NCATE
The Standard of Excellence
in Teacher Preparation

INSTITUTIONAL REPORT

INDIANA UNIVERSITY SOUTHEAST

4201 Grant Line Road
New Albany, IN 47150
November 3-5, 2013

Type of Visit:
Continuing visit - Initial Teacher Preparation
Continuing visit - Advanced Preparation

Institutional Report for Visits (Continuous Improvement Option) in Fall 2012 and Beyond

I. Overview and Conceptual Framework

This section sets the context for the visit. It should state the insitution's characterisitics and mission, along with a description of the professional education unit. The basis tenents of the conceptual framework should also be discussed.

I.1 What are the institution's historical context and unique characteristics (e.g., HBCU or religious)?

Indiana University Southeast (IU Southeast) is one of the eight campuses that is part of the Indiana University (IU) System. IU, created in 1820 by an Act of the General Assembly, is one of the oldest stat universities in the Midwest. IU Southeast began as a regional campus of IU in 1941 and began awarding degrees in 1968. The original campus was located in borrowed classroom space in Jeffersonville. The current campus was established in 1973 in New Albany which is across the Ohio River from Louisville, Kentucky. The three buildings that opened in 1973 have grown to eleven. The Graduate Center was opened in Jeffersonville in 2003 and was relocated to a new location in fall 2012. Graduate and undergraduate courses are offered there.

The Indiana Commission on Higher Education as defined the IU Southeast service area as the counties of Clark, Crawford, Floyd, Harrison, Jackson, Jefferson, Orange, Scott, and Washington. A tuition reciprocity agreement exists with Kentucky for Bullitt, Jefferson, Meade, Oldham, and Trimble counties. These counties represent urban, suburban, and rural settings. The 2010 census reported the Louisville metropolitan area's population as 1,307,647.

IU Southeast is a comprehensive university offering more than 50 degrees: four year, graduate, and two year as well as certifications. Over 180 full-time faculty members, holding degrees from leading universities throughout the nation and world, provide students with up-to-date, high-quality courses and programs of study.

Up until 2008, the university served as a commuter campus. Five residence halls called lodges opened in the fall of 2008 and immediately housed. Ground has been broken on the sixth. In 1941, there were 291 students enrolled. The university reached its highest enrollment in fall 2012 with 7256 students; there were 6904 students enrolled in fall 2013.

See the exhibit document for live links.

I.2 What is the institution's mission?

The following is taken from the IU Southeast Reference Book (I.5.f).

The mission statement found in the IU Southeast Reference Book is
"Indiana University Southeast is the regional campus of Indiana University
that serves Southern Indiana and the Greater Louisville metropolitan area. As a
public comprehensive university, its mission is to provide high-quality educational

programs and services that promote student learning and prepare students for productive citizenship in a diverse society, and to contribute to the intellectual, cultural, and economic development of the region. Its academic programs include a comprehensive array of baccalaureate degrees, a limited number of associate degrees, and a selected set of master's programs. The campus is committed to offering educational programs and services which promote and support diversity in all its aspects. The faculty engage in research and creative activities which strengthen teaching and learning through inquiry into both the content and the pedagogy of the disciplines and create opportunities for students to engage in applied learning. Finally, members of the campus community are committed to using their professional and personal expertise to address the intellectual, cultural, and economic development needs of the campus's service region."

In addition, the campus identified its Core Values. These are fostering a "nurturing environment", improving the quality and service provide to students through "holistic learning", exhibiting "integrity", and supporting the many communities through "connectedness".

The campus Strategic Plan has eight goals. They are educational excellence, effective enrollment management, embracing diversity, strategic resource management, marketing, enhanced community engagement, ongoing strategic planning, and effective alumni relations.

See the exhibit document for live links.

I.3 What is the professional education unit at your institution, what is its relationship to other units at the institution that are involved in the preparation of professional educators, and what are the significant changes since the last NCATE review?

The professional education unit consists of 29 full-time faculty and 24 part-time faculty in an academic year. Twenty-one (21) faculty positions are tenure track and eight (8) lecturer positions; one position is open. Faculty are assigned to the undergraduate programs as follows: Ten (10) to the elementary program, two to the special education program, five to the secondary program. There is one faculty member assigned to coordinate and teach courses in the elementary Transition to Teaching (T2T) program. The graduate program has nine; one position is open. Faculty may be assigned to one program team but teach courses in other programs. There are nine staff members; five are assigned to advising and licensing functions, one serves as the data coordinator, one serves as the receptionist, one serves as the Dean's administrative assistant, and one serves part-time to perform accounting duties.

There are three undergraduate degrees in elementary education, secondary education, and special education; three master's degrees in elementary education, secondary education, and counseling; and four graduate licenses in reading, gifted and talented, technology facilitator, and building level administrator. A partnership with the IU Bloomington School of Education allows candidates to take four of the eight courses required for an ENL license which is awarded by IU Bloomington. Candidates may take the licensure courses and complete an elementary or secondary master's degree with a concentration in reading, gifted and talented, technology or ENL. The building level administrator license is a post-master's degree program.

The School of Education is one of six schools on campus. There is also a Bachelor of General Studies degree for non-traditional students. Graduate degrees are awarded in Education, Business, and Liberal Studies. Undergraduate candidates take content coursework in the Schools of Arts and Letters, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences. Representatives from those schools and the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs meet with undergraduate program faculty and the Dean of the School of Education

two times a year. The Council on Preparing Education Professionals (COPEP) meets once each semester to discuss changes being made in the School of Education, to review program data, and to identify issues to be address to better serve the education candidates. Program coordinators meet as needed with representative faculty from the other schools when either data results or changes mandated by the Indiana Department of Education and/or the Indiana General Assembly require changes in the content course requirements.

Secondary master's candidates may take up to six hours of approved upper level coursework in content courses outside the School of Education. Candidates in the gifted and talented program must take three hours of approved upper level coursework outside the School of Education. Advisors may assist candidates in identifying appropriate courses and communicate with content faculty concerning these courses.

Since the last NCATE review, several significant unit changes have occurred, driven by needs identified by the SOE, SPA expectations, and state policies in both Indiana and Kentucky. They include:

--In 2012, the Indiana legislature mandated that undergraduate teacher education degrees shall not exceed 120 credit hours. This forced the programs to restructure the both the number of content courses. The elementary program restructured its professional education program to include seminars that carry zero credit. The secondary program restructured its program by realigning content courses with general education requirements.

--The undergraduate programs redesigned their field and clinical experiences to reflect the recommendations from the NCATE Blue Ribbon Panel.

--Due to SPA expectations, two full time faculty members were moved to the graduate team.

--To address the lack of coherence between and among the graduate degrees and licenses, the coordinator of the Graduate Program was changed to Director of Graduate program with additional release time and extra stipend for working in the summer.

--Based upon a self-study of the graduate program, including its alignment with NCATE Standard One, the Elementary and Secondary master's degree programs were redesigned and approved in Spring 2012. License areas were added as concentrations. A research course was added based upon the evaluation of the capstone Teacher as Researcher paper.

--Due to low enrollments and challenging with SPA completion, the secondary alternative certification (T2T), the post-bac special education, the middle school, the secondary world language and journalism, and the early childhood licensure programs were identified as dormant. Other "add on" graduate licenses that were not comprehensive and would not fulfill SPA requirements were also made dormant.

--Based upon the campus student retention committee recommendations, an additional license advisor was added to meet with students seeking admission to the School of Education. This advisor is housed in a recently created SOE advising suite.

--Indiana Rules for Educator Preparation and Accountability (REPA 1 2010) required Elementary Programs offer minors. The SOE opted for creating minors in language arts, math, science, social studies, and fine arts. Required secondary education programs to meet or exceed the coursework required for majors in secondary education. All teacher preparation programs had to align all programs professional sequence to essential pedagogy outlined in REPA.

--The Indiana Department of Education is replacing ETS "Praxis 1" (Pre-professional Skills Test) with Pearson's "CASA" Core Academic Skills Assessment effective summer 2013.

I.4 Summarize basic tenets of the conceptual framework, institutional standards and candidate proficiencies related to expected knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions as well as significant changes made to the conceptual framework since the last NCATE review?

Mission
The mission of the Indiana University Southeast School of Education is to develop high quality, caring professionals who are leaders in the continuous transformation of schools within a diverse society.

Overview
The Conceptual Framework (CF) and underlying knowledge base are aligned with the IU Southeast Campus and SOE mission statements. The CF articulates our professional commitments to knowledge, professional practices, teaching competence, and student learning. The CF also supports the campus core values which have been added since the CF was written. The core values are "nurturing environment, holistic learning, integrity, and connectedness".

The CF incorporates the themes, disposition statements, and individual program standards. The CF is a shared vision developed and reviewed in collaboration with our professional community composed of full and part-time unit faculty , unit professional staff, content faculty, P-12 faculty and administrators, program candidates, and program alumni.

Since the last NCATE review, the SOE revised its candidate outcomes/goals in order to clearly align to the CF. Candidates completing the SOE programs of study will demonstrate:
1. Knowledge of content and the use of best practices in delivering effective instruction to all students;
2. Dispositions necessary to help all students learn;
3. Knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to participate in school transformation.

The following dispositions 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
• are committed to continuous self-evaluation and personal improvement

Themes
The Unit framework themes are derived from the Mission and are aligned to the outcomes/goals. Each of the four themes incorporates a set of assumptions about learning, teaching, and professional competence. The themes signify our commitment to professional education and guide our work in the Unit. The themes and corresponding SOE outcomes numbers are:

•High Quality Educators(1, 2, 3)
This is the overarching CF theme. In May 2009, the SOE faculty concluded that High Quality was embedded in and served as the foundation for the other three themes. This decision was reached after a syllabi review, an analysis of practices, and a discussion at a faculty retreat. One summary statement best captures the faculty members' thinking: "High quality is integrated throughout the curriculum and is

reflected in our teaching. We emphasize best practice research applications for the candidates and they, in turn, implement such practices." These practices, in turn, ensure that candidates acquire the knowledge and skills necessary for being caring professionals, participating in the renewal of schools, and addressing the needs of all students in a diverse society.

•Caring Professionals (2)
The second theme that is indicative of high quality and assessed at various times within each program is Caring Professionals. The Unit knows that there is no prototypical "teacher or school leader personality" but believes that standards would be incomplete without attention to dispositions. Dispositions are used as indicators of this theme. While elements in several standards address the "belief that all children can learn", the unit adopted an additional disposition to assess that belief in Fall 2012 and will implement it starting in Fall 2013.

•Continuous Transformation of Schools (3)
The original theme was the "continuous renewal of schools" which was defined as having knowledge of schools as organizations, knowledge about central issues that are at the center of school change, and skills to analyze and revise new approaches proposed in reforms (Holmes Group, 1986). School transformation encompasses not only the elements reflected in the "school renewal" definition but adds a focus on school reform. The subtle difference was one the Unit believed better reflected the desired outcomes for its candidates. Systematic reform takes into consideration the interrelatedness of all components that function together in the education system. As one component changes, so must the others in order to maintain the integrity, unity, continuity, and consistency of the entire system (Slick and Burrett, 1995).

•Diverse Society (3)
The Unit defines diversity as the multiplicity of identities such as race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, language, gender, religion, sexual orientation, geographic origin, and exceptionalities in accordance with NCATE's definition. Since the original CF framed the fourth theme around diversity, the Unit changed the theme from "Multicultural Society" to "Diverse Society" in May 2009 believing that the term more accurately defined its purpose. Feedback from stakeholders also provided rationale for this change. Stakeholders frequently identified only race and ethnicity as multi-cultural thus overlooking the other elements of diversity. The theme stresses the central human values of social justice, equal opportunity, and respect for the dignity of all, regardless of their backgrounds and individual characteristics. "All students of all backgrounds bring talents and strengths to their learning and as educators we need to find ways to build on these" (Nieto, 2001, p. 121). This fourth theme is operationalized through diversity proficiencies adopted in 2009.

I.5 Exhbits

I.5.a	Links to unit catalogs and other printed documents describing general education, specialty/content studies, and professional studies
I.5.b	Syllabi for professional education courses
I.5.c	Conceptual framework(s)
I.5.d	Findings of other national accreditation associations related to the preparation of education professionals (e.g., ASHA, NASM, APA, CACREP)
I.5.e	Updated institutional, program, and faculty information under institutional work space in AIMS

1. Standard 1. Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

1.1 What do candidate assessment data tell the unit about candidates' meeting professional, state, and institutional standards and their impact on P-12 student learning? For programs not nationally/state reviewed, summarize data from key assessments and discuss these results.

Eleven programs submitted SPA Program Review reports in September 2011: 6 undergraduate initial licenses; 1 post-bac initial license; 2 graduate level licenses; and 2 other school personnel. In February 2012, Reading and Secondary Mathematics were recognized; Elementary, Special Education Initial and Post-bac, Secondary Social Studies and Language Arts, and Gifted and Talented (Gifted) were recognized with conditions. Secondary Science, Computer Education (Technology) and Building Level Administrator (Educational Leadership) received "further development required". The Unit suspended the post-bac Special Education program pending licensure requirement changes for candidates with emergency permits. Eight programs submitted revised reports in September 2012. In February 2013, the Secondary Language Arts, Social Studies, and Science and Elementary programs were recognized. Four graduate licensure programs were recognized with conditions and will address concerns cited in revised reports in Fall 2013 or Spring 2014.(AIMS)

Three programs with no SPA were reviewed through the Indiana Program Review Protocol: Elementary Transition to Teaching (T2T), Secondary T2T, and the Masters in School Counseling (Counseling); reports are found in exhibit 1.3.a. The Elementary T2T report was submitted in Summer 2010; 3 areas for improvement were cited. A rejoinder was submitted and the program was approved in February 2011. The Secondary T2T report was submitted in Summer 2010; 3 areas for improvement were cited, a rejoinder was submitted, and the response to the rejoinder stated the program "did not meet state expectations." Due to Unit limitations and the program's low enrollment, the Unit discontinued the program. Counseling submitted its state report in February 2012 and was approved in June 2012.(1.3.a)

The Masters in Elementary or Secondary Program (MEST) does not submit a program review. It assesses the NBPTS, the CF, the Diversity Proficiencies, and the SOE dispositions in core course assignments providing evidence for Decision Point II (DPII) and in the Teacher as Research project (TAR) as part of DPIII.(1.3.c & 1.3.d)

Dispositions are systematically assessed multiple times.(1.3.e & 1.f)) One disposition is "candidate is committed to data based decision-making and fair practices." The faculty reviewed dispositions in May 2012 and determined "the belief that all children can learn" is embedded in 3 dispositions. In August 2012 faculty voted to add a 9th disposition stating the belief that all children can learn. An ad-hoc team is identifying key elements for Fall 2013 implementation. (1.3.e)

Programs review and analyze candidate data using the key assessments: Program Review assessments, dispositional data, and Decision Point (transition point) data. The review also documents evidence that candidates are meeting the 4 CF themes and the 5 Diversity Proficiencies.(1.3.d)

Assessment data provide evidence that candidates are meeting standards and impact on student learning. SPA reports submitted in September 2011 include an analysis of assessment data in terms of candidates' content knowledge; professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions; and impact on student learning. A "Data Day" facilitated programs' review of 2011-2012 data or data in the SPA reports when they were recognized or recognized with conditions. Ongoing analysis is critical to ensure candidate success and program improvement. The Data Day results follow:

Elementary
•Candidates perform at the highest level in all but 1 assessment, are able to plan individual lessons, and struggle with unit cohesiveness.
•All demonstrate an impact on student learning.
•The disposition on personal management behaviors is the one most frequently reported with a concern.
•Candidates meet the required GPAs for content knowledge in DPI; Praxis I writing scores are the lowest. DPII reveals the lowest scores in social studies and science for 1 cohort; highest scores are in math and art. DPIV reveals while all candidates met the GPA requirements, the "basic" rating for GPAs increased from 9.1% to 25% from 2011 to 2012.

Secondary
•All secondary candidates meet the Praxis I and the 2.75 content area GPA requirements.
•All meet the minimum requirements for the target rating on SPA assessments, including impact on student learning.
•There is 1 disposition concern out of 166 ratings.
•In DPI the most frequent reasons for being conditionally admitted or denied admission are difficulties with Praxis I in reading and/or math or unacceptable GPAs in the licensing content area. DPII and DPIII reveal few candidates with conditions.

Special Education
•Most candidates pass the Praxis II exam on the first try and have high scores on senior projects which focus on content knowledge.
•One assessment shows the need to strengthen the connection of daily instruction to IEPs. Candidates are meeting the expectations related to impact on student learning.
•Class tardiness, late submission of assignments, or poor attendance are the disposition behaviors most often cited with a possible correlation between the behaviors and difficulty later in the program and/or at field schools.
•At DPI, not passing Praxis I is the major reason for being denied admission. Candidates leaving affter DPI tend to leave on their on accord rather than due to a programrm decision.

Gifted, Reading and Technology licensure programs recently designed plans to systematically collect data on dispositions and Decision Points. The license areas are now considered programs in the SOE in the redesigned graduate program due to NCATE's SPA requirements.

Gifted
•Candidates perform at the proficient level on all SPA assessments.
•Dispositions are assessed at the end of 2 courses, upon entrance to the graduate program, and summatively at DPIII.

Reading
•Candidates perform at high levels; a need exists to focus on the connection between assessment and instruction in the 1st course.
•Assessment results provide evidence that candidates are rated at high levels. Nearly all elements are rated 100% proficient on the impact on student learning assessment.
•Decision Points and the systematic assessments of dispositions are now in place.

Technology
•All candidates demonstrate a high level of content knowledge based upon grades and the CAT1 assessment (SPA #1)
•The revised SPA assessments provide evidence that all candidates are rated proficient; there are areas

identified to address due to lower, but not low scores.

Educational Leadership
•SLLA scores and course grades provide evidence of candidate content knowledge. There are not adequate data for the revised assessments. New rubrics provide more discriminate data to identify areas of concern as noted on projects recently assessed. Data for impact on student learning for 2 SPA reports provide evidence that candidates are prepared to impact student learning.
•DPI decisions are delayed if applications need more information that addresses evidence of leadership. Candidates with problems completing clinical assignments may lack teacher leadership experiences and/or problems with personal management behaviors.

The following are summaries for the 3 programs not SPA reviewed:
Elementary T2T:
•All candidates score at the proficient level in DPII and DPIII where content knowledge and the professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions are assessed but not reported as aggregated data for separate elements. The Indiana Protocol does not require this. All but 2 candidates are proficient on the impact on student learning.
•All candidates receive an overall acceptable rating on dispositions; candidates may receive a lower rating on one or two dispositions.
•All candidates are proficient on DPI and DPIII; 1 basic score on DPII

MEST
•Candidates must have an overall GPA of 3.0 to graduate and must complete the four core courses with a B or higher, ensuring the acquisition of content knowledge and the professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions.
•All candidates demonstrate the ability to impact student learning through the focus in specific assignments and in the Teacher as Research (TAR) action research project.
•All candidates demonstrate the SOE dispositions in written assignments in the core courses that are part of DPII and DPIII.
•Candidates resubmitting the DPIII TAR papers during 2011-2012 most frequently were marked as unacceptable in problem statement and the review of literature.

Counseling
•Assessment #1 provides evidence that all candidates have content knowledge.
•Assessment #2 occurs early in the program and evaluates knowledge and skills for working with diverse populations; performance is acceptable but demonstrates areas for improvement.
•Three other assessments provide strong evidence that candidates are prepared with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions in the Indiana standards. Scores on the Close the Gap projects are high; candidates impact student learning.
•Disposition data collected in 2012 reveal some candidates need improvement but there is no area of concern.
•DPII, used to determine entrance to the clinical cohort, provides evidence there is a wide range between those accepted and those not accepted. DPIII and DPIV results do not show any significant variations across the program.

All programs have aligned their key assessments to the CF and to the Diversity Proficiencies. (1.3.d) Candidates demonstrate the elements found in the CF themes and the Diversity Proficiencies. CF alignments are holistic, as was the alingment in place and acceptable during the 2005 NCATE review. Programs have determined that detailed alignments will provide more useful data for improving candidate performance and program improvement. MEST and Reading have completed this "micro" alignment.(1.3.n)

1.2 Please respond to 1.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the **target level**. If it is not the standard on which you are moving to the target level, respond to 1.2.b.

1.2.a Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level

- **Describe areas of the standard at which the unit is currently performing at the target level.**
- **Summarize activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that have led to target level performance.**
- **Discuss plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as articulated in unit Standard 1.**

1.2.b Continuous Improvement

- **Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.**
- **Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in unit Standard 1.**

Programs maintain "change documents" to document changes made using candidate performance data, survey data, stakeholder feedback, unit and campus policy changes, state policy requirements, and accreditation requirements. Programs changes are collapsed into one document (2.3.h.) with alignments to the NCATE Standards. The following are examples, including changes to curriculum, instruction, and assessment, that relate to Standard One:

Elementary
•added "Impact on Student Learning" project to student teaching; a curriculum audit revealed the program was not meeting requirements for program review
•added classroom management strategies to courses and seminars; alumni survey data revealed this need

•revised student teaching University Supervisor policy and provided additional training; analysis of evaluations revealed inconsistencies in scoring

Secondary
•modified requirements for content courses to meet the new state licensure requirements based upon analysis of course content and SPA content requirements
•made Block 3 changes based upon curriculum mapping which revealed gaps, repetitions, and alignment issues
•added new course M300 to address schools and the pluralistic society; curriculum mapping identified gaps in coursework related to cultural diversity

Special Education
•implemented revised rubrics used by K-12 faculty to evaluate candidates in early field experiences; advisory committee reviewed results and rubrics to determine clarity needed

•revised documents used by K-12 supervisors for student teaching assessment; review of scores revealed ratings higher than expected due to lack of clarity in the directions and rubrics
•divided K480 assignments into two parts to be completed in K480 and a practicum; review of candidate work suggested too many assignments embedded in 1 course led to poor performance

Elementary, Special Education, and Secondary
•revised programs to meet the Indiana 120 hour maximum BS degree using a review of curriculum maps, program standards, and NCATE standards and during consultation with content faculty
Elementary T2T
•added classroom management seminars based upon feedback from candidates, input from advisory committee, and data from surveys
•added seminars on Foundations, Ed Psych, Children's literature, RTI, differentiated instruction, and assessment based upon feedback from cooperating teachers and input from advisory committee

MEST
•updated workshop courses to include technology, RTI, autism, and assessment/rubrics based upon administrator survey results citing areas of need
•increased the DPIII paper length to 25 pages based upon instructor analysis of the expectations for a proficient paper
•added requirement of content-based advanced teaching courses to replace content courses outside the SOE; self-study revealed 1 required course in advanced pedagogy with no content-based pedagogy courses and 500 level content courses are not offered by other units

Counseling
•divided Multicultural Standards project into 3 parts providing additional instruction based upon candidate results
•adjusted internship assignments and due date to ensure consistency, added workshop on grief and crisis counseling, and combined group supervision based upon candidate survey data

Gifted
•field experiences combine with Project AHEAD, a Saturday program for gifted children; analysis of field experiences revealed a need to provide candidates opportunities to observe all developmental levels to meet standards
•adjusted point value of field component in planning and teaching based upon feedback from candidates concerning the rigor and expectations of the assessment

Reading
•added disposition assessment to university and school-based supervisors' evaluation of Seminar/Practicum; review of assessments revealed disposition assessment not included
•modified assessments related to IRA standard 6 based upon data from new assessments and rubrics
•added introduction to dispositions through course assignments and began requiring a disposition self-assessment by those applying to the program based upon an analysis of the assessment of dispositions in the program

Technology
•implemented technology collaboration assignment; curriculum audit revealed that current technology content was not included
•added emphasis on legal and ethical issues to all courses based upon analysis of SPA assessment results

Educational Leadership

•a sequence of courses established; review of candidate transcripts revealed candidates taking the introduction course last and learning basic concepts such as creating a vision too late in the program
•assigned pre-requisite courses to each practicum course; past practice did not ensure candidates had necessary knowledge to complete projects
•full-time position filled with adjuncts; syllabi analysis revealed candidates taking all but 2 courses from 1 person did not provide multiple perspectives and varied instructional practices

The Elementary; Secondary Language Arts, Science, and Social Studies; Special Education; Gifted; Reading; Technology; and Educational Leadership programs used feedback from the SPA reports to revise assessments.

The following describe Unit and program plans to sustain and enhance performance through continuous improvement. Many plans relate to curriculum redesign, assessment revisions, and more refined alignments of standards, and the Diversity Proficiencies.

Programs recognized with conditions will submit revised reports to ensure they continue with national recognition.

Programs will modify assessments to align to new SPA and state standards as they are approved by the appropriate agencies.

Programs will align the sub-parts of the SPA assessment rubrics on planning and impact on student learning to the CF, the SOE dispositions, and the Diversity Proficiencies. The alignments will allow all programs to analyze aggregated candidate data at a micro level to determine specific strengths and areas of concern. MEST, in DPII and DPIII, and Reading have completed the alignment. (1.3.n)

After approval of the elements of the disposition to assess the belief that all children can learn, each program will align syllabi, assignments, assessments, and decision points to it. Data will be collected and analyzed by programs and Quality Teams 1 and 2.

Specific program plans include:
Elementary
•continue to use Professional Improvement Plans to address dispositional concerns and monitor DPI results to determine if additional actions need to be taken to improve writing scores
•bring specific candidate concerns to the team for remediation plans based upon key assessment data
•adjust courses to assist candidates in becoming proficient in unit plan cohesiveness

Secondary
•monitor the effects of Indiana's mandates for increased content courses for candidates graduating after August 2013 using DPI results to determine if adjustments are warranted
•monitor the impact of changes on candidate achievement and program quality, such as the addition of M300, special education courses, GPA requirements, and Block 3

Special Education
•monitor the changes made to content knowledge assessments to determine if additional course adjustments are needed
•use the curriculum maps to determine if other candidate work should replace the senior project
•monitor the assessment results related to working with families
•rework assessments to utilize data required by districts making the assignment more authentic
•address disposition concerns early by using the new campus system of "flagging" to document concerns early in the semester

•study the impact of moving DPII when adequate data are available

T2T
•revise the way assessments are designed to ensure results can be disaggregated for content knowledge and the professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills and dispositions
•use elementary SPA Assessment #3 rubric to assess candidate planning
•redesign DP data collection to provide data that can be disaggregated

MEST
•assess the impact of the required frameworks for the advanced methods courses upon teachers' practices and student learning
•use new DPII form to track areas rated as unacceptable on the initial DPII papers; make instructional adjustments
•review candidate demographics to determine if there are patterns that predict candidate success or failure and then address the issues linked to the outcomes
•review core course standardized assessments to ensure evidence of candidates' disposition reflections
•analyze DPIII results from the research course and use results for curriculum changes

Counseling
•review rubrics to make better distinctions between the basic and proficient ratings
•consider using Indiana Program Review assessments in DPIII and DPIV to further differentiate candidate performance
•revise assessments to address the new Indiana standards

Gifted
•resolve issues related to the use of a campus sponsored Saturday program for high ability children for its field and clinical work as the summer program for 2013 is not offered, providing challenges for candidates to complete the program

Reading
•analyze the sub-element ratings in the SPA assessments to determine the degree of proficiency related to the CF and the Diversity Proficiencies

Technology
•address the concerns revealed in data analysis to revise courses (need to emphasize lesson design, diversity, digital citizenship, and data analysis)
•analyze DP and disposition results after Spring 2014

Educational Leadership
•study candidate success and failure by tracking each to admission requirements and dispositions, making changes as appropriate
•analyze the results from the new rubrics to determine areas of concern and adjust course curriculum
•study results from the survey that measures impact on student learning related to program changes

1.3 Exhibits

1.3.a	State program review documents and state findings (Some of these documents may be available in AIMS.)
1.3.b	Title II reports submitted to the state for the previous three years
	Key assessments and scoring guides used for assessing candidate learning against standards and

1.3.c	proficiencies identified in the unit's conceptual framework (Some of this information may be accessible for nationally recognized programs in AIMS. Cross reference as appropriate.)
1.3.d	Data and summaries of results on key assessments, including proficiencies identified in the unit's conceptual framework (Data should be disaggregated by program, and for off-campus, distance learning, and alternative route programs.)
1.3.e	Key assessments and scoring guides used for assessing professional dispositions, including fairness and the belief that all students can learn
1.3.f	Data and summaries of results on key assessments of candidates' professional dispositions (Data should be disaggregated by program, and for off-campus, distance learning, and alternative route programs.)
1.3.g	Examples of candidates' assessment and analysis of P-12 student learning
1.3.h	Samples of candidates' work (e.g., portfolios at different proficiency levels) from programs across the unit
1.3.i	Follow-up studies of graduates and summaries of the results
1.3.j	Employer feedback on graduates and summaries of the results
1.3.k	Data collected by state and/or national agencies on performance of educator preparation programs and the effectiveness of their graduates in classrooms and schools, including student achievement data, when available

2. Standard 2. The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.

2.1 How does the unit use its assessment system to improve candidate performance, program quality and unit operations?

The structure of the Unit Assessment System (UAS), including a table of core duties for teams of faculty and staff members, is described in exhibit 2.3.a. Quality Teams (QT) aligned to each of the NCATE Standards and Program Teams aligned to the Unit's programs implement the comprehensive and integrated evaluation measures embedded in the UAS.

The UAS ensures candidate performance data are collected at the Summative Decision Points (DP) by each program (2.3a). Decisions begin with DPI at admission and end with DPIII or DPIV upon program completion. Most DP data are collected on Scantron forms, the practice since 2002. In 2004, alignment to the CF was added, and reflected on the Scantron forms. Disposition data, as described in each program's disposition matrix (1.3.e), are collected. In late 2007, the Unit's programs began addressing the Indiana Program Review Protocol requirements related to the 6 required key assessments. The protocol did not require the reporting of aggregated data on individual standards or the CF. SPA assessments, which started as Indiana Program Review key assessments, continue to be aligned holistically to the CF and the Diversity Proficiencies.(1.3.c) The Unit is aligning rubric elements to the CF and Diversity Proficiencies in order to refine the data.

The Indiana Content Standards are aligned to national standards by the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) and included in each programs' curriculum maps.

DP and disposition data are collected and reported separately for the only alternative route program

Elementary Transition to Teaching (T2T). The T2T data for planning and impact on student learning are embedded in the DPs but T2T is transitioning to reporting those data separately from DP data. The three licensing programs (Reading, Gifted, and Technology) are now recognized as programs for assessment purposes within the unit; each has a plan to systematically collect disposition data and use DPs in addition to SPA Assessment results.

While key assessment data are collected, aggregated, and disaggregated to improve program quality, the first use of results is with candidates. Results are shared with candidates throughout all programs, including written and face-to-face feedback and during advising, with some results posted in Milestones in Onestart, the IU student information management system. Individual candidate concerns are addressed through faculty-designed improvement or remediation plans.

Elementary, Secondary, Counseling and Educational Leadership completers respond to program-specific surveys. All degree applicants complete an online campus survey. At the end of their last course candidates complete a Unit Assessment Survey which asks for feedback on advising, technology, facilities, on-line courses, communication, and impact on teaching and learning.(2.3.d) Alumni surveys are sent to program and degree completers at the beginning of their second year out. Employers are surveyed at the end of the 1st school year of candidates' employment. Both surveys are aligned to the CF. (1.3.i & 1.3.j) Programs survey candidates during an academic year to obtain immediate feedback on changes under consideration. The UAS includes survey data to help judge program quality and unit effectiveness. (2.3.d)

At the end of the academic year, the Unit Database Coordinator prepares reports to be analyzed at faculty or program meetings, or retreats. "Data Days" are scheduled when an extended period of time is needed for data analysis and review. Programs and the Unit share results with advisory groups, providing another venue for analysis, review, feedback, and direction.(2.3.d) The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) reviews and provides feedback on the use of data to make program improvements for the 5 programs with coordinators (Elementary, Secondary, Special Education, and the Masters in Elementary and Secondary, and Counseling). OIRA has worked with the Unit to align the SPA Assessments to the required reporting process. (2.3.j) Similar results are shared with the Council of Professional Education Preparation (COPEP) whose members are faculty in other disciplines and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

Faculty and staff are assigned to work on 6 Quality Teams (QT) whose charges are aligned to the NCATE Standards. Each team monitors the specific elements embedded in the standards as related to program quality and unit operations.

QT 2, Program Assessment and Unit Evaluation (PAUE), oversees the collection and use of the following unit and program data: key assessment (candidate assessment, DP, and disposition), employer and alumni survey, enrollment, and Unit Assessment Survey data. The Unit Database Coordinator serves on PAUE. Enrollment data reports are prepared by the Records Specialist who serves on PAUE along with the NCATE Coordinator and representatives from all major programs. The structure provides a cohesive mechanism for communication between PAUE and the program teams. PAUE also monitors bias, fairness, accuracy and consistency of assessment procedures and tools. It ensures that a file of candidate complaints are on file in the Dean's office.

In the last 2 years, PAUE responded to concerns related to "data overload" by designing a unit-wide calendar for collecting and reviewing data. (2.3.a) The calendar includes all data previously discussed as well as data collected by QTs related to the NCATE Standards. The latest iteration is aligned to the cycle in which each data set is collected and available to be reported. (2.3.a)

The work of Program and Quality teams is included in action plans submitted to the Dean each fall. Status reports for the work are submitted to the Dean each June. (2.3.i) The specifics of their monthly work are documented through minutes which include action and the rationale for changes. Data used to drive changes are candidate data from key assessments and dispositions, survey data, stakeholder feedback after data review, SPA feedback in recognition reports, and the data collected by Quality Teams related to the NCATE Standards. Examples of data related to unit operations collected by Quality Teams include:

QT 1: collects, analyzes and provides feedback on the systematic assessment of dispositions; facilitates the alignment of the CF and Diversity Proficiencies to the SPA (key) assessments

QT 2: designs and oversees the protocol used during Data Days; reviews the data day results for common themes and concerns; designs and implements surveys related to unit effectiveness; analyzes responses to program surveys on assessment bias and the fairness, accuracy and consistency of assessments (2.3.c); makes changes in the design of the alumni, employer, and Unit Assessments Surveys to ensure each assesses pertinent aspects; reviews the efficiency of data collection processes

QT 3: provides feedback to teams regarding their specific plans for "moving to target;" monitors clinical handbooks for items that demonstrate standards are being met; collects and provides feedback on experiences for candidates' reflection in field and clinical experiences

QT 4: monitors practices to ensure candidates have experiences with diverse students in schools; collects evidence and provides feedback on the alignment of curriculum and assessment to the Diversity Proficiencies

QT 5: along with QT 3, collects, analyzes, and provides feedback to programs on qualifications of K-12 clinical faculty; surveys faculty on utilization of various instructional practices and faculty PD needs; recommends improvements to the evaluation process for adjunct faculty

QT 6: develops Unit policies related to issues identified by other QTs; monitors budget; along with QT 2, analyzes results of Unit Assessment Survey identifying concerns related to advising, technology, facilities, on-line courses, communication, and impact on teaching and learning

The UAS has gained efficiency due to the NCATE Coordinator attending QT meetings to improve members' understanding of NCATE Standards and connecting their work with other QTs. The NCATE Steering Committee, the QT chairs, meet with the Dean at least 2 times a year.

When the Unit's programs began preparing reports for the Indiana Program Review Protocol, no changes in the UAS operations were needed; most of the 6 assessments, as required by the Protocol, were already part of each program's DPs and the data collection process. The UAS collected data on the number of candidates that had an overall Proficient, Basic or Unacceptable rating on an assessment. In November 2009, a challenge arose when the Indiana DOE sent an email concerning a new NCATE partnership agreement stating the "major change in the documents is that Indiana will longer have joint state/national teams for accreditation visits." The attachment further revealed that Indiana would no longer have Program Reviews for programs that had a SPA. To respond to this change, the Unit's faculty needed training on designing assessments to meet SPA standards. This included rubrics clearly aligned to each standard, sometimes the sub-elements, and required data for each element of the rubric. Assessments were in place by fall 2010 so 2 cycles of data could be collected for the Fall 2011 SPA reports. While the SPA review process ensures programs are assessing each element of a standard and reviewing aggregated data for each element, Scantron forms that had been used to collect data are not adequate for SPA assessments. Programs nationally recognized are now in position to move to an efficient data

collection process for the SPA assessments. PAUE will continue its study of iRubic, an electronic rubric, piloted by 3 programs since summer 2012. WEAVE and Qualtrics are other campus tools that may be useful. The continued use of Scantron forms will be considered.

    2.2 Please respond to 2.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the **target level**. If it is not the standard on which you are moving to the target level, respond to 2.2.b.

2.2.a Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level

- **Describe areas of the standard at which the unit is currently performing at the target level.**
- **Summarize activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that have led to target level performance.**
- **Discuss plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as articulated in unit Standard 2.**

2.2.b Continuous Improvement

- **Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.**
- **Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in unit Standard 2.**

The Unit uses the UAS to initiate changes to improve candidate performance and program quality. Under PAUE's leadership, 3 Data Days were held so faculty could focus on data using a protocol. PAUE examined the successes and challenges, revising the protocol each time. The December 2012 summary provides evidence of unit strengths and areas of concern. (2.3.d)

To provide more granular analysis of admission data for all graduate programs, the DPI form was revised to collect specific GPA values needed to determine ranges and averages of accepted candidates. This will provide an electronic means to track individuals if concerns arise as they move through a program. All programs reviewed Scantron forms, eliminating ones not providing useful data for key assessments. Programs used adjunct evaluations and candidate feedback to recommend to the Dean to discontinue adjuncts' employment.

A review of minutes and change documents by QTs 1 and 2 revealed that teams did not always clearly articulate the data source and rationale for changes. A template for program, unit, and team minutes is being implemented to ensure clarity of the data used to make changes.

QT5 used Qualtrics, an online tool, to assess faculty's use of instructional best practices and preferences for faculty PD (Brown Bags). QT 5 used the data to identify topics and schedule Brown Bags at the end of faculty meetings to avoid scheduling conflicts. (5.3.h)

The following are examples of changes based on the UAS and found in the Unit change document (2.3.h):

Elementary
•approved new admission requirement after review of admission requirements revealed passing Praxis I not included
•revised training for student teaching University Supervisors; analysis of evaluations revealed scoring inconsistencies

Secondary
•made changes to Block 3: curriculum mapping revealed gaps, repetitions, and alignment issues within the assessments
•added course topics and revised rubrics for unit development, student teaching observations, and student learning project; curriculum mapping revealed gaps
•revisited the GPA change adopted in 2007, approving a pilot for Social Studies and Mathematics; analysis of results suggested the GPA requirement policy eliminated applicants who could be successful

Special Education:
•made change to K-12 Clinical Supervisor guidance documents and rubrics; review of ratings revealed higher ratings than expected and did not provide accurate data on Impact on Student Learning
•began a partnership with an elementary school to ensure "moving to target" and experiences with LEP students using self-study results
•added new reflection assignment to Block 1 related to the dispositions; curriculum map analysis revealed candidates need more than one opportunity to reflect on the dispositions

Elementary, Special Education and Secondary—made changes to F200 after QT 2 analyzed data from the instructors' forms and found concerns related to inter-rater reliability, different application of recommendations, and high and low marks.

T2T
•classroom management seminars added; used candidate feedback, advisory committee input, and survey data
•added three school observations to include schools with LEP population and others with literacy rich programs; used candidate feedback, advisory committee input, and survey data
•added Impact on Student Learning assignment; analysis of program review requirements revealed its need

Masters in Elementary or Secondary Education (MEST)
•aligned specific dispositions in 3 core courses where candidates wrote a DPII paper on the dispositions and revised the common rubric; analysis of candidate papers revealed not all dispositions were addressed by each candidate
•revised the rubric for the DPIII on the research project; review by the two course instructors to ensure the rubric and its use were fair and consistent and aligned
•established a framework for new advanced methods courses; the results from candidate surveys revealed the pedagogical issues that need to be met

Masters in School Counseling
•made changes to Multicultural Standards Reflection project; used candidate performance results to divide project into 3 parts and provide additional instruction to ensure time for candidate learning
•adjusted internship assignments and the date due to ensure consistency, added workshop on grief and crisis counseling, and combined group supervision based upon candidate survey
•G523 candidates began working with K-12 students based upon candidate feedback and scores from

G524 practicum

Gifted
•field experiences combined with Project AHEAD, a Saturday program for gifted children; an analysis of field experiences revealed a need to provide candidates opportunities to observe all developmental levels of instruction to meet IDOE standards
•disposition data added to W552 requirements based upon feedback from QTI

Reading
•modified assessments related to IRA standard 6 based upon first set of data from new assessments and rubrics
•added secondary and elementary strand to Reading license based upon feedback from candidates, advisory board, and reading faculty
•added disposition assessment to university and school-site supervisors' evaluation of Seminar/Practicum; review of assessments revealed that the dispositional assessment was not included

Technology—data collection is limited. The first data were aligned to the wrong standards due to confusion with the Indiana protocol. Data were not submitted to the SPA until September 2012.
•replaced the assessment "SOE Pre-prerequisite Knowledge Test" with the CATI Technology Fluency assessment; analysis by faculty of the test and results revealed the test was not objective and did not assess the appropriate skills
•added hybrid courses based upon candidate feedback

Gifted, Reading, and Technology developed a systematic process to assess dispositions. Prior to the SPA submissions, the programs had not been recognized as a Unit programs and were not required to assess dispositions in a systematic way. They also added more specificity in Decision Points.

Educational Leadership
•assessments refined and more clearly aligned to the ELCC Standards; candidate feedback and scoring results indicated the expectations were not clearly stated in the project directions and rubrics
•added 2 courses to meet out-of-state program requirements for Kentucky licenses; courses based upon gaps in the curriculum map and to ensure all candidates have experiences with all areas of diversity

The following are plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement related to the UAS. Some plans have been identified through the self-study process and are part of the UAS since Quality Teams are assigned the responsibility to monitor the Unit and its programs to assure that unit Standards are met.

A more systematic plan for the examination of data has been developed as part of the UAS. (2.3.a) Faculty and staff will examine data following a cycle aligned to when data are collected and reports prepared.

QTs 1 and 2 will monitor the use of new template for program, unit, and team minutes to ensure clarity of the data used to make program or Unit changes.

QT2 will seek other measures that reflect candidate success beyond alumni and employer surveys. The team will also devise a protocol to assist programs in identifying and using data related to attrition, retention, and failure of candidates.

QTs 2 and 6 will continue to work to refine the candidate complaint process to align the Unit's process with the campus grievance procedure. The final policy will go to faculty for approval.

QTs 1 and 2 will work with the Unit Data Coordinator and the Unit's SPA contacts to create an efficient and effective manner to collect SPA data including rubric element alignment to the CF and Diversity Proficiencies. T2T will redesign its Scantron sheets to capture specific information from DPII and DPIII on candidate planning and candidate impact on student learning.

QTs 5 and 6 will continue work to develop a PD policy to be approved by the faculty and added to the faculty handbook.

QT 3 will evaluate each program's progress toward moving to target over the next three years. Based on that evaluation, as well as the feedback from the NCATE BOE, it will determine if revisions are needed in the IR addendum including the descriptions of QT and Program Team actions. It will make recommendations for changes to the Unit.

QT 6 will monitor the effectiveness of the new advising system as part of unit effectiveness. It, along with the graduate team, will monitor what graduate students report on advising on the Unit Assessment Survey and will monitor all results on the website. Concerns will go back to the appropriate teams or stakeholders.

The NCATE coordinator will continue to hold sessions with all new faculty and staff to explain the accreditation process, its value to the Unit, and each person's role in the process. Once the CAEP process accreditation process has been fully developed, training for all faculty and staff will be delivered to ensure a smooth transition. A new structure for Quality Teams, if needed, will be developed and used to revise the UAS in order to be aligned to the CAEP Standards.

The NCATE coordinator will continue to work with OIRA to ensure the campus uses SPA data to complete the required campus reports.
QT2 will work with OIRA to determine the usefulness of WEAVE in collecting key assessment data; explore Unit wide implementation of iRubrics; determine if and where Scantron sheets are the most efficient data collection tool; work with the Alumni Affairs Office to discover the best means to contact alumni.

2.3 Exhibits

2.3.a	Description of the unit's assessment system in detail including the requirements and key assessments used at transition points
2.3.b	Admission criteria and data from key assessments used for entry to programs
2.3.c	Policies, procedures and practices for ensuring that key assessments of candidate performance and evaluations of program quality and unit operations are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias
2.3.d	Policies, procedures and practices for ensuring that data are regularly collected, compiled, aggregated, summarized, analyzed, and used for continuous improvement
2.3.e	Data and summaries of results on key assessments disaggregated by program, alternate route, off-campus, and distance learning programs (Cross reference with Exhibits 1.3.d and 1.3.f as appropriate)
2.3.f	Policies, procedures and practices for managing candidate complaints
2.3.g	File of candidate complaints and the unit's responses and resolutions (This information should be available during the onsite visit)
	Examples of significant changes made to courses, programs, and the unit in response to data

| 2.3.h | gathered from the assessment system |

3. Standard 3. The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

3.1 How does the unit work with the school partners to deliver field experiences and clinical practice to enable candidates to develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to help all students learn?

Programs collaborate with school partners to design, implement and evaluate field and clinical experiences. The elementary, secondary, special education, T2T, counseling, graduate, and reading programs have advisory groups that meet or communicate on a regular basis to review program data; discuss and recommend program changes, including field and clinical experiences; and provide input to the programs' assessments and the CF. The Technology, Gifted, Reading, and Educational Leadership licensure programs are part of the restructured graduate advisory group sessions scheduled to begin in summer 2013. Field and clinical discussions are part of the agenda for the Dean's meetings with Superintendents and the SOE Advisory Council.

The SOE selects P-12 clinical faculty for the undergraduate programs and maintains open lines of communication with them and their school administrators. The Field Placement office sends a letter to principals stating criteria for undergraduate supervising teachers. SOE faculty identify schools for clinical experiences based on criteria: school program's reputation, alignment of faculty expertise to SOE needs, faculty's professional credentials, and faculty willingness to work collaboratively with the SOE. SOE faculty and school administrators initially discuss goals, outcomes, and expectations. Often an entire school enters a partnership with the SOE; faculty go to schools with candidates to teach and observe.

All Unit programs ensure clinical experiences are supported by handbooks containing goals, guidelines, and candidate expectations to support clinical faculty as they work with candidates. (3.3.e) Throughout each experience, candidates reflect on their teaching and collaboration with peers and University faculty. (3.3.e) At the end of the clinical experience, undergraduate candidates are given the opportunity to evaluate P-12 and University field/clinical faculty. Summaries of data are reviewed by faculty, program teams, the Dean, and/or advisory groups.

Clinical placements for educational leadership candidates are made in the schools in which they are employed with the placement approved by the superintendent. Counseling candidates are placed by Unit faculty and partner school administrators. Candidates for the Reading license complete the experience in their schools with their principals' approval.

The Unit invites P-12 partners to share the Unit's expertise during the Diversity Conference, Brown Bags, and the Annual Student Research Conference and through an emailed list of PD opportunities. Graduate licensure candidates design and deliver PD to their school staffs as a program requirement. The USDOE OELA grant project "Network Capacity Building for ENL/ESL Best Practices" awarded in 2008 to the SOE has allowed the Unit to provide over 500 PD opportunities and provide scholarships to candidates to complete the ENL License offered in partnership with IU Bloomington.

The requirements for entry and exit to clinical experiences are identified by programs and reflected in

Summative Decision Points (DPs). These include, but are not limited to, meeting prerequisites, meeting GPA requirements, and assessment of dispositions. (2.3a, 3.3f, 3.3g) All candidates are assessed on using information technology to support teaching and learning during clinical practice. (3.3f)

In each SPA report's Section I: Content 2 and in descriptions in the Indiana Program Review Report for T2T and Counseling, the depth and breadth of each program's field and clinical experiences are described. No concerns were noted in the SPA reports (1.3.a and AIMS) related to the field and clinical experiences. Field experiences are designed to provide candidates with a variety of opportunities to prepare them for clinical practice. Alignment to the CF, dispositions, and professional standards are reflected in the curriculum maps. (1.3.m) The maps also indicate the types of assessments used. Opportunities for reflection have been mapped to courses. (3.3.e)

All programs have requirements that school faculty meet. (3.3.c) Prior to the final placement of candidates, information concerning the qualifications of the supervisor or mentor is reviewed to ensure "high quality".(3.3.h) This is validated by the approval of the principal or the superintendent. School based clinical faculty must have a master's degree or evidence of PD experiences, an appropriate license, and experience in the area being supervised. All programs provide various supports for student teachers and practicum candidates in clinical work as explained in program or clinical handbooks. (3.3.j)

Each of the 4 core courses in the MEST program have a required field component where candidates are required to apply what they have learned in their classrooms. Candidates reflect upon the application of their learning and the SOE dispositions in each core course. The capstone project Teacher as Researcher involves using data and current research, the designing and implementing of a project to impact student learning, and reflecting on the experience. (1.3.c) Gifted and Reading teaching licensure candidates complete coursework requiring the application of learning to their classrooms followed by reflection. (1.3.a)

Candidates in programs for Other School Professionals (Technology, Educational Leadership, and Counseling) apply their learning to structured learning related to the roles of technology facilitator, principal or counselor. The structured experiences for Technology and Educational Leadership meet the SPA standards as described in Section I: Content 2. (1.3.a) Evidence for Counseling is found in its program review report (1.3.c) Candidates in these programs apply knowledge related to using technology, working with families, analyzing data, and using current research in assignments that mirror the positions for which they are preparing.

Each program uses assessments to ensure candidates have mastered content and pedagogical and professional content knowledge prior to admission to clinical work. These include results on key assessments, GPAs, PRAXIS scores, and assessments on dispositions. (3.3.f) Key assessments have been aligned to the CF and the diversity proficiencies. (1.3.l) The assessments, along with other requirements found in the DPs (2.3.a), are used to determine both admission to and completion of clinical practice.

Candidates in clinical practice are assessed throughout their experiences by P-12 school faculty called School-based Supervisors (SS) and by the Unit's clinical faculty called University Supervisors (US).
•Initial candidates in Elementary, Secondary, and Special Education—meet regularly (at least 5 times in Elementary, 5 times in Secondary, and 6 times in Special Education) with the US and daily with the SS.
•Transition to Teaching-conference throughout the field and clinical experiences at least ten times with the US and at least 20 times with the SS
•Educational Leadership-meet with mentors in their schools and contact the US for feedback and direction; US meets in a candidate's school at least once each semester and in seminars twice each semester
•Counseling-conference weekly with their SS and at least every two weeks with the US

•Gifted- faculty serve as US and course instructors, observing and conferencing as candidates complete clinical coursework in their schools and in Project AHEAD, the IU Southeast program for high ability children
•Reading-both the SS and US meet with candidates after observations at 2 times
•Technology-clinical supervision uses a blended approach to the assessment experiences embedded in W540. The instructor who is the US assesses and views instruction via SKYPE, video recording, and/or on-site visits.

All undergraduate and advanced programs have field experiences embedded in required courses that provide candidates a variety of experiences with diverse students. Field and clinical descriptions are found in the SPA reports and the Program Review documents. (1.3.a & AIMS) The 4 core courses in the MEST program each have a required field component; three are experiences in the candidate's school or classroom and the fourth is a service learning project that is completed with LEP students. The alignments to the diversity proficiencies are found in the curriculum maps. (1.3.m) Examples of placements or experiences related to student diversity include:
•Elementary candidates-selection of schools for Blocks 1 and 2 that meet NCATE's diversity definition
•Secondary candidates-placements at schools for general methods meet NCATE's diversity definition for general methods; M300 has LEP practicum
•Special Education-selection of schools for Blocks 1 and 2 that meet the diversity definition.
•T2T-Reading II course and additional field work are held in a school with a diverse population meeting NCATE's diversity definition
•MEST-required to complete a service learning project with LEP students if candidates do not work in schools with LEP students
•Counseling-requires candidates complete a minimum of 25 field hours working with diverse students
•Reading-in the practicum, if candidates do not have experiences with diverse populations, they must assess a child from another school; they also interview a reading coach from a diverse school
•Gifted -children in Project AHEAD meet NCATE's definition for race and gender, economic status information is not available but some students attend on scholarships
•Technology-requires candidates to study and write about what the Digital Divide means and explain how technology can empower learners from diverse backgrounds and with different abilities
•Educational Leadership-complete a service learning project with LEP and other diverse students; beginning in Spring 2013 candidates meet with advisor to discuss individual assignments to ensure experiences with diverse schools

3.2 Please respond to 3.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the **target level**. If it is not the standard on which you are moving to the target level, respond to 3.2.b.

3.2.a Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level

- **Describe areas of the standard at which the unit is currently performing at the target level.**
- **Summarize activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that have led to target level performance.**
- **Discuss plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as articulated in unit Standard 3.**

As cited in the last NCATE Offsite BOE Report, the SOE "unit faculty and school partners collaboratively design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice that are aligned to

the conceptual framework, institution, state, and national standards." The field and clinical practices at both the initial and advanced levels were cited in the report " to provide opportunities to observe, assist, instruct, conduct research, analyze data, reflect on teaching and learning, and interact with students and their families."

The practices in place in 2005 continue but have been enhanced and expanded since 2010 when the Unit chose Standard 3 as the target standard. The decision to select Standard 3 began in 2010 with a discussion with the Dean and Quality Team chairs (NCATE Steering Committee). The members reviewed the target rubrics, and chose Standard 3 based upon the review and the Unit's commitment to early field and high quality clinical experiences. Before taking the recommendation to the faculty, each Quality Team reviewed the target rubric for each standard. After the review, the QTs recommended Standard 3 as the target standard. The SOE faculty approved the recommendation in December 2010.

The Field and Clinical Quality Team 3 for Standard 3 (QT3) assumed the leadership for guiding the Unit in moving to target level. The members reviewed the rubric, began to collect the evidence for the IR as required at that time, helped to determine a baseline for how close each program was to target, and led a review of "Transforming Teacher Education through Clinical Practice" with the faculty. Since members of the team represented each program, members communicated QT3's work to their program teams. During 2011-2012, verbal commitments, plans, and organizational work began. The Unit discussed high quality field experiences at faculty meetings and retreats. In fall 2012, the SOE faculty began reviewing an Addendum to the CF (1.5.c) that addresses reaching target by the Unit. The Addendum was approved in February 2013.

In the Fall 2012, each program conducted a self-study reporting on its status of "at target " or "moving to target" on each element of the target rubric. (3.3.i) Programs began to develop plans for being at target within 3 years. QT 3 reviewed each self-study and provided feedback. Programs provided more details, clarified aspects of the report, and/or revised the plans. After revisions, the plans were again reviewed and final feedback provided.

Using the self-studies and plans for each of the 10 programs (3.3.i), the following summary is provided for each element of the rubric where 6 or more programs report meeting the target element of the rubric in the self-study. All others describe the evidence for "moving to target" and describe the plan for reaching target. Examples of activities provided as evidence from programs are included for each:

•The unit and its school partners share expertise and integrate resources to support candidate learning. Six programs address this by providing access to the resource lab with over 100 multi-disciplinary units; sharing special education resources from the WHAS Crusade for Children materials; candidates build resource files in collaboration with cooperating teachers to share with other candidates and cooperating teachers; student teachers attend PD with P-12 supervisors; P-12 supervisors and mentors invited to campus and Unit sponsored events and PD.

•Field experiences allow candidates to apply and reflect on their content, professional, and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions in a variety of settings with students and adults. Eight programs address this by structuring reflections with supervisors and peers in seminars; requiring journals that are reviewed by supervisors; guiding reflective writing and discussions on learning gained during field work in graduate courses.

•Both field experiences and clinical practice extend the unit's conceptual framework into practice through modeling by clinical faculty and well-designed opportunities to learn through doing. Eight programs report target activities such as using the principles in the CF to choose field experiences; ensuring that clinical faculty qualifications mirror the CF themes; activities move from observing to

assisting, and to short-term teaching.

•During clinical practice, candidate learning is integrated into the school program and into teaching practice. Eight programs ensure this by having candidates implement lessons that are part of the school curriculum and instruction requirements; providing professional development for school faculty based upon the school's needs and the candidate's knowledge; reviewing and preparing lessons aligned to standards and best-practice.

•Candidates observe and are observed by others. Nine programs report that candidates observe other teachers or counselors; programs describe a systematic process for these observations. All candidates are observed by a school-based supervisor and/or a university supervisor.

•Candidates interact with teachers, families of students, administrators, college or university supervisors, and other interns about their practice regularly and continually. Nine programs report target activities such as candidates attending all school-sponsored activities; candidates participating in parent conference and team meetings; candidates interacting during seminars or meetings with other candidates and supervisors.

•Candidates reflect on and can justify their own practice. Nine programs report structured, systematic means for candidates that include journals that are read by supervisors; reflective responses at the end of a project or activity; peer seminars to reflect on experiences in the field.

•Candidates are members of instructional teams in the school and are active participants in professional decisions. Eight programs report examples such as participating in PLCs and on instructional/grade level teams; leading others in school improvement efforts; using a research project to determine how to make informed decisions about instruction.

•Candidates are involved in a variety of school-based activities directed at the improvement of teaching and learning, such as collaborative projects with peers, using information technology, and engaging in service learning. Six programs address this through required presentations for teachers in the building where they teach; field experiences that build from working with individual students, to teaching to small groups, to teaching whole group lessons; requiring candidates to demonstrate the integration of technology in identified lessons, projects, or assignments.

•Candidates in advanced programs for teachers participate in field experiences that require them to critique and synthesize educational theory related to classroom practice based on their own applied research. Two of the three advanced programs for teachers ensure this by embedding theory to practice in field assignments in each of the required courses; capstone projects assess a candidate's ability to apply best teaching practices and assessments to their practices.

•Candidates in programs for other school professionals participate in field experiences and clinical practice that require them to design, implement, and evaluate projects related to the roles for which they are preparing; these projects are theoretically based, involve the use of research and technology, and have real-world application in the candidates' field placement setting. Two of the three programs report various experiences require candidates to complete projects that involve analyzing data, creating plans to address the issues identified in the analysis, implementing the plan, and evaluating its impact on students. Candidates must use research based best practices and utilize technology and assume leadership roles in the process.

•Field experiences and clinical practice facilitate candidates' exploration of their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions related to all students. Eight programs report a target rating in the self-study by

assessing candidates on this in the SPA or key assessments; using reflective journals throughout programs; completing a disposition and NBPTS based essay.

•Candidates develop and demonstrate proficiencies that support learning by all students as shown in their work with students with exceptionalities and those from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic groups in classrooms and schools. While all programs develop the proficiencies to support learning by all students (curriculum maps 1.3.m), eight programs report being at target as shown in candidate work with students in field and clinical assignments.

Summarize activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality.

The changes that have been made cannot yet be quantitatively measured since no cohort has yet to have been through the cycle affected by the changes. Changes to impact program quality as programs move to or reach target include:
• Advanced programs, Reading, Gifted, Technology, Educational Leadership and Counseling, strengthen field and clinical component requirements with assessments aligned to SPA or IDOE standards for program reviews.
•All Graduate degree and licensure programs map all core coursework to include field experiences.
•Elementary Team moves toward implementing a clinically-based model; schools selected for partnerships and collaborative field components are formed.
•PD is implemented for clinical faculty in areas noted in need of improvement.
•Unit continues to move undergraduate programs to partnership school involvement with an emphasis on involvement from clinical faculty.
•Programs adopt procedures to ensure that candidates have experiences working with diverse student populations.
•Reading license program collaborates with a local school to provide field work in a summer school for candidates to work with LEP students.
•Graduate degree and degree/license candidates meet the requirement to work with diverse learners by participating in a service learning project in H520 with LEP students. The results of a survey of graduate students revealed many candidates do not have LEP students in their schools.

Plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance

All programs have articulated a plan to be at target in each part of the rubric by Fall 2015. The timeline below shows the semester when each program plans to be at target in all elements of the rubric followed by the number of rubric elements that need to move to target.

Fall 2013—Elementary, eight elements; Reading, eight elements; Gifted, three elements; Counseling, two elements; Special Education, eleven elements
Spring 2014—Technology, five elements; Secondary, four elements; Transition to Teaching, four elements
Fall 2014—MEST, three elements
Fall 2015—Educational Leadership, seven elements

The assessment of the impact of the changes will be built into UAS as reflected in the timeline in the Addendum to the IR. As part of the UAS, all QTs will monitor progress toward target. The specific duties, as taken from the Addendum and aligned to the CF, for each QT follow:

2013-2014 Quality teams study the changes needed for Unit compliance:
•QT1: Rigorous assessments of knowledge, skills and dispositions will be evaluated and redesigned as determined through collaboration between SOE Faculty and Clinical Faculty in the field and aligned to

national and state standards and SOE CF. (HQ, CP)
•QT2: Ensure that program assessments are reviewed by Clinical Faculty regarding "buy-in" and assessed in collaboration with partner sites. (HQ, CT) Assist programs to design assessments with a focus on understanding teaching and learning through observation protocols and school and district reviews. (HQ)
•QT3: Field and clinical compliance to NCATE Standard 3. Partnerships must have a significant role in designing and implementing programs, selecting candidates for placement in their schools, and assessing candidate performance and progress. (HQ, CT) Team determines acceptable partnerships with regard to technologies. (CT)
•QT4: Diverse field experiences built into the collaborative partnerships so that all candidates are exposed to settings with diverse students. (MS)
•QT5: PD initiatives become shared experiences between SOE Faculty and Clinical Faculty in the field. (HQ, CT) Criteria for the qualifications of cooperating teachers, and school mentors for Principal and Counseling are reviewed to ensure expertise. (HQ, CP)
•QT6: Governance related issues such as load requirements from University Faculty working in the field are studied such as recommending changes in the reward structure to value clinical teaching and support effective mentoring and improvement in clinical preparation. (HQ) Identify financial incentives to reward expansion of partnerships such as grant initiatives. (HQ, CT)

The following are indicators of success:

By or before May 2016:
•Goals of the partnership are integrated into the partnering institutions.
•Partnership work is expected and supported and reflects what is known about best practice.
•Unit collects data to monitor progress of programs and disseminate what has been learned from this research.

By or Before May 2017:
•Systematic changes are in place in policy and practice in partnering institutions.
•Policy, at the district and university levels, supports partnerships for clinically based teacher preparation.
•Improvement of student learning is documented.
•Improvement of school partnerships for clinically-based teacher preparation is documented.
•Improvement of collaboration with school partners to advance curriculum content and professional coursework is documented.
•New staffing models are in place in partnership schools.

Preparation that takes place in school settings will help ensure that candidates will be prepared. Transforming teacher education by placing clinical preparation at the center of training programs has the potential for purposeful changes in schools. Through new roles, incentives, and rewards for teachers and faculty, the SOE will work together to develop assessments and new instructional approaches. This Addendum to the Conceptual Framework is a 'living document' and will be in need of modifications and updating as the IU Southeast School of Education continues to move towards 'target' for NCATE accreditation.

3.2.b Continuous Improvement

- **Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.**
- **Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in unit Standard 3.**

3.3 Exhibits

3.3.a	Examples across programs of collaborative activities between unit and P-12 schools to support the design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice, including memoranda of understanding
3.3.b	Policies, practices, and data on candidate placement in field experiences and clinical practice
3.3.c	Criteria for the selection of clinical faculty, which includes both higher education and P–12 school faculty
3.3.d	Examples of support and evaluation of clinical faculty across programs
3.3.e	Guidelines/handbooks on field experiences and clinical practice for candidates, and clinical faculty, including support provided by the unit and opportunities for feedback and reflection
3.3.f	Assessment instruments and scoring guides used for and data collected from field experiences and clinical practice for all programs, including use of technology for teaching and learning (These assessments may be included in program review documents or the exhibits for Standard 1. Cross reference as appropriate.)
3.3.g	Performance data on candidates entering and exiting from clinical practice for all programs (These assessments may be included in program review documents or the exhibits for Standard 1. Cross reference as appropriate.)

4. Standard 4. The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P–12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P–12 schools.

4.1 How does the unit prepare candidates to work effectively with all students, including individuals of different ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation, and/or geographical area?

Preparing candidates to work in a "multicultural society" was one of the four CF themes approved in 2001. The Unit changed that theme to "Diverse Society" in May 2009 to more accurately define all elements of diversity. Feedback from stakeholders also provided rationale for this change. Stakeholders frequently identified only race and ethnicity as multicultural thus overlooking the other diversity areas.

Between 2006 and 2008, the Unit began its work to adopt diversity proficiencies. Candidates were assessed on the theme Diverse Society on key assessments/decision points through 2009 when the unit adopted diversity proficiencies. The proficiencies were selected after Quality Team 4 (QT4) reviewed information shared by QT4 members who attended the NCATE AACTE 2008 fall conference. QT4 shared the proficiencies with faculty and revised the proficiencies based upon the feedback. The final 5 proficiencies were recommended to the faculty and unanimously adopted by the SOE in February 2009. The 5 proficiencies are based upon those presented by Maureen D. Gillette, Northeastern Illinois

University. Alignments of the following proficiencies are included in syllabi (I.5.b), key assessments (1.3.l), curriculum maps (1.3.m), and Diversity Proficiencies maps (4.3.b):

1. Learn about and respect diverse learners and their families
2. Understand social disparities that affect students and apply social justice within the classroom and the school
3. Create an inclusive learning community where differences are respected
4. Adjust lessons, educational materials, resources, guidance, and other materials to accommodate needs of all students
5. Examine and reflect on personal practice to reduce bias and stereotypes within their work.

All programs design and implement curriculum and experiences to ensure candidates are prepared to work with diverse students. Programs report the following as examples of assurances that candidates are prepared to work effectively with all students; others are found in the mapping of courses to the Diversity Proficiencies:

Elementary
•The redesigned program ensures that candidates in Block 1 complete an early field experience in schools that meet NCATE's definition of student diversity.
•Candidates take M300 Teaching in a Pluralistic Society which addresses issues related to racism, sexism, homophobia, disabilities, and socio-economic differences. They work with second language learners as part of the 15-30 hour practicum in Block 1. The course is scheduled early in the program in order that candidates build the foundation of vocabulary, self-reflection and analysis, and an understanding of how students are diverse.
•Each methods course is designed to teach candidates strategies for teaching all learners.

Secondary
•Candidates take M300 which addresses issues related to racism, sexism, homophobia, disabilities, and socio-economic differences. They work with second language learners in a ten-clock-hour practicum. The course is scheduled early in the program so candidates build the foundation of vocabulary, self-reflection and analysis, and an understanding of how students are diverse.
•In Block 1, candidates complete a 50-90 hour practicum that includes work with students with disabilities.
•Candidates in Block 2 prepare and teach lessons in diverse schools
•In Reading methods, candidates learn strategies for teaching diverse students reading comprehension.
•The Specific methods course is designed to teach content area planning with attention to building lessons and using cooperative strategies to help all children learn.

Special Education
•Candidates complete coursework and early field experiences preparing them to teach students with a range of disabilities (mild/moderate) in K-12 settings; additional coursework with children without disabilities expands their skills and understanding of a wider range of students.
•The first 2 early field experiences are in urban schools that are ethnically, racially, and economically diverse. A third early experience in a Title I school specifically focuses on learning about the similarities and differences between students with and without IEPs and as well as native and non-native speakers.

Prior to admission to the Elementary, Secondary, or Special Education programs, candidates complete F200, introducing them to the education profession. The thirty-hour practicum ensures that candidates observe students from diverse age, racial, ethnic, and socio-economic groups.

Elementary, Secondary, and T2T require or give credit for candidates' attendance at the Annual SOE

Diversity Conference. (6.3.e) Sessions center on issues relating to working with all students and all areas of diversity.

Transition to Teaching
•The Indiana Protocol does not require an "Impact on Student Learning" assessment. After a review of NCATE standards, the program added the project in 2011 to include in student teaching. The rubric has been revised to allow the program to address the diversity proficiencies. Learning opportunities to teach diverse populations occur by completing field or clinical experiences in Title I and rural schools.
•Candidates observe students in all settings: special needs classrooms, Title I schools and schools with LEP students, schools with two or more racial and ethnic groups. They tutor students in a school with a diverse ethnic/racial population and socio-economic statuses and students with disabilities.
•Candidates must participate in the IU Southeast Diversity Conference where sessions center on issues related to working with all students and all areas of diversity.
•The curriculum is mapped and designed to ensure courses support candidates in their work with all students. In two field experiences they research and profile the school's demographics to raise awareness of the school's population.

MEST
•All candidates take H520 Education and Social Issues. The course addresses all areas of diversity identified in NCATE's definition of diversity. Candidates reflect on their beliefs, including stereotypes, and their impact on students.
•All core courses have multiple assignments that align to the diversity proficiencies and include reflection journals, life history project, social issue paper, conducting research on effective teaching strategies, implementing appropriate teaching strategies, and writing a paper on the hidden curriculum.

Counseling
•Candidates take an Introduction to Special Education course, a Child Development course, and a social issues course as prerequisites to admission to the program.
•Candidates complete a Multicultural Counseling course that addresses cultural variables that influence them and others; how cultural variables impact the learning and development of K-12 students; and how to work with students and families regardless of cultural variables.
•A "Close the Gap" project requires candidates to use data to identify learning gaps between student groups and use evidence-based strategies to close the gap.
•During their internship, candidates complete activities with LEP students and complete at least 25 clock hours in an ethnically diverse school.

Gifted
•The program embeds instructional strategies to prepare candidates to work effectively with all students as demonstrated in the SPA assessments that are aligned to the NAGC/CEC standards. The standards focus extensively on diversity through field and university-based assignments.
•One activity related to diversity, a Profile Study in W551, involves studying how students representing diverse backgrounds are identified for gifted programs in the candidate's school. This profile must be presented to school personnel.
•In W552, W553, and W595, candidates must prepare and facilitate instruction that is inclusive to all populations of learners with attention to language, gender, socioeconomic status, and exceptionalities.

Reading
•A required course, L520 Advanced Study of Second/Foreign Language (ENL), contains a SPA assessment and the content and pedagogical knowledge related to it.
•Beginning in 2012, the field work in E549: Advanced Study of Elementary Language Arts is with LEP students in a local elementary school.

•In another course, candidates create a literature-based study on a topic of diversity.
•During the practicum, candidates must interview a teacher from a highly diverse school and assess a child that represents an NCLB sub-group.
•Courses and assessments are aligned to the IRA standards, ensuring that diversity concepts are threaded throughout the program.

Technology (Computer Education)
•In the introductory course, candidates submit a report on legal, ethical, and diversity issues.
•Candidates create projects that include the facilitation of equitable access to technology for all students.
•In the clinical course, candidates complete an analysis of their classrooms and schools in order to develop a plan to address all students' instructional needs.

Educational Leadership
•Candidates analyze school data to identify achievement gaps. They work with stakeholders in their schools to develop and implement plans based upon research-based best practices to close the gaps.
•Candidates review budgets, school schedules, and the school improvement plan to determine if they are aligned to the school's vision and student learning.
•During the practicum, they work with parents to identify barriers to family involvement in the school.
•During the practicum, candidates observe a disciplinary meeting with a student, a special education case conference and a 504 meeting. They analyze each in terms of whether principles related to educational equity were followed.
•Candidates create interview questions that will assist them determine if job applicants have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to work with LEP and special education students.

4.2 Please respond to 4.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the **target level**. If it is not the standard on which you are moving to the target level, respond to 4.2.b.

4.2.a Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level

- **Describe areas of the standard at which the unit is currently performing at the target level.**
- **Summarize activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that have led to target level performance.**
- **Discuss plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as articulated in unit Standard 4.**

4.2.b Continuous Improvement

- **Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.**
- **Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in unit Standard 4.**

The chart on the diversity of professional education faculty reflects that 10 of 77 (13%) of full & part-time SOE faculty are from non-white ethnic and racial groups. (4.3.d) The chart reflects that campus faculty diversity for non-white groups is 35 of 212 (17%). Campus practices, policies, and good faith efforts (4.3.g), as utilized by the SOE in the recruitment and retention (5.3.k) of faculty have helped facilitate these results. SOE data on gender reflects patterns found in P-12 education with 72% female; campus data for females is 48%.

Campus and SOE candidate demographics reflect the racial and ethnic diversity, not the percentage, of citizens living in the service area. The census data on the demographics chart is for the service area of 9 Indiana and the 5 Kentucky counties in the reciprocity agreement. (4.3e) This includes Jefferson County (Metro Louisville) which has a very diverse population; the remaining 13 counties are not as diverse and some have very little diversity. Fewer Kentucky undergraduate candidates may choose to attend IU Southeast, as state scholarship money based upon GPAs and ACT scores are not transferrable to Indiana. The graduate program attracts a number of candidates from diverse communities with more than 70% of the SOE graduate students living in Kentucky, most in Jefferson County. There are significantly more female than male candidates in the SOE and on campus. The financial aid office reports that SOE candidates are from a range of socioeconomic levels; 356 of 742 undergraduate education candidates receive Pell Grants and 572 of 742 have financial need; 132 of 434 graduate candidates have financial need. Campus practices, policies, and good faith efforts have assisted with campus diversity. (4.3.h) SOE efforts include working at the Kentucky State Fair recruitment booth, holding graduate advising sessions in Jefferson County (JCPS) and at times convenient for JCPS educators, attending freshman advising sessions, and meeting with area high school groups. The CF Diverse Society theme and the Diversity Proficiencies are discussed in advising sessions; advising materials help diverse candidates recognize that the Unit has a welcoming environment that supports diversity.

QT 4 audited programs to ensure field and/or clinical experiences provide candidates experiences with diverse P-12 students. The demographic data for schools used in clinical experiences reveal that 90% of all schools (85% for Indiana and 98% for Kentucky) have student populations that reflect diversity as defined by NCATE. (4.3.f) Programs have identified barriers to candidate placements at diverse schools and revised policies and practices. Challenges include designing experiences for graduate degree and licensure candidates outside their own schools and finding diverse placements for student teachers, who commute to campus, that are close to their homes in rural areas. Policy gaps have been addressed and are found in program and/or field/clinical handbooks.(3.3.j & 4.3.i)

Programs evaluate the curriculum and experiences that prepare candidates to work effectively with diverse students. Changes are made when evaluation reveals gaps and/or failures as reflected in the Change Document. (2.3.h) Examples include:

Elementary
•M300 added more authentic opportunities by using programs found in Louisville including the Muhammad Ali Center and poverty simulations.
•Based upon an analysis of the demographics of schools where candidates had been placed, the team identified schools for the new program to ensure diversity.

Secondary
Curriculum mapping led to the following:
•Added M300 to address race, socio-economic status, gender, sexuality, 13 areas of disability, language, religion and geographical areas; revise unit design, student teaching, and impact on student learning assessments to close diversity proficiency gaps
•General Methods now addresses diversity in lesson building, in classroom pedagogy, and by working

with a special education student. Instruction on RrI, IEPs, and LEP and experiences in urban and non-urban schools added or enhanced.

Special Education
A self-study led to the following:
•An early field experience in an ESL program and work with LEP students in the redesigned courses shared with the elementary program and more contact hours in diverse urban schools
•A partnership with a school whose students are 45% non-white, 75% economically disadvantaged, and 18% LEP

T2T
•After an audit of the diversity proficiencies and the schools in which candidates complete their work revealed the program did not ensure placements with LEP students, added schools with LEP students; candidates include adaptations and accommodations for diverse learners in all lesson plans.

MEST
•After a review of syllabi and DPII results, redesigned H520 to ensure alignment with the diversity proficiencies
•Modifications of core course assignments and assessments, including DPs II and III, after gaps identified through curriculum mapping.
Counseling
•Candidate data used to make changes to the assessment of knowledge of diversity variables and how they impact student learning
•Analysis of the same data led to splitting an assessment into 3 and later 5 parts, spread across courses, so candidates could focus on specific concepts and receive additional instruction.

Gifted
•After a review of assessments and SPA standards, added diversity descriptors to assessment scoring rubrics, thus strengthening LEP focus

Reading
•Aligning the IRA standards and reviewing the demographics of the schools in which candidates teach led to a new format for E549 to ensure candidates work with students from diverse groups as they plan and implement lessons; new guidelines for selecting a study to evaluate were developed.
•Added a school demographic form to ensure candidates work with diverse learners in their schools or have another placement.

Technology
•Added assignments to all courses to address social, legal, and ethical issues after an analysis of results in a SPA assessment.

Educational Leadership
•Added 2 courses based upon gaps in the curriculum map on instruction in working with students with disabilities and LEP students and leading a culturally proficient school.
•Based upon SPA feedback, additional experiences specific to school culture added to the content and the clinical assessments

Twenty-two faculty enhanced curriculum to prepare candidates to work with LEP students through PD as part of the USDOE OELA grant project "Network Capacity Building for ENL/ESL Best Practices" awarded in 2008 to the SOE.

Programs will complete the alignment of each element in the SPA assessment rubrics on planning and impact on student learning to the CF, the dispositions, and the Diversity Proficiencies. The alignments will allow programs to analyze candidate data at a micro level to determine specific strengths and areas of concern. MEST has completed this for DPII and DPIII; Reading for Assessments 3 and 5. (1.3.n)

In 2012, faculty reviewed dispositions to identify where the "belief that all children can learn" is addressed and assessed. Results indicate that while the belief was embedded four of the dispositions, a disposition to address the belief should be added. An ad-hoc team has developed elements for the new disposition for review, approval, and implementation by Fall 2013.(1.3.e) Data will be collected and analyzed by program teams and Quality Teams 2 and 4 in 2014.

QT 4 will meet with the campus Diversity Office to identify other best practices for recruiting and retaining diverse candidates.

Other plans for sustaining and enhancing the elements in Unit Standard 4 include:

Elementary
•Work with the graduate Gifted program faculty to identify and incorporate topics on teaching high ability children into seminars.
Secondary
•Add 2 special education courses to better prepare candidates with teaching strategies for working with students with disabilities.
•Use data from key assessments (SPA) to determine the impact of the changes to curriculum related to student diversity.

Special Education
•Develop, implement, and evaluate activities to help candidates respond effectively to differences in sexual orientation and religion.

T2T
•Use the Elementary program's rubric for the clinical experience, as it provides a more granular assessment of candidates' ability to teach all students.

MEST
•Implement the framework for advanced methods courses which includes preparing candidates to differentiate instruction; study the impact of the courses on student achievement; use results to make improvements
•Monitor DPIV results as candidates reflect upon the CF, analyzing comments about growth in the theme Diverse Society; use data to identify changes needed

Counseling
•Develop a more systematic integration of the elements of diversity in the Career Development course
•Use the assessment course to prepare candidates to understand the bias that may be present in some assessments
•Identify strategies to prepare candidates to be change leaders in their schools by helping others identify bias and behaviors that discriminate against students

Gifted
•Analyze revisions to SPA assessments, once administered, to determine if candidates have the knowledge and skills related to the diversity proficiencies and the NAGC/CEC standards

Reading
•Faculty and the Reading Advisory Board will review the results of the Diversity Proficiencies alignments to assessments to determine the program's strengths and weaknesses and make improvements.

Educational Leadership
•Candidates will meet with their advisor to review the demographics of their schools prior to beginning the practicum to ensure candidates will have experiences(s) with all groups of students
•Analyze revised SPA data related to diversity; make adjustments based upon results

4.3 Exhibits

4.3.a	Proficiencies related to diversity that candidates are expected to demonstrate through working with students from diverse groups in classrooms and schools
4.3.b	Curriculum components and experiences that address diversity proficiencies (This might be a matrix that shows diversity components in required courses.)
4.3.c	Assessment instruments, scoring guides, and data related to candidates meeting diversity proficiencies, including impact on student learning (These assessments may be included in program review documents or the exhibits for Standard 1. Cross reference as appropriate.)
4.3.d	Data table on faculty demographics (See example attached to NCATE's list of exhibits)
4.3.e	Data table on candidates demographics (See example attached to NCATE's list of exhibits)
4.3.f	Data table on demographics of P-12 students in schools used for clinical practice (See example attached to NCATE's list of exhibits)
4.3.g	Policies and practices, including good faith efforts, for recruiting and retaining diverse faculty
4.3.h	Policies and practices, including good faith efforts, for recruiting and retaining diverse candidates
4.3.i	Policies, procedures, and practices that support candidates working with P-12 students from diverse groups

5. Standard 5. 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.

5.1 How does the unit ensure that its professional education faculty contributes to the preparation of effective educators through scholarship, service, teaching, collaboration and assessment of their performance?

The first step the Unit takes to ensure it prepares effective educators is to select high quality faculty. Since the last NCATE review, eleven full-time faculty have been hired as assistant professors or lecturers. After identifying qualifications such as preparation, licensure, and K-12 experiences for the position, the campus process is followed. (5.3.k) The process ensures each position is widely advertised and minority applicants are recruited. Selection committees, consisting of SOE faculty with one serving as the compliance officer, follow the campus guidelines and recommend the successful applicant to the Dean.

Once hired, the new faculty member is assigned a mentor by the Dean. Mentors' duties are outlined in

the SOE Policy Manual p. 30. (6.3.a) and is part of the induction process and guidance through the tenure and promotion process. First year faculty also receive a list of PD and research support opportunities from the campus.

Adjunct or part-time instructors are hired by the Dean based upon program coordinators' recommendations after they review letters of interest, vitae, and recommendations and conduct interviews. They are mentored by full-time faculty.

Assessment of faculty performance occurs in 3 ways. The 1st is performance data that each faculty member collects. This includes the "Student Evaluations of Teaching" (SETs) anonymously and voluntarily collected by faculty at the end of each semester. These data are processed and reports are created by IU Bloomington. Faculty members use the results, along with other candidate feedback and an analysis of candidate performance, to improve their teaching. Full-time faculty results are shared with others if the faculty member choses to do so. Evaluations of one's teaching must be presented in Annual Reports, at Third Year Review, and in the P & T dossier. SETs results for adjunct faculty are reviewed by the Dean and the program's coordinator and used to determine continued employment and suggestions for improvements.

The 2nd form of performance assessment occurs yearly by faculty completing an Annual Report (6.3.a, Faculty Manual, pg. 19). The campus establishes the format for full-time faculty; the Dean requires alignment of individual goals to the CF. Faculty must provide evidence to support their performance in teaching, scholarship (if tenure track), and service. The Dean reviews the reports with assistant professors and junior lecturers, and uses the reports to make recommendations to the Chancellor for continued employment. Associate and full professors and senior lectures have the option to meet with the Dean. Annual reports are used by the Merit Committee to make recommendations to the Dean for additional compensation for faculty, if available. Adjunct faculty complete a SOE-designed Annual Report that is reviewed by the Dean to make suggestions for improvements and to guide employment decisions.

The 3rd form of full-time faculty performance assessment occurs through the P & T process as described in the Faculty Manual on pages 21-33.(6.3.a) Changes in ranks and the performance decisions made for SOE faculty are found in exhibit 5.3.fg. These decisions for SOE faculty document a high level of performance as evidenced by the excellent rating received by all. Mentors play a critical role as they shepherd candidates through the process, especially the third year review, the mid-point P & T check completed in the SOE.

Teaching excellence is highly valued by the SOE as demonstrated by the change in the tenure and promotion requirement made by the SOE. Effective after April 2006, all education faculty must receive an excellent rating in teaching in order to be recommended for tenure or promotion.

Scholarly work is aligned to professors' teaching area or their other expertise. Each full-time, tenure track faculty member may request 1 course release each semester to engage in scholarly work. Each is eligible for a one-semester paid sabbatical leave every 7 years as described in the campus Faculty Manual. (6.3.a, pg. 35) Sabbaticals have been used to improve teaching by studying topics tied to courses. Faculty members may also receive fellowships and research grants that impact their teaching. Examples include:
•Using results from a school governance law study to design real-life scenarios in principal preparation courses
•Identifying improvements to the teaching of research and revising the rubric for the Teacher as Researcher (TAR) paper; preparing a prospectus and writing chapter drafts related to the TAR paper
•Expanding course materials, developing more effective teacher evaluation procedures, and developing

new course after a Fulbright Fellowship
•Findings from a grant provide examples for M300 of how culture affects beliefs about skills that are important and how some skills important for global citizenship do not translate well into all communities
•A 2013 study to create a digital data base of Writing Project demonstration lesson aligned to CCSS standards

Scholarly work is demonstrated in publications in journals, including peer reviewed journals; books and book chapters; and presentations at local, state, and national conferences. Major faculty work is listed in faculty qualifications in AIMS; examples are in exhibit 5.3.d; the onsite review of Annual Reports will provide additional evidence.

The University recognizes service as both "service and leadership to various levels of the university, the profession and/or the community and is a contributing member of the academic community". Faculty identify service in Annual Reports. The campus collects and publishes information on service to the local community and local schools each year (5.3.e) Examples of service include:
•Serving or leading system, campus, and unit committees
•Membership and leadership on state and national professional organizations
•Membership and leadership on community boards including service organizations, religious institutions, and agencies for families and children
•Serving as judges and hosting content specific events
•Serving as an external evaluators for grants and programs
•Training volunteers to work with immigrant and refugee adolescents
•Providing parent involvement/family literacy sessions

A significant role SOE faculty play in service is their collaboration with colleagues in the disciplines, both inside and outside the institution, and in local schools. Found as evidence in the Annual Reports, examples include:
•Working with a low performing school to improve student achievement
•Working with content faculty to address content knowledge issues identified in the SPA report and changes to meet the 120 hour degree requirements
•Studying the concept of transformative curriculum with a faculty learning community
•Working with colleagues from other IHEs to improve state-wide principal preparation programs
•Designing and delivering PD experiences
•Assisting schools in program development
•Planning, collaborating, studying or publishing articles with international colleagues (Bulgaria, Ecuador, Kenya, China, and the Philippines)
•Serving on standards-setting committees for state assessments
•Collaborating with stakeholders to write and implement grants

The Unit and the campus provide opportunities for faculty to improve their teaching skills. QT 5 surveyed faculty to determine the degree to which faculty implemented instructional best practices. (5.3.h) Results suggest faculty are using best practices and were used to identify topics for Unit PD or "Brown Bags." (5.3.h) QT 5 used another survey's results to determine times for PD. (5.3.h) The campus Institute for Learning and Teaching Excellence (ILTE) facilitates PD opportunities at the beginning of the fall semester and throughout the year. ILTE workshops are often done in collaboration with Faculty Colloquium on Excellence in Teaching (FACET) members. Outstanding instructors across the IU system from all disciplines belong to FACET. ILTE currently facilitates training across campus, including 8 SOE faculty, on the design and delivery of high quality on-line and hybrid courses. Faculty participation in state and national conference PD is summarized in exhibit 5.3.g.

Teaching excellence in the SOE has also been recognized through awards and nominations for awards.

Five current SOE faculty members are members of FACET; 3 Trustees Teaching Awards have been earned; one received the Distinguished Teaching Award as the outstanding teacher for the campus. Two faculty members have been named as the SOE Distinguished Alumni, partly based on their teaching as evidence of contribution to the profession. Faculty have received other teaching awards including the innovative use of technology and a Fulbright Fellowship for Teaching and Research.

Additional evidence of SOE faculty quality is found in the Higher Education Research Institute IHERI) report as administered during in 2010-2011.(5.3.i) The survey gathered information related to faculty members' professional practices in teaching, scholarship, and service. Several key findings in the report are:
•"Over 40% of SOE faculty use competency-based grading and none report grading on a curve;
•"SOE faculty use reflective writing/journaling, experiential learning, field studies, and community service more frequently that do faculty in other units;
•"SOE faculty more often collaborate with the local community in research and conduct research or writing focused on racial or ethnic minorities; and
•"55% of SOE faculty use their scholarship to address community needs".
The SOE rating is higher than the other units in terms of having "student-centered pedagogy"; 70% of the SOE faculty reporting a "high" commitment to this. A high or average "commitment to diversity" is identified by 80%.

5.2 Please respond to 5.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the **target level**. If it is not the standard on which you are moving to the target level, respond to 5.2.b.

5.2.a Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level

- **Describe areas of the standard at which the unit is currently performing at the target level.**
- **Summarize activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that have led to target level performance.**
- **Discuss plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as articulated in unit Standard 5.**

5.2.b Continuous Improvement

- **Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.**
- **Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in unit Standard 5.**

Faculty members use candidate feedback and performance data to improve the quality of their teaching and to improve candidate learning. Faculty are expected to analyze their data and plan improvements as part of their annual reports and in their tenure and promotion dossiers. While all changes can be reviewed in the Annual Reports during the onsite visit, the following serve as examples:

•Revised P510 scoring rubrics, the syllabus, and added a Venn diagram in P510 to provide clarity; the previous semester, students were confused about the instructions on concept mapping
•Made multiple changes over several years to a project based on candidate performance data; includes additional instruction and examples on challenging material; and incorporate opportunities for peer review and self-correction prior to submission
•Used candidate performance on formative drafts of the action research paper to design online lecture notes, on-site peer reviews, and add more time into the course schedule to improve researching and writing a literature review
•Adjusted curriculum, activities, and topics per results from candidates end-of-course reflective essay
•Professor joined the ILTE online cohort to learn how to "flip" some of class materials for a Summer 2013; joined cohort based upon issues identified by candidates that could be resolved in this manner
•To coincide with the conceptual framework of SOE, candidates in the undergraduate and graduate programs were mentored not just to create classroom teaching projects but also to present at the Annual IU Southeast Student Conference. The Student Conference spotlights students and academic organizations that represent the multitude of ways students are engaging in one of the over 50 majors at IU Southeast. Faculty started sponsoring undergraduate and graduate students to participate. Candidates participated through table-top displays, posters and PowerPoint presentations.
•The Graduate program faculty made changes to see evidence of teachers pondering on their acquired knowledge. This pedagogical change was based on evaluating performance of candidates at the end of the semester. Assessment tools and procedures were revised to see the use of internalization by engaging candidates in higher mental functioning learning activities. Two main mechanisms were used to evaluate this project. They were: 1) Teachers' internalized knowledge was evaluated through the evidence of learning outcomes. Each set of criteria or rubric measures evidences of internalization of learning theories; and 2) Teachers' instructional self-efficacy was evaluated through the reflective paper as part of DPII. This individual paper required teachers to explain internalized knowledge of learning theories and evidence of instructional self-efficacy.

QT 5 surveyed faculty to determine the reasons for poor attendance at Brown Bags and used the results to schedule the Brown Bag PD at the end of faculty meetings on topics the survey identified and results from the survey on instructional practices. Attendance at the Brown Bags presented has improved.

Based on several faculty members' desire to improve the mentoring process, QT5 reviewed the process and determined more structure was needed. The review led to a 2011 policy change that ensures new faculty members are supported from the time they are hired through tenure and promotion process.

In Spring 2012 full-time faculty peer reviewed all course syllabi, using a check sheet to provide feedback. The checksheet included the required syllabus elements, per the SOE faculty manual, and alignments to the CF, SOE outcomes, Diversity Proficiencies, and program's standards. Faculty used the feedback to make improvements and adjuncts were contacted by individual program coordinators concerning needed changes. During the 2012 fall semester, a second review was conducted. More than 95% of the syllabi (I.5.b) reflect the required elements and demonstrate clarity of the alignments.

QT 5 reviewed the SOE Faculty Manual and determined that a Professional Development policy was needed. They recommended a policy to QT 6 that will be reviewed by faculty by May 2013. QT 5 reviewed the evaluation of adjunct faculty policy and recommended a new one to QT 6 that will also go before the faculty by May 2013.

MEST adopted the practice of using only full-time faculty to teach the core courses. A review of syllabi and assessment rubrics used by adjuncts revealed that core courses were inconsistent when taught by adjuncts.

Four programs and the Dean determined that specific adjuncts should not be rehired due to issues identified through the evaluation process.

One of the campus expectations for tenure and promotion is peer review of teaching. When junior faculty's needs for reviews of their teaching could not be met, 3 additional faculty members volunteered to be trained to serve in this capacity, thus ensuring that SOE faculty could receive critical feedback for the improvement of their teaching from 8 colleagues.

The faculty member directing the Federal ESL grant surveyed SOE faculty on their knowledge and skills related to second language learners. The results were used to plan PD and identify 22 faculty to participate in workshops directed at increasing their knowledge in order to embed appropriate instruction about LEP students and their families into SOE courses.

To ensure ethical use of human subjects in research, all faculty and staff (both full-time and part-time) using human subjects or identifiable, private information about human subjects to conduct research within the course and scope of their duties, are required to have prior approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) before research is initiated. Projects must be approved regardless of whether or not the research is funded and regardless of the funding source. This University policy also applies to candidates whose research is conducted under the advisement of a faculty member, an example being MSED candidates completing their Teacher as Researcher project. All research proposals must be reviewed by the IRB and no individual, other than the IRB Chair, may exempt a proposal from review.

SOE Programs and Quality Teams have plans to sustain and enhance the Unit's performance as articulated in Standard 5.

QT 5 plans to continue the best practices surveys on a three year cycle, using the results to plan Brown Bags for SOE faculty PD.

A course framework will be used for the advanced methods courses offered in Summer 2013. Advanced methods courses are now requirements for the MEST program. Current graduate students were surveyed and asked to identify issues that provided challenges as they worked to ensure that all children were successful learners. These challenges included effective teaching practices. Modeling of effective strategies is one of the items in the framework. The MEST program will survey candidates after the school year to determine the impact of the advanced methods course(s) to determine their impact on student learning. The MEST will use the results to modify the framework as needed.

The campus is upgrading technology in the SOE classrooms to include collaborative workstations. These upgrades are also available in the four classrooms in the Graduate Center. PD will be provided so faculty members are able to use instructional technology effectively. Faculty members will continue to provide opportunities in the courses they teach for candidates to learn to use the instructional technology effectively, focusing on problem-based learning models.

QT 5 will lead the development of initiatives across all programs to provide more shared experiences between SOE faculty and the clinical faculty in the schools. The team will continue its review of the criteria for the qualifications of supervisors and mentors to ensure clear evidence of expertise is included. This work supports the Unit as it moves target in unit Standard 3.

QT 5 will use the results of the Higher Education Research Institute report to identify topics for Brown Bags and will lead a review of the results with faculty asking them to identify areas for SOE improvement.

The Institute for Learning and Teaching Excellence is currently providing training to 8 School of Education faculty members with the purpose of developing online courses taught by SOE faculty. There are 4 half day sessions in which faculty members learn not only the mechanics of online teaching, but good pedagogy as well. It is anticipated that all participating SOE faculty members have at least one course online or as a hybrid by the fall of 2013.(5.3.j) Each participant is expected to produce a course introductory Vodcast, e-modules, netiquette and other learning materials relevant to the proposed online course.

5.3.a Data table on faculty qualifications (These data may be compiled from the tables submitted earlier for national program review by clicking on "Import" below, or compiled in Excel, Word, or PDF format and uploaded as an exhibit in following "5.3.b Exhibit Links" section.)

Table 1
Faculty Qualification Summary

FacultyInfo_14707_4497_62543.xls
See **Attachments** panel below.

5.3.b Exhibits

5.3.a	Data table on qualifications of professional education faculty (This table can be compiled in the online template from data submitted for national program reviews or compiled in Excel, Word, or another format and uploaded as an exhibit. See example attached to NCATE's list of exhibits.)
5.3.b	Data table on qualifications of clinical faculty (i.e., P–12 school professionals and professional education faculty responsible for instruction, supervision, and/or assessment of candidates during field experiences and clinical practice)
5.3.c	Policies and practices to assure clinical faculty meet unit expectations
5.3.d	Policies, expectations, and samples of faculty scholarly activities
5.3.e	Summary of faculty service and collaborative activities in schools (e.g., collaborative project with school faculty, teacher professional development, and addressing the needs of low performing schools) and with the professional community (e.g., grants, evaluations, task force participation, provision of professional development, offering courses, etc.)
5.3.f	Policies, procedures, and practices for faculty evaluation (including promotion and tenure) and summaries of the results in areas of teaching, scholarship and service
5.3.g	Policies, procedures, and practices for professional development and summaries of the results

6. Standard 6. 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.

6.1 How do the unit's governance system and resources contribute to adequately preparing candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards?

The SOE is organized to provide multiple opportunities for collaboration among faculty members, the Dean, other units, and the professional community.(6.3.b) Each degree or licensing area is part of a

program team with a coordinator (undergraduate) or director (graduate). Coordinators and the Graduate Director meet with the Dean once a month as the School Council to review SOE issues and set the agenda for faculty meetings. Program teams meet monthly to review candidate assessment data, discuss issues identified by the Dean and/or a Quality Team (QT), and work on program issues such as curriculum, assessment development, candidate concerns, and program changes.

All faculty and staff are assigned to one of 6 Quality Teams in order to provide a coherent effort. As part of the UAS (2.3.a), team functions are aligned to the NCATE Standards and found in the SOE Faculty Manual. (6.3.a) Each QT identifies issues or concerns to take to the appropriate stakeholder group, including other QTs, program team(s). The QT chairs regularly meet with the Dean and NCATE coordinator. Each program team and QT develops a work plan to submit to the Dean in late September and reports on work accomplished by the end of June. (2.3.i)

QT 6 is responsible for overseeing the Unit's governance system and for collecting information concerning resources used to prepare candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards. Overseeing the governance system includes facilitating the nominations and elections of faculty members to Senate committees and the campus and IU system committees; recommending Unit committee appointments; and developing policies for faculty review and approval.

The organizational chart reflects opportunities for input or advice from external stakeholder groups. (2.3.a & 6.3.b) The information shared and discussed with each group is identified by the Dean or a team. For example, the Dean and coordinators meet with superintendents to share updates from the SOE and gain input on specific Unit issues. Programs meet with candidates, alumni, and practitioners to review data and discuss program changes. The Dean and coordinators meet with representatives from other Units to review candidate content data.

All Quality Teams identify policies and procedures related to their NCATE Standard to include in handbooks to ensure candidate access to important information. A chart summarizes this information and is included with each program's handbook (3.3.e) The campus website provides links to the Bulletin, academic and event calendars, schedules, publications, the Student Code of Rights and Responsibilities, advising information, admission requirements, and campus policies on grading, appeals, and complaints. (6.3.e)

A budget chart shows expenditures for the SOE and the School of Nursing, the two units with clinical components. Another chart shows the funds allocated to the 3 units that participate in an accreditation process (Education, Nursing, and Business) for travel and registration as well as available Foundation funds. (6.3.g) The campus has experienced a financial shortfall due to reductions in state funding for higher education but the reduction has not negatively impacted course offerings. While the 2013 summer school budgets are reduced across campus, required graduate courses will be offered; numerous electives will not.

As per the campus policy, all full-time faculty members are assigned 12 hours each semester with course releases for administrative work and scholarly activities. Coordinators for elementary, secondary, special education, reading, and counseling have 1 three-hour course release each semester; the graduate director has 2 course releases; the NCATE coordinator has 1 or 2 course releases based upon the accreditation cycle; tenure-track track faculty engaged in scholarly work have 1 course release each semester. The Dean may assign other release time for special projects. If a faculty member voluntarily assumes a course over-load, the faculty member's load is reduced in a subsequent semester.

PD is available through SOE Brown Bags and campus events sponsored by ILTE and FACET. (5.3.g) Travel funds are provided for junior faculty making presentations at conferences. The campus has

"second travel funds" to assist faculty members' travel to conferences as they build a case of scholarly work for dossiers.

QT 6 collects and reviews data concerning campus and unit facilities and resources used to prepare candidates and support their learning. Findings include:

•Candidates and faculty have access to a faculty member's collection of over 20,000 pieces of children's literature. The collection is located in the Library's Curriculum Materials Center (CMC). Candidates use the books in lessons presented to P-12 students. The CMC is a designated room in the library building and houses the Center for Cultural Resources (CCR) with a large collection of P-12 textbooks, trade books, "hands-on" materials for all content and grade levels, and other collections pertinent to educator preparation including over 65 culture kits with artifacts and realia collected from around the world, lesson plans, supplemental books, and materials. The Children and Young Adult literature collection was expanded by several hundred titles in 2006 and continues to be expanded through SOE and Library collaborations.

•Candidates taking EDUC F200 attend an "Introduction to the Education Major" session to familiarize them with the Library's resources and literature of the field prior to admission to an SOE program. Electronic databases include ERIC, EBSCO's Professional Development Collection, Children's Literature Comprehensive Database, Hornbook Guide, and Teaching Books.

•IU Southeast IT is part of IU system's Information Technology Services (UITS). IU Southeast IT employees report to the Office of the Vice President of Information Technology at IU Bloomington but serve the technology needs of the Southeast campus.

•Currently all faculty, staff, and student technology center computers are replaced every 4 years.

•Every faculty and staff member has a university provided office computer. The campus has a 1 Gb fiber optic backbone for local area networking and provides at least 100 Mb to all desktops. The campus is connected to I-Light, a high-speed fiber optic network connecting all universities and other Indiana public agencies. Campus resources include OneStart, Oncourse, Sharepoint, IUanyWare, email, UniCom, the university Knowledge Base, enrollment management services and all administrative services. I-Light provides the Internet connection.

•The campus has ubiquitous wireless network connectivity that includes all buildings and contiguous outdoor areas. All classrooms are equipped with a minimum of an instructor station computer, a digital projector, and video playback capability.

•There are 2 classrooms and 5 general purpose rooms on the campus providing video conferencing connectivity to all IU campuses as well as compatible non-university locations.

•IU has contracts with software vendors including Microsoft, Adobe, SPSS, ESRI, Citrix, and Red Hat. Applications are installed on all campus computers and are updated as new versions become available. Other applications are found in specialty labs such as the SOE computer classroom and the Adaptive Technology Center. Software is made available free or at a substantial discount to candidates, faculty, and staff through IUWare, the university's on-line software distribution site. IUWare provides Microsoft and Adobe applications via "the cloud" allowing easier access from personal computers.

•There are approximately 1100 computers available in labs, classrooms, and student organizations and approximately 550 faculty and staff computers of which 41 are in the SOE. The 5600 sq. ft. space at the Water Tower Square in Jeffersonville has 4 classrooms including a computer lab. The facility is the new home of the IU Southeast Graduate Center shared by the Business and the SOE Graduate programs.

•The IU Support Center in Bloomington is open 24/7/363 to provide technology support for all IU system faculty, staff and candidates. They handle tier-one support phone calls and IM messages. IU Southeast has 7 full-time and 5 part-time employees providing on-going maintenance and support for classroom technology, the Student Technology Centers (STCs), and faculty and staff offices by taking tier-two calls. About 30 part-time student employees staff the major student labs providing face-to-face support during the STCs' open hours.

•In January 2012, IT began a transition from the old campus telephone system to UniCom which integrates voice, video, and instant messaging at the faculty/staff member's computer.

Allocation of IT funds:
•IU provides base budget funding for IT infrastructure and personnel. Approximately $20,000 is allotted by the Faculty Senate IT Advisory Committee for the purchase and licensing of campus software. The committee allocates some funding for use at the discretion of the Deans and entertains requests from faculty for the remainder. The amount allotted to the schools can vary yearly and recently has been $1,500 per school. The remaining base budget funding is used by UITS to provide and maintain IT services to the campus.
•Total IT expenditures for the last 5 fiscal years range from a low of $3,123,951 In FY11 to a high of $3,573,095 in FY09. This includes costs for all campus desktop computers, student technology centers, and classroom technology as well as all operating and infrastructure costs for the support center, network services, telephone services, and printing & duplicating services. Expenditures for the current fiscal year are expected to be at similar levels and no significant budget reduction is expected in the next fiscal year.

6.2 Please respond to 6.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the **target level**. If it is not the standard on which you are moving to the target level, respond to 6.2.b.

6.2.a Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level

- **Describe areas of the standard at which the unit is currently performing at the target level.**
- **Summarize activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that have led to target level performance.**
- **Discuss plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as articulated in unit Standard 6.**

6.2.b Continuous Improvement

- **Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.**
- **Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in unit Standard 6.**

In summer 2011, the Library's liaison to the SOE began interviewing faculty members to identify the research needs of candidates, as well as faculty researchers, to assist in weeding and collection development of the Library's professional education collection and the CMC. After determining circulation statistics, currency and usefulness to research, items were discarded after being reviewed by Education faculty. Collection development is ongoing with faculty members able to place orders for needed materials at any time through the Library's Purchase Request system. Results of these librarian and faculty meetings were an increased awareness of the Library's resources, especially electronic resources organized for students through LibGuide pathfinders (http://libguides.ius.edu/tradebooks and http://libguides.ius.edu/education).

The campus added an advisor to each unit based upon recommendations of the campus Student Persistence Committee. The new SOE advisor is housed with 2 other SOE advisors, the records specialist, and assistant in the new advising suite.

The SOE technology committee recommends purchases based upon the results of needs assessments administered each year. Recent purchases include iPads, a mini-projector, and SOE computer lab software.

All programs "recognized with conditions" or with "revisions needed" revised assessments and rubrics in response to the National Recognition Reports. This involved changes ranging from recreating to modifying assessments and rubrics. The campus provided compensation for this work as the faculty involved did not have summer release time.

All programs changed, as needed, policies and practices concerning candidate experiences with diverse students after an audit revealed gaps.

The Unit determined that Quality Teams will maintain their membership and chairs as much as possible through Spring 2014 to assure continuity and Unit effectiveness.

The SOE faculty reviewed the dispositions for alignments to the "belief that all children can learn". Based upon the results of the review and discussions, the faculty followed the SOE governance process to add the disposition "candidates exhibit behaviors that demonstrate the belief that all children can learn" to be implemented in fall 2013; an ad-hoc committee has identified the elements.

All programs revised program and field/clinical handbooks after an audit using the 6 NCATE standards identified gaps. Revisions ensure candidates have nformation related to each Standard.

Programs made changes and followed the policies for QT 1, faculty, campus, and system approval. (6.3.a, SOE Policy Manual, pg. 19) Examples include the following:
•Elementary—replaced a 300 level writing course with a 200 level. A check sheet review revealed the current course was a 300 level course that could not be transferred from another institution due to IU Southeast general education policy.
•Secondary—made changes to the content requirements for all four majors and developed new advising sheets. This was based upon a review of the current required courses and the changes mandated by the new licensure requirements under REPA.
•Elementary, Secondary, and Special Education—revised programs to meet the Indiana 120 hour maximum BS degree. Based upon mandated changes, programs reviewed curriculum maps and standards to determine courses that would ensure all program and NCATE standards would be met.
•MEST—redesigned all degree requirements after a Standard 1 audit revealed advanced pedagogy courses were not required courses in the program.
•Educational Leadership added two courses to ensure Kentucky candidates would meet the new Kentucky requirements.

Programs, with the autonomy permitted through SOE governance, revised policies related to admission, courses, and assessment. The following are examples:
•Elementary—planned to implement co-teaching model starting in Fall 2012; related to moving to target and based upon cooperating teacher evaluations and advisory group recommendations
•Secondary—revisited the change in GPA adopted in 2007 and approved a pilot for Social Studies and Mathematics; analysis of the admission data revealed the way the requirement is implemented eliminates some candidates that could meet the requirement if given time
•Secondary—modified course requirements for Mathematics; based upon changes made in the

Mathematics department
•Special Education—post-bac program stopped accepting new candidates; based upon results of SPA review and discussions with area Special Education Directors concerning candidate placements and nature of the program with emergency licensed teachers
•Counseling—adjusted Summer 2011 course schedule; based on feedback from candidates on appropriateness of course sequence
•T2T—added options for entrance to the program; based upon analysis of current practice in light of the IDOE's alternative certification requirements
•MEST—revised policy on readmission for candidates not enrolled in coursework for 2 or more years; based upon evidence that candidates returning after a two or more year gap may not meet new requirements for the degree
•MEST—adopted policy to approve only workshop courses aligned to the NBPTS and program proficiencies; based up a syllabi review's results related to rigor and alignment
•Educational Leadership—determined that A500, A510, and A608 would no longer be offered to candidates not admitted to the program; based upon loss of a faculty line, courses could only be offered once each year rather than two to three times
•Four programs recommended to the Dean that adjuncts for which data (SETs, feedback from candidates, and/or syllabi analysis) reflected poor performance not be rehired.

Program and Quality Teams plan to sustain and enhance the Unit' performance through continuous improvement as articulated in unit Standard 6.

In 2012, all programs and Quality Teams began using a common template for reporting actions taken that include the data/rationale as appropriate. Quality Team 2 analyzed minutes and determined that data- based decisions were implied but not always clearly articulated.

Based upon feedback from faculty and an analysis of the feedback from Data Days, Quality Team 2 created a clearer picture of the data cycle.(2.3.a) The routine practices of analyzing data by Program and Quality Teams have been brought together in a unit-wide perspective through the calendar developed by QT2; after implementation, QT2 will monitor the calendar to determine its effectiveness.

Quality Team 6 will engage in the following to lead the sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement:
•Study the impact of new undergraduate advisor and recommend changes to the Dean and the undergraduate programs
•Review changes recommended by QT 5 in adjunct evaluation, professional development, and mentoring policies and take recommendations to the faculty for consideration
•Facilitate and identify grant opportunities to promote and reward the expansion of partnership schools
•Work with the marketing office to promote the SOE graduate programs to off-set the decline in enrollment experienced by Indiana removing the financial incentive linked to a MS degree
•Provide leadership to the Unit in identifying the most current and relevant instructional technology; work with QT 5 to provide PD
•Analyze the results of the Unit Assessment Survey looking for continued trends; recommending changes to the appropriate programs or Quality Teams by following the process in the UAS flow chart
•Work with QT 2 to align the SOE complaint process with the campus grievance process
•Work with QT 2 to analyze the results on the unit assessment survey to determine the quality of candidate experiences with advising, technology, faculty quality, and facilities; take issues identified to the appropriate stakeholder group for further analysis and action
•QT 6 will recommend ways to increase the availability of Foundation funds for the SOE

Programs will engage in the following to sustain and enhance performance through continuous

improvement:
•Elementary, Secondary, and Special Education will monitor the effects of the 120 hour program and make recommendations for necessary changes to the faculty for approval.
•The Computer Licensure Program initiated 50% hybrid online courses in the spring of 2012. Since that time the Computer Licensure Program has evolved to 100% online instruction in the for Spring 2013 with all Computer Licensure courses are now taught online with the exception of W540 which is 75% hybrid course. SPA data from the new course delivery in Spring and Summer 2013 will be disaggregated and compared to the hybrid and face-to-face course results.

The campus plans the following changes related to IT:
•Creating environments for collaboration and providing for the use of mobile devices will bring more IT innovation to campus. IT is working with campus stakeholders to develop two or three existing student study spaces into areas with furniture and technology designed to encourage and facilitate work on collaborative assignments. These spaces will be equipped with interactive computing and display tools.
•Public computers will likely transition to more streamlined all-in-one machines, some of which will feature multi-touch monitors for interaction. Lounge-type furniture will be located near power outlets for students to use in charging their mobile devices. In addition, easily-accessed power outlets are being added to the counter seating in the dining hall for charging.
•IT will continue to work with ILTE in identifying potential classroom improvements and upgrades. Both departments will work with the campus Classroom Committee (a subcommittee of the Facilities & Environment Committee) to identify viable classrooms for piloting new collaborative furniture concepts. Classroom life-cycle replacements have begun.

6.3 Exhibits

6.3.a	Policies, procedures, and practices for governance and operations of the unit
6.3.b	Organizational chart and/or description of the unit governance structure and its relationship to institutional governance structure
6.3.c	Policies, procedures, and practices for candidate services such as counseling and advising
6.3.d	Policies, procedures, and practices for candidate recruitment and admission, and accessibility to candidates and the education community
6.3.e	Academic calendars, catalogs, unit publications, grading policies, and unit advertising
6.3.f	Unit budget, with provisions for assessment, technology, professional development, and support for off-campus, distance learning , and alternative route programs when applicable
6.3.g	Budgets of comparable units with clinical components on campus or similar units at other campuses
6.3.h	Policies, procedures, and practices for faculty workload and summary of faculty workload
6.3.i	Candidates' access to physical and/or virtual classrooms, computer labs, curriculum resources, and library resources that support teaching and learning
6.3.j	Candidates' access to distance learning including support services and resources, if applicable