority students would have opportunities to interact with other candidates. Involving minority faculty in these gatherings would help minority candidates understand that minority perspectives are valued and respected.
- The Unit has attempted to understand the climate for diverse candidates at IUS and in teacher education programs, more specifically. The Diversity Quality team conducted a pilot survey (4.3.d.) with graduate and undergraduate students with encouraging results that indicate that the SOE offers a pluralistic, inclusive, and welcoming environment. The survey will be applied again in the fall 2004 to students attending entry and exiting courses in each program.

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

A conscious effort has been made to place candidates in field and clinical experiences in locations where they will have opportunities to develop and practice their work with students representing diverse backgrounds. Initial programs candidates are required to have one H340 field experience in a diverse setting (SOE Diversity Plan Objective 2.4.).

Secondary education candidates are placed for one of their M301 practicum field experiences at Jeffersonville High School, New Albany/Floyd County High School or a Louisville area high school. Though other schools are more accessible to the campus, these lasts are chosen in order to provide the candidates with exposure to diversity.

The Field Experience and Quality Team has worked to more effectively document individual candidate and field experiences. A scantron form was created with assistance from the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment and piloted with several sections of field experience students in Spring 2004. The Unit also wants to document and expand ENL field placements (SOE Diversity Plan Objective 2.4). ENL will be added to the scantron form documentation and more information will be gathered by the

Field and Clinical Experience Quality Team during the 2004-2005 academic year regarding potential ENL field placements to support candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions with this population of learners.

Overall, the Unit has made significant progress in the area of diversity: there is focus, renewed energy, as well as synergies within the SOE, with content area units, with the local schools and community organizations, as well as with international partners. The Unit major challenge remains the undergraduate minority recruitment, which will become the priority of the implementation of the Diversity Plan for 2004-2005.

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance and Development

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

Introduction

In order to accomplish its mission, the School of Education at Indiana University Southeast is committed to recruiting, developing, and retaining highly qualified and diverse faculty. Teacher education and other school personnel candidates in the SOE are taught, advised, supervised and guided by well-prepared, experienced personnel.

The Unit's four themes are rallying points to help faculty and administrators evaluate professional effort and effectiveness. Preparing candidates who are highly qualified and caring and who are able to contribute to continuous renewal of schools in a multicultural society demands that all faculty and professional staff regularly enhance their own knowledge, skills and dispositions related to candidate performance. Such professional development opportunities for faculty and professional staff are arranged and carried out by individuals, the Unit, and the campus.

In preparation for their annual review by the Dean and Vice-Chancellor of Academic Affairs, faculty identify how their professional goals support the Unit's focus on the themes of high quality, continuous renewal, caring, and multicultural. A self-evaluation of progress on those goals subsequently appears in the annual report for that year.

Element 1: Qualified Faculty

Unit Professional Education faculty and professional staff include 27 full-time faculty, a full-time dean, and 30-45 adjunct faculty (per semester), and two SOE advisors. Faculty members who instruct or supervise teacher education and other school personnel candidates for the SOE's initial and advanced programs hold teaching credentials and have practical knowledge and skills appropriate to their assignments.

Approximately three-fourths (20 of 27) of the full-time faculty hold doctorates in their fields.

All full-time faculty have P-12 teaching experience. The average number of years by program team is: 8.6 years for Elementary Education; 11 years for Secondary Education; 11.5 years for Special Education; 10 years for Graduate Studies, 11 years for School Counseling, and 25 years for School Leadership. In addition, the two SOE academic/licensing advisors average 21 years of experience. Four tenure track faculty have taught in schools outside the USA: in Canada, the Philippines, Ecuador, Kuwait and Saudi Arabia. The tables below document the rank and expertise of resident faculty and professional staff and adjunct faculty. We believe our faculty members are high quality educators.

Table 15. Resident Faculty Members' Rank and Degree by Program

Program	Full Professor	Associate Prof.	Assistant Prof.	Lecturer
Elem. Ed.	Ph.D.(2); Ed.D.(1)	Ph.D.(3); Ed.D(1)	Ph.D. (1)	M.S. Ed. (2)
Sec. Ed.	Ed.D (3)		Ph.D.(1); Ed.D.(1)	M.S. Ed. (1)
Spec. Ed .	Ph.D.(1)			M.S. Ed. (1)
Schl. Coun.	Ed.D (2)			
Grad. Studies			Ph.D.(3)	M.S. Ed. (1)
Ed. Ldrshp.			Ph.D. (1)	M.S. Ed. (2)

Table 16: Credentials, Rank, Degree, Teaching Experience Outside the USA, & Total Yrs. Professional Experience of Full-Time Professional Faculty and Advisors

Program: Name	Preparation/ Expertise	Rank	Highest Degree	Years Experience
EE: C. Bowles*	Reading/Lit.	Lecturer	M.S. Ed.	6
EE: C. deGraaf	Ed. Psych	Professor	Ph. D.	3
EE: M. Harshfield*	Elem. Ed.	Lecturer	M.S. Ed.	24
EE: M. Herdoiza* @	Soc. Studies	Asst. Prof.	Ph. D.	7
EE: J. Nunnelley*	Gen/Early Chld	Assoc. Prof	Ed. D	7
EE: S. Ridout*	Reading	Professor	Ph. D.	4
EE: W. Ryan* @	Mathematics	Assoc. Prof.	Ph. D.	10
EE: F. Squires*	Science	Assoc. Prof.	Ph. D.	13
EE: B. Thompson*	Literacy/ESL	Asst. Prof.	Ph. D	7
EE: G. Wall *	Curr & Inst.	Professor	Ed. D.	5
SE: K. Bailey*	English/Literacy	Professor	Ed. D.	15
SE: J. Hollenbeck*	Science Ed.	Asst. Prof.	Ph. D.	8

SE: W. Jamski*	Mathematics	Professor	Ed. D.	6
SE: L. Morganett	Soc Studies/Ed. Psy.	Professor	Ed. D.	4
SE: G. Pinkston @	Ed. Technology	Asst. Prof	Ed. D.	24
SE: K. Simms*	C&I. /English	Lecturer	M.S. Ed.	13
SpE: K. Jackson*	Special Ed.	Lecturer	M.S. Ed.	17
SpE: C. Shea*	Special Ed.	Professor	Ph. D.	6
SC: T. Fields*	School Psych	Professor	Ed. D.	15
SC: R. Smead	Counseling/Psych	Professor	Ed. D.	7
GS: C. Babione	Ed. Found./ Literacy/Elem Ed	Assoc. Prof.	Ph. D.	13
GS: N. Brewer	Elem.Ed/Curr.	Lecturer	M.S. Ed.	20
GS: F. Camahalan @	Ed. Psych.	Asst. Prof.	Ph. D.	4
GS: M. J. Lewellen*	Psychology	Asst. Prof..	Ph. D.	4
EL: R. Fankhauser*	Ed. Admin.	Asst. Prof.	Ed. D.	30
EL N. Hottman*	Ed Admin.	Lecturer	M.S. Ed	25
EL S. Whitaker*	Ed. Admin.	Lecturer	M.S. A.	29
Advisor: J. Clements	Secondary Ed.	Prof. Staff	M.S. Ed.	25
Advisor: J. Riehl	Elementary Ed.	Prof. Staff	M.S. Ed.	17

* Supervise field experience or clinical practice annually. @ K-12 teaching experience outside the United States. NOTE: The Dean is not included in this chart.

Table 17. Highest Degrees Held by Adjunct Faculty

Spring 2004	M. S.	Ed. D.	Ph. D.	J.D.
Adjuncts (46)	39	5	1	1

Note: 29 adjunct faculty taught a 2-3 credit course (including counseling internship); 4 taught a one-credit Saturday workshop; 10 supervised one or more student teachers; 2 taught a three-credit course and a one-credit workshop, and 1 taught two three-credit courses.

Besides credentials and school experience, resident faculty members demonstrate their expertise through consulting and workshop presentations for P-12 schools (5.1.a. and 5.1.b.). For example, faculty work with schools on grant projects, provide in-service training, help schools improve technology skills, collaborate on cadet teaching programs, and judge student competitions and events. One faculty member has been a principal advisor for international UNESCO projects focusing on national curriculum reforms in Honduras and Haiti.

School faculty who supervise candidates in field and clinical experience hold valid licenses and/or needed experience for their assignments (5.1.c.). Those supervising

initial level candidates have at least three years teaching experience, and in nearly every case have more than a master's degree.

Element 2: Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

Faculty members in the School of Education at IUS strive to model best professional teaching practices. They are teacher scholars who link theory to practice with expertise in their areas of teaching. They model the Conceptual Framework through exhibiting teaching that is consistent with the themes of high quality, caring, continuous renewal of schools, and multicultural society.

Teaching is a priority to faculty in the School of Education, as evidenced by the merit salary policy (5.2.a.). Faculty members are evaluated in teaching, scholarship and service each year for consideration of merit award raises. A committee has been established within the college of Education to assist the Dean in determining the guidelines for merit pay.

Indiana University has several other ways to recognize and reward teaching, thus corroborating our contention that SOE faculty are high quality educators. SOE faculty have successfully competed with campus colleagues for the F.A.C.E.T. (Faculty Colloquium on Excellence in Teaching) award and Trustee Teaching Award (a.k.a., T.E.R.A.--Teaching Excellence Recognition Award before 2000-2001). Recently four SOE faculty members were awarded Indiana University Trustee Teaching Awards; this was the most awarded to any School on campus. Currently five members of the SOE have been inducted into the F.A.C.E.T. Academy. More information about the Academy can be found at <http://www.iusb.edu/~sbfacet/> (5.2.b.) Additionally, last year one of the SOE adjunct faculty was recognized as the Outstanding Adjunct Faculty Member on campus, and more recently received the 2004 Metroversity Outstanding Faculty of Adult Learners Award.

In addition to the awards earned by the faculty other evidence of best practices exist in the student evaluations of the instructors and the syllabi of the faculty which reflect the work of each person in their field and the assignments and work of each student in the School of Education. The syllabi (5.2.c.) in the exhibit room also examples of student work which again reflects the latest in teaching methods and the most current thinking in their respective areas (i.e. science, mathematics, social studies, reading, classroom management, etc.).

A professor's syllabus is one indicator of what she/he believes about teaching and learning. The implementation of the syllabus through class activities, requirements and assessments provides a model to candidates. Candidates see, hear and experience the use of different teaching styles and multiple assessment techniques.

Assessment techniques include portfolios, case studies, learning logs, lesson plans and units, school improvement plans, observations by IUS and field faculty and self-evaluation. Other strategies include open response questions, check lists, on-demand

tasks, rating scales, and process or lab oriented tests. The School Counseling, Educational Leadership, all initial programs and the advanced problem in Special Education require candidates to develop a portfolio to demonstrate performance at either a particular point in the program (akin to a snap-shot) or longitudinally over several semesters (akin to a video). Examples of portfolios (5.2.d.) can be found in the exhibit room. The Masters in Elementary or Secondary Education is phasing in a Teacher as Researcher project. The variety and frequency of assessment undergone by candidates provides the individual candidate, the program and the Unit with important formative and summative data as well as modeling these techniques to candidates themselves.

High quality educators model exemplary pedagogy themselves. Syllabi in the documents room contain evidence of faculty's use of multiple teaching strategies, including demonstrations, case studies, simulations, games, experience-based hands-on science, manipulatives, field trips, story telling, dramatization, role playing, research papers and projects, guest speakers, peer instruction, and lectures.

Instructional technology is becoming a more frequently used technique at IUS and within the School of Education. Results from a technology survey (5.2.e.) indicate widespread use of technology to enhance candidates' learning experience. For example, of the 137 advanced candidates surveyed in six classes during the spring 2004, 90 reported using the IU system's Oncourse to view the course syllabus and more than 40 accessed needed forms or reading materials through the same technology. Seventy-eight percent of the advanced candidates and 94% of initial candidates (Elementary or Secondary Education spring, 2004 student teachers) completing the survey indicated that IUS "somewhat" if not "well prepared" them to do a variety of professional tasks with technology, ranging from planning engaging lessons to creating analyze achievement data.

Element 3: Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship

The professional teacher education faculty in the School of Education is actively engaged in scholarly activity related to teaching and learning, creative achievements, research, and grant writing. Contributions by the faculty to the scholarly literature of their respective professional specialty are expected and valued by the School and the University.

Vitae (5.1.b.) of faculty show how they disseminate their knowledge in skills in a variety of venues, including refereed journals, books, and presentations at local, regional, state, national and international conferences. Between 1999 and 2002, faculty have published:

Table 18. Scholarship

	1999	2000	2001	2002
Books	-	1	-	1
Articles	7	8	9	14
Proceedings, Papers, & Published Abstracts	-	3	-	-
Media Materials & Other	-	5	3	5

In addition to publications the faculty members in the School of Education are productive in terms of presentations. Table 18 shows the number of presentations made by the SOE faculty in the last 5 years.

Table 19. School of Education Faculty Presentations 2000 – 2004

Department	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004*
International	--	--	1	5	2
National	10	5	16	10	5
State	4	6	18	9	2
Regional	25	21	14	29	--
Local	37	52	74	38	31

* January to April 2004.

Faculty have also been active in acquiring external and internal funding (5.3.a). For example, in the past two years substantial grants in excess of \$100,000 each have been awarded to SOE faculty to improve academic performance of children and youth in high-poverty schools, prepare sixth-grade teachers to move from an elementary education to a middle school education model and to provide alternative certification options for high need content areas. Other grants ranging from a few to fifteen thousand dollars have been awarded to SOE members to improve the use of technology in the SOE and schools, to study abroad, to participate in the National Writing Project, and to conduct service learning projects. A comprehensive chart (5.3.b.) provides totals and additional details. The volume of grant projects indicates how SOE faculty collaborate with P-12 personnel to maintain high quality and engage with our communities to continuously renew schools in our service region.

Element 4: Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

Faculty within the School of Education provide and lead a broad range of service activities on campus and participate and lead state-level professional organizations and committees. For example in the most recent academic year, SOE faculty chaired five campus level governance committees (Academic Assessment, Faculty Board of Review, Faculty Affairs, Improvement of Writing, and Library); this was the most of any of the schools on campus. In the last three years, two members have been on the IUS Faculty Senate Executive Committee--a key leadership group.

The SOE is also involved in state-level organizations, committees, and other venues in which issues and decisions are centered on P-12 and teacher education. One member co-chairs an Indiana Professional Standards Board Committee; another was asked to be part of an Indiana Professional Standards Board sponsored panel discussion regarding Exceptional Needs licensure.

Faculty are not only actively involved in the schools through special projects but also through supervision of field experiences. The vast majority of faculty (20 of 27) supervise field experiences each year. For a complete picture of faculty service see 5.5.c.

Element 5: Collaboration

Faculty of the School of Education of Indiana University Southeast participate in many school related activities in the service area of the University. The SOE has various school partnership projects within the thirteen Indiana counties of its service region and in Louisville, Kentucky and its contiguous counties. These collaborations are important ways in which the SOE participates in school renewal. A comprehensive list of collaborative projects (5.1.b.) can be found in the documents room; a sample of such collaborations by program involvement follows:

Table 20. Sample of SOE Collaborations

Project	Program Teams Involved					
	EE	SE	SpE	GS	SC	SL
Conducted 2 yr. study of K-12 standards with two low income IN school districts				X		
Trained mentors and retained spec ed teachers IN school districts			X	X		
Helped principal develop school-wide plan for improving literacy in an IN school					X	
Set up project for English ed majors to coach writing in a KY middle school					X	
Provided PDAs and in-service for faculty at an IN elementary school that hosted elem ed methods class	X	X				
Sponsored Science Olympiad for southern IN middle & high schools	X	X				X
Coached a high school on test prep techniques for 10 th grade students						X
Provided support for revision of forms used in special ed services in an IN cooperative			X			
Trained faculty in one IN middle school on use of functional behavior analysis and behavior plans			X			

Judged “We the People..” competition in IN		X				
Taught faculty at one IN elementary how to use PDAs to assess student performance		X				
Staffed lending library of materials for use by local teachers and candidates			X			
Facilitated integration of two young adults with disabilities into a college class activities.	X	X				
Helped develop learning activities for one IN schools’ 8 th graders’ field trip to Cincinnati aquarium	X					
Evaluated an after-school learning project for an IN district				X		
Provided 4-day training for peer mediators at an IN high school					X	
Provided technical assistance to a KY elementary school applying for a literacy grant						X

Consistent with IUS’ vision of “providing a broad range of highest quality professional services to the community through collaborations, partnerships, and applied research,” SOE faculty and campus content faculty form partnerships with schools. Faculty from Natural Sciences and Purdue’s School of Technology are event coordinators and judges for the Science Olympiad held on campus in late winter. A member of the Secondary Education team participates in the Visiting Scientist and State Mathematics Contest, both of which are coordinated by members of IUS’ School of Natural Sciences. A recent multi-year with New Albany-Floyd Country School District designed to transition teachers from a junior high to a middle school model also involved IUS Arts and Letters faculty. A member of the Elementary Education Program, an IUS faculty member in mathematics, and the Clarksville Community Schools curriculum coordinator jointly wrote a successful multi-year grant to improve mathematics skills of middle schools students. IUS Arts and Letters faculty have been involved with the National Writing Project under the guidance of a faculty member of the Secondary Education program.

EDUC M300 Teaching in a Pluralistic Society is a new course for candidates in the Elementary Education program. In order for this course to have a strong content component, a substantial module dealing with Gender and Sexual Orientation is taught and evaluated by an IUS sociologist. An equally substantial unit on World Religions is taught by an IUS professor of Religion.

SOE faculty have demonstrated further collaboration by co-presenting at conferences with P-12 faculty. For example, the coordinators of Graduate Studies and Special Education programs co-presented with two special educators at a national conference.

The Graduate Studies coordinator also co-presented on a different topic and with another P-12 faculty member at a national education conference. The coordinator of the School Leadership Program delivered a joint presentation with a Kentucky school principal at the Kentucky Teaching and Learning Conference. A member of the Secondary team co-wrote articles for science journals with local middle and high school teachers.

Element 6: Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

All members of the SOE faculty undergo regular and comprehensive evaluations of their performance in teaching and service, and if tenure track, in their scholarship. Review processes, policies and expectations are delineated in the IU Faculty Handbook (5.6.a.) and IUS' Faculty Manual (5.6.b). Evaluation of tenure faculty* performance is completed by:

- a. the faculty member her/himself on an annual basis,
- b. Unit peers annually for extra merit pay,
- c. Unit dean annually to assess suitability for reappointment,
- d. Unit peers at the third year of appointment (formative only),
- e. Unit peers for triennial evaluations of reassigned time for research after tenure is achieved, and
- f. Unit peers, the Dean, campus colleagues, the Vice-Chancellor of Academic Affairs, and the Chancellor at tenure and promotion times, and by the Dean of Education in Bloomington for the tenure decision.

* Some senior faculty hired under different guidelines for promotion and tenure opt to not be held to scholarship expectations and thus are not eligible for reassigned time for scholarship.

Evaluation of performance of lecturers in the areas of teaching is done by:

- a. the faculty member her/himself,
- b. Unit peers annually for extra merit pay,
- c. Unit dean to assess suitability for reappointment, and
- d. Unit peers every three years.

The Dean provides each faculty member with a written evaluation which includes formative and summative feedback. Faculty are offered an opportunity to meet with the Dean to discuss his/her written evaluation.

All adjunct professors are expected to distribute end-of-the-semester evaluations to their students. These forms are electronically scored. A copy of the tallies and students' handwritten comments are mailed to the instructor and a duplicate is provided to the appropriate program coordinator for consideration.

The Dean's performance is evaluated every three years by the Unit faculty and annually by the central office administration. The third-year review is organized by an ad hoc committee in the Unit and carried out in accordance with campus policies.

Faculty are responsible for submitting evidence of their performance and do so by completing a campus-wide annual report form (5.6.c.) and submitting supporting documents, explanations and analyses of their work completed during the previous calendar year. Faculty are expected to submit professional goals for the coming year and to show how those align with the themes or priorities of the Unit.

Though not required to use them and/or submit the data for review, faculty have access to Indiana University's system-wide Multi-Op course-instructor evaluation service. Faculty can select up to 35 items from a bank of 198 items, and include up to 15 self-written items in an electronically tabulated rating scale completed by students in their courses. Information about Multi-Op (5.6.d.) can be found at http://www.indiana.edu/~best/course_evaluations.shtml

Element 7: Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

The Unit believes professional development of its faculty is important for its mission. Its importance is embodied in the following Unit Goal: Engage in continuous self-improvement and professional growth, support the professional development of others, and display positive professional behaviors and dispositions for effective practice. To that end, the unit arranges professional development activities for faculty to support unit outcomes. Such opportunities are considered a prerequisite for demonstrating and continuing the success of the model.

New unit faculty are given an opportunity to have a mentor within the SOE. The appropriate program coordinator provides the Dean with a list of potential mentors. Before designating a mentor, the Dean asks if the mentor and the new faculty member are willing to be placed in a mentoring relationship. Each mentor-mentee relationship takes on its own character and lasts as long as the mentee wishes and the mentor is willing.

Teaching is designated as the first priority for new faculty. Either the mentor and/or the new faculty member's program coordinator help her/him develop syllabi which focus on program and Unit outcomes. Expectations for committee service and scholarship increase in subsequent years. Senior faculty, but not always the mentor, partner with new faculty on projects. Examples include a senior faculty in Special Education securing teaching-learning partnerships (internal grants for less than \$300 each) with two newly hired faculty members in Graduate Studies and a presentation with a lecturer in special education; a senior member in Secondary Education editing articles for a newly hired Elementary Education faculty member; and the coordinator of Graduate Studies co-writing and presenting at conferences with newly hired faculty in that program.

Newly hired full-time faculty members have a campus-centered orientation and in-service each August. Topics (5.7.a) covered over the course of the initial year are vary. Examples are: information about FERPA, opportunities for internal and external funding,

human subjects guidelines, pedagogy, and documentation of production in teaching, scholarship and service.

Ongoing development occurs during the regular meetings of various committees, through workshops such as the technology training for the entire Unit, through brown bag luncheon discussions of hot topics, and via university sponsored faculty development programs. A list of professional development opportunities (5.7.b) provided or organized by the Unit can be found in the documents room. A survey done by the Faculty Development Quality Team provided guidance for selecting topics.

A rich source of periodic and on-going professional development assistance is IUS's Institute for Learning and Teaching Excellence (ILTE). A partial list of its services and resources follow and details can be found at <http://ilte.ius.edu/> (5.7.c)

- Grants relating to pedagogy and assessment
- Publications about pedagogy
- Newsletter devoted to pedagogy
- Workshops on teaching with technology, teaching and assessment
- Links to publications including Journal on Excellence in College Teaching

Each faculty member is allotted approximately \$400 annually to defray costs of attending conferences and trainings. Faculty have successfully applied for additional monies to at least partially underwrite travel to a second conference in the same year.

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. The SOE is fortunate to have access to resources, such as one of the finest libraries in the world, of a well-established university system. Although IUS and the SOE are autonomous in governance, they operate within a system-wide infrastructure. The Indiana University Academic Handbook (6.A.) and an IUS Faculty Manual (6.B.) provide insights into system-wide and campus administrative oversight, respectively. The IUS Strategic Plan (<http://www.ius.edu/aboutIUS/StrategicPlanningProject/>) is currently being revised. The Dean and two SOE faculty are members of the revision committee and will guide the SOE through a study of the plan's implications for the SOE.

The Dean of Education at the Bloomington campus of the IU system is the IU Dean of Education and participates in the evaluation of candidates for tenure but not in annual

reviews or promotion (except for the tenure year). The IU Education Council which is comprised of faculty representatives of all IU campuses with teacher preparation programs plus the Dean of Education at the Bloomington campus has curriculum oversight responsibilities. Members meet several times as year to share ideas and solve problems faced by one or more campuses and their work is defined by its constitution and by-laws (6.C.)

Given the foundation above, the Unit is provided leadership and authority to plan, deliver, and operate coherent programs of study. The following description focus primarily on the SOE's internal governance and resources available within the Unit, on the IUS campus, and in the educational community.

Element 1: Unit Leadership and Authority

The primary leadership and authority for the unit lies with the IUS' Dean of Education who serves as an administrative liaison with the IUS campus and to the IU System. The School Council which is comprised of the coordinators for each of the six programs (Elementary Education, Secondary Education, Special Education, Educational Leadership, Graduate Studies, and School Counseling) serves in an advisory capacity to the Dean on items relative to that particular program, assists in setting the agendas for faculty meetings, and facilitates dissemination of information to program faculty (6.1.a.). This structure allows the unit to effectively manage and coordinate all programs. The Unit's organizational chart is at the end of this section.

To further insure effectiveness and quality preparation of candidates, there are six "quality teams" congruent with the six standards for NCATE: Curriculum Development, Program Assessment and Unit Evaluation, Field Experience, Diversity, Faculty Performance and Development/Student Support and Recognition, and Governance and Resources. Each of these teams establishes annual goals and a work plan (6.1.b.) which align with the Unit's Strategic Plan, Diversity Plan, and Conceptual Framework. Progress reports are made annually and at the beginning of each academic year, new goals are established. As much as possible, each quality team is represented by a member of a program team to assist in coordination of responsibilities among programs and the teams. An NCATE Steering Committee (6.1.c.) further coordinates endeavors among the quality teams. The School Council, the Dean, program teams, or in some cases, the faculty as a whole may refer concerns or issues to a quality team for recommendations, further study, or the development of strategies relative to the issue.

In addition to the documents mentioned above there is a SOE Policy Manual (6.1.d.) with information organized around Program Teams and Quality Teams. It is updated annually and provides an historical record, as well. A major goal of the Governance and Resource Committee is to review all current policies. Changes in programs, degrees and courses have specific administrative paths (6.1.e.) at the Unit, campus, system and State level.

Admissions policies are described in the official *IUS Bulletin* <http://www.ius.edu/bulletin/bulletin2003-05.pdf> and other program brochures specific to the SOE. The SOE Diversity Plan includes strategies for recruiting more minorities and under-represented groups as students. An SOE faculty member is in charge of an experiment program to provide support for students who may have difficulties with the Praxis I, the main entrance requirement for undergraduate students.

Information on the assessment system is provided on an ongoing basis in courses and at Summative Decisions Points for all programs. The Elementary Education Program has a *Program Manual* available on-line and has orientations for all prospective students through the University Division <http://www.ius.edu/Education/Elementary/elementaryeducation.htm>. The Secondary Education Program provides orientation sessions through the foundation courses of H340 and P250. All candidates for advanced programs must attend an orientation session prior to formal admission into the program. Students who have a Masters entering the Educational Leadership Program receive individual sessions with a team member from that program.

Particulars regarding academic calendars, grading policies, and many other issues relative to academic success are available through the IUS Web Site <http://www.ius.edu/academics/> and the SOE Web Page <http://www.ius.edu/Education/>

The SOE has a Student Services/Field Placement Office with two full-time professional staff members and a full-time secretary. These individuals work closely with all program teams in the coordination and implementation of the assessment system, certification, advising, job placement, and other services related to candidates' decision making regarding their career, progressing efficiently through programs, and acquiring jobs.

Newly matriculated undergraduate students 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 students and maintains contact with program coordinators so updated information is relayed to candidates. Once accepted into the SOE, initial program students in Elementary Education and Special Education are assigned to faculty advisors. All Secondary Education students have advisors assigned by content area. Special Education faculty often co-advise candidates in UD who have expressed an interest in the program; this is a retention strategy that reflects the program's goal of providing enough qualified graduates for the region. Group orientation sessions are held several times each year for candidates interested in School Counseling, Educational Leadership and Graduate Studies. Candidates in the advanced program in Special Education are advised individually by program faculty. Additionally, all IUS students may access 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/>, and academic support through Student Development <http://www.ius.edu/SDC/>

The SOE has outstanding involvement of P-12 practitioners and other members of the professional community in the participation of program design, implementation and evaluation of the various programs. Each program has an advisory committee whose members come from one or more of the following: members from P-12 schools, the community, IUS content faculty, current students, and recent graduates of that program (6.1.f.). Each advisory committee meets twice during an academic year to review current practices, assessment data, and other pertinent issues specific to the various programs. Examples of involvement include review and input into the SOE assessment system, development of the SOE dispositions, and the restructuring of programs as needed (6.1.g.). Additionally, current undergraduate students provide input. The Special & Elementary Education Student Advisory Committee (SEESAC) (6.1.h.) and the Secondary Education Advisory Group (SEAG)(6.1.i.) are made up of current students and offer valuable insights into ongoing issues that may need further attention by the faculty.

The SOE is well aware that without our school and community partners, we could not accomplish our mission. In an effort to recognize members of educational community who have provided outstanding guidance and service to the SOE, an annual awards reception is held (6.1.j.). The faculty and students may nominate individuals, schools, or school corporations in the following areas: Community Contribution to Education, Friend of the School of Education, Outstanding School Partner, Outstanding Supervisors, and School of the Year. All of the nominees and awards presented document the SOE's commitment to involve P-12 educators and the community in its services and programs.

To coordinate a more general advisement in the preparation of educators from other members of the professional community, including faculty from other disciplines, the Council on Preparing Education Professionals (COPEP) was established in 2004 (6.1.k.). It consists of representatives from the schools of Natural Sciences, Physical Sciences, Arts and Letters, and Business, all SOE program coordinators, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and community representatives. Its primary purpose is to provide a forum for communication of information, coordination of efforts with stakeholders, and to make recommendations with respect to programs that prepare educators.

Additional input regarding the quality of our programs is gathered from teachers, administrators, and counselors supervising SOE candidates. These data are forwarded to program teams for their consideration and action (6.1.l.).

Element 2: Unit Budget

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

Table 21. Base Budget

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION BASE BUDGETS					
1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
\$1,636,309	\$1,891,620	\$2,090,812	\$2,214,907	\$2,588,288	\$2,731,329

Funding allows each full-time tenured-track faculty position to request up to three hours release time per semester for scholarly endeavors. Allocations for travel allow the Unit to have a well-recognized emphasis on field placement assignments in P-12 education for all programs.

The table below compares allocations of the SOE with other academic units at IUS.

Table 22. IUS Budget by School—Six-Year History

School	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004
Arts & Ltrs	2,411,464	2,521,588	2,799,014	3,004,708	3,156,991	3,357,024
Natural Sci	2,522,204	2,712,295	3,160,028	3,617,126	3,860,182	4,058,956
Social Sci	1,817,577	1,868,898	2,005,824	2,059,146	2,270,644	2,366,296
Business	2,769,475	2,902,376	2,996,089	3,127,811	3,338,878	3,621,207
Education	1,636,309	1,891,620	2,090,812	2,214,907	2,588,288	2,731,329
Nursing-BS	831,418	933,654	969,705	1,004,958	1,053,553	1,073,066
Totals	11,988,447	12,830,431	14,021,472	15,028,656	16,268,536	17,207,878

Like others units, the SOE is receiving additional funding each year in an attempt to keep pace with increasing expenses. The campus is experiencing budget constraints at the present time and faculty, including those in the SOE, have been working with the administration to pull back expenses and maintain quality. For example, some elective courses and duplicate sections of courses were trimmed from the summer 2004 schedule.

Because a number of SOE programs have extensive school-based experiences, the campus provides funds for faculty to travel to school sites to evaluate candidates' performance. The chart below shows the number of supervisory visits made in the 2003-2004 academic year for which faculty requested mileage. (Note: Because some faculty chose not to request reimbursement for short trips, totals do not reflect all visitations made.)

Table 23. Field Placement Visits

Program	No. of Field Placement Visits
Elementary Education	509
Secondary Education	152
Special Education	148
Educational Leadership	38
Counseling (not in field during Fall)	8

Element 3: Personnel

Workload policies and practices permit and encourage faculty to effectively engage in teaching, scholarship, assessment, advisement, collaborative work in P-12 schools, and service. All faculty members are assigned only a 12 hour teaching load per semester. As stated above, tenured-track faculty may choose up to three hours of release time for scholarly endeavors per semester. Summary data of workloads for the last three years are available (6.3.a.).

The Unit has a well-established policy for the number of hours allowed for supervision of clinical practice and has a formula that takes into account 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. Although, methods classes in the Elementary Education Program typically exceed that number, the benefits of the candidates actually being in the schools for these classes is a hallmark of the program. For advanced programs that have clinical practice, a three-hour course assignment is given for each faculty member conducting supervision. The number enrolled in the courses ranges from approximately 12 - 16 students. See 6.3.c. for Unit supervision loads.

The Unit has significantly increased the number of full-time faculty positions since fall 2000, each of those replacing a number of part-time faculty. By program and rank, the following full-time faculty have been hired:

Table 24. Full-time Faculty Positions since Fall 2000

NAME	PROGRAM	HIRING RANK	TYPE
Bowles	Elementary	Lecturer	New position
Harshfield	Elementary	Lecturer	New position
Herdoiza	Elementary	Assistant Prof	Replacement
Hollenbeck	Secondary	Assistant Prof	Replacement
Pinkston	Secondary/Tech	Assistant Prof	New position
Simms	Secondary/Found	Lecturer	New position
Jackson	Special Education	Lecturer	Replacement
Brewer	Graduate Studies	Lecturer	New position
Camahalan	Graduate Studies	Assistant Prof	New position

Lewellen	Graduate Studies	Assistant Prof	New position
Fankhauser	Educational Leadership	Assistant Prof	Replacement
Hottman	Educational Leadership	Lecturer	New position
Murray (Dean)	Secondary	Associate Prof	New position

The SOE takes advantage of a cadre of adjunct instructors 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. The candidates respect and profit from the practical application of educational theories and pedagogical skills that these adjuncts provide. Each is provided with a handbook of information (6.3.d.), invited to a fall orientation conducted by the Dean (6.3.e.), and has a mailbox in the SOE. The appropriate program coordinator or his/her designee meets with each new adjunct and provides on-going support and guidance through examining the syllabus and providing materials. For example, the two full-time faculty in the Special Education Program divide the duties according to which one has taught the same or related course as the new adjunct lecturer.

To more thoroughly study the use of part-time versus full-time faculty, the Governance and Resource Committee performed an analysis of existing data by program (6.3.f.). Courses from Fall 1999 were compared with those same courses for Fall 2003 and Spring 2000 courses were compared with the same courses for Spring 2004. For initial programs, the number of full-time faculty increased from 61% to 74% for the fall and from 61% to 68% for the spring. The gains were more modest for advanced programs with a gain from 53% to 58% for the fall and 55% to 58% for the spring.

Although additional support staff would enhance the overall efficiency of programs, the Unit has adequate support staff, which has recently increased in number and scope. A part-time receptionist has been added which greatly enhances the focus of other support staff. Changes in the physical environment for the support staff have also greatly enhanced their job performance. The number of student workers has also increased over the last two years and they serve as receptionists as well. Their duties involve general clerical tasks while providing valuable assistance to candidates' needs as they arise. A significant addition has been a full-time support person to assist with assessment.

The Unit supports professional development activities that engage faculty in dialogue and skill development related to emerging theories and practices, including technology. More information about this is presented in Standard 5 Element 7 Unit Facilitation of Professional Development.

Professional development outside the University is encouraged through allocations for travel. Additional monies may be sought through grants from the Office of Academic Affairs. Numerous other opportunities are available to faculty through the IU system and several faculty members have participated in summer fellowships. The IU Foundation also provides funding for annual retreats specifically for professional development.

Element 4: Unit Facilities

The Unit has outstanding facilities on campus and capitalizes upon those of partner school to support candidates in meeting the standards for each of its programs. Each faculty member has a private and individual office space equipped with a personal computer. These are replaced on less than every three years and supported by a highly qualified technicians from the Office of Information Technology. The classrooms dedicated for the SOE's use all have access to mobile presentation technology and one is considered a fully equipped and model technologically equipped classroom. Some of the advanced program classes are held in the new McCauley Nicolas Graduate Center located in a convenient off-campus site.

In 2001, a newly equipped Elementary and Secondary Science Laboratory became available. Numerous mathematics manipulatives, artifacts for social studies, resources for special education teachers from a Crusade for Children Grant. The WHAS Crusade for Children, Inc. donates several thousand dollars annually for the purchase of materials that improve the education of students with disabilities in local schools. Currently those materials are housed in faculty offices and storage areas; they will be move to the new library upon its completion. Other teaching materials are available in classrooms and storage at Hillside Hall. A favorite resource for candidates and faculty is the extensive collection of over 7000 pieces of children's literature housed in the personal collection of a faculty member at Hillside Hall.

A new IUS library is currently under construction and will house the Curriculum Laboratory (CuLab) with its 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 (6.4.a.). To enhance and refine this resource, the Governance and Resource Committee recently conducted a "March Make-Over" of the existing CuLab (6.4.b.). The purpose was to cull out-dated resources from the CuLab as well as the general stacks and to identify areas that need additional resources. Faculty members were assigned particular content or subject areas to review. This is an on-going project that will greatly strengthen the materials and resources available to our candidates in all programs. Finally, all full-time faculty members have on-going access for placing orders for books and other resources for the IUS collection through on-line procedures.

Several courses for the Elementary Education Program are actually taught in area schools to support candidates' understanding of "real world" school environments. Candidates thus have access to school-based collections which provide opportunities for candidates to reflect on and use materials actually being used in a given school or classroom. Regional educational service centers are available, such as the Wilson Center in Charlestown, Indiana and the Gheens Academy in Louisville, Kentucky (6.4.c.).

The most recent developments in technology are available to our candidates through excellent technology labs located across campus with approximately 850 computers in service. Significant upgrades on all hardware are on-going. One laboratory located in Hillside Hall is specifically designed and equipped for the preparation of professionals in education. See next section for details. See <http://it.ius.edu/> for information about computer labs, public computer stations, and services provided through the Office of Integrated Technology.

The ability to activate resources and solicit cooperation from other units on campus was evidenced in January of 2004 when one SOE faculty member was unable to return from overseas in time to start her graduate classes. Within forty-eight hours of learning that she could be delayed for several weeks, staff from ILTE and IT were able to arrange for the faculty member to use web-based instruction, a listserv and conference calls to teach students. Another SOE faculty member provided on-site support and conducted some instructional activities that could not be done via technology. Though thousands of miles away, the instructor, with the help of technology, had a presence in the classroom and no instructional time was lost.

Element 5: Unit Resources Including Technology

The Unit has secured resources to support high-quality and exemplary programs and projects to ensure candidates are well prepared in technology. A recent survey of students' opinions regarding how well IUS prepared them to use technology was conducted. The results of the study indicated that most respondents thought they at least somewhat if not well-prepared in technology utilization. More detailed results are in Standard 5 Element 2 Modeling Best Practices in Teaching in this report.

A full-time tenured track technology position was created in 2000 to facilitate these efforts. Two technology grants totaling \$14,400 have been awarded in the last three years. The goals of the projects are multiple and closely integrated with the conceptual framework of SOE (6.5.a.). A designed Education computer classroom/lab in the same building where most SOE courses are taught has 23 up-to-date computers, a high speed printer, scanners and overhead projection equipment and light table on and 13 (soon to be 19) computers and printers. Twenty hours a week, a student technician staffs the room. Over 50 pieces of software for P-12 students are available for review and use. Numerous digital and video cameras are frequently used for self-evaluation and reflection purposes. The undergraduate curriculum has a required course specific to technology for the classroom teacher and there are courses available at the advanced level. Surveys from the field placement supervisors and students reveal the use of technology as a major strength of the Unit.

Resources for technology extend beyond education. There are several fully equipped rooms on campus for distance education and teleconferences (6.5.b.). These facilities are made available to the community and P-12 educators on a reservation basis. Numerous meetings are held on campus and technology equipment is available upon request.

As mentioned in the introduction of this section, candidates and faculty have access to numerous resources available through the internationally recognized IU library system. The IUS Library contains over 585,000 volumes and microforms and subscribes to over 1200 periodicals as well as many indexes in CD-Rom format on a LAN located in the Library (6.5.c.). The Library has six librarians and ten support personnel and uses the web-based online catalog and circulation system. The IU system (IUCAT) contains over 7 million records. Many indexes to periodicals are available via the World Wide Web. IUS is also a member of [Kentuckiana Metroversity](#), a consortium of seven higher education institutions in the greater metropolitan Louisville area. Access to the collections of the member libraries is also available to the students and faculty of IUS. The Curriculum Laboratory (CuLab) houses P-12 instructional materials. (6.5.d.).

IUS will soon have a new \$15.4 million library (6.5.e.). It will double the space for books and have a seating capacity of 500 instead of the current 300. Expanded seating will accommodate more small group work, an increasing trend on campus.

All P-12 teachers may utilize the resources available at the Center for Cultural Resources housed at the IUS library. The CuLab also serves as a regional textbook repository site for Indiana Public Schools. The WHAS Crusade for Children, Inc. donates several thousand dollars annually for the purchase of materials that improve the education of students with disabilities in local schools. Currently those materials are housed in faculty offices and storage areas; they will be move to the new library upon its completion.