BOARD OF EXAMINERS OFFSITE REPORT: CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PATHWAY

Indiana University Southeast
July 10, 2013 1:00-5:00 p.m.

Offsite BOE Team Members

Dr. J. Phillip Bennett, Chair
Dr. Tahsin Khalid, Member
Dr. Loretta J. Leaphart, Member
Dr. Carol A. Ryan, Member
Mrs. Cynthia P. Sutyak, Member

Offsite BOE Team Observers

Dr. George Frampton, State Consultant
Ms. Wendy Wiggins, NCATE Staff

BOARD OF EXAMINERS OFFSITE REPORT:
CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PATHWAY

The Purpose the of BOE Offsite Report

One of the key features of the Continuous Improvement (CI) Pathway is the combination of formative and summative processes. *The BOE Offsite Report provides formative feedback from the offsite review meeting. The BOE Onsite Report provides a summative evaluation of the findings from the onsite visit.*

The following BOE Offsite Report indicates areas of concern on which the Onsite BOE Team will focus during the upcoming visit. In addition, the last section for each standard is a list of evidence that the team plans to validate during the visit to ensure that the standards continue to be met. This validation will occur as the team interviews faculty, administrators, school-based partners, and other members of the professional community. Validation could also occur in the visits to schools and observations on campus. The validation list also includes some specific documentation that the team would like to review during the onsite visit. In some cases, the Offsite Team members could not locate a document or open a link and have requested that the Onsite Team review those documents.

The BOE Offsite Team has conducted a thorough review of the Institutional Report and exhibits to produce this report; however, the BOE Onsite Team is not limited to these findings. If the team is unable to validate information, or if further or contradictory information is found, the Onsite BOE Team may request additional evidence and/or cite new concerns as areas for improvement.

**BOARD OF EXAMINERS OFFSITE REPORT:
CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PATHWAY**

I.   Movement Toward Target

Please indicate the standard(s) on which the unit selected to demonstrate movement toward target:

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

II.   Unit Standards

Standard 1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

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

1.1.a Preliminary Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The unit consists of six programs, three at the undergraduate and three at the graduate level. The undergraduate programs are as follows: elementary education including a transition to teaching (T2T) program; secondary education in English, Math, Science, and Social Studies; and special education. Advanced master's programs are offered in elementary and secondary education (non-licensure); and counseling, reading, special education, gifted and talented, technology facilitator (all licensure).   In addition, a building level administrator program is offered at the post master's licensure level.   The Secondary T2T program has been discontinued.

With regard to the initial programs, the following have been nationally recognized by their respective SPAs: Reading, Secondary Mathematics, Language Arts and Social Studies as well as Elementary programs. The four advanced programs have been recognized with conditions. These conditions appear to be related to the lack of data and data interpretation for various assessments as well as the inconsistent alignment of some of the rubrics to the actual assessment being measured. These concerns have been explained by the unit, but were not verified by data which are yet to be collected.

It is clear that the unit has aligned its assessment data to the four pathways found in its conceptual framework. Additionally it has identified five diversity proficiencies that are also assessed. It has developed four specific decision points (transition points) where data are systematically collected. The unit has carefully outlined each of the programs at both the initial and advanced level indicating that candidates meet the content knowledge and professional knowledge components of this standard.

The unit uses multiple assessments documented within individual SPA reports for evaluation of content knowledge. Regarding the initial programs which include secondary social studies, science, math and language arts as well as elementary education, the SPA reports validate candidate content knowledge, alignment to rubrics and sufficient data provision. As such all of these programs have been nationally recognized. With regard to the initial program of Special Education at both the Baccalaureate and Post Baccalaureate levels the SPA reports document significant concern with regard to candidate content knowledge. Specifically, not all candidates are required to pass the state Praxis II exam. Also, noted are assessments that appear to be loosely aligned to the standards and/or are grouped in ways that are not clear and meaningful. As such, additional explanation and documentation in this area are needed to confirm candidate content knowledge for this program.

At the advanced level, the reading endorsement program has been nationally recognized. Within each of the SPA reports for the programs listed above, alignment to course grades, performance on state licensure exams at or above 80 percent and various portfolio assessments are all cited with regard to meeting this area. The Reading teacher licensure program at the advanced level also has achieved national recognition and provided sufficient content knowledge evidence within the SPA report documentation. Regarding other programs at the advanced level, the SPA report for the Building Level Administrator notes a particular area of strength in the reporting of this area through documentation of content knowledge through grades. This is also the case for the computer licensure program and the Gifted and Talented Education program. These three programs are recognized with conditions. The conditions, however, are not regarding content knowledge but rather other areas within the standard and thus the content knowledge component appears to be sufficiently documented. With regard to the three programs that are not SPA reviewed, the elementary T2T program documents candidate proficiency through licensing exams such as Praxis II as well as Decision Point (DP) assessments I, II and III. It appears that data for these assessments show candidate passage at or above 80 percent. Regarding the Masters in Elementary or Secondary Program (MEST) program, candidate grade point average, the Teacher as Research (TAR) action research project as well as DP II and DP III are sources of evidence in this area. Finally, the counseling program, through the first assessment, documents candidate proficiency in the area of content knowledge. As such all of the programs appear to appropriately document the content knowledge area of this standard.

At the initial level, SPA reports for all secondary programs (language arts, math, science and social studies) as well as the elementary program, document evidence that candidates know instructional strategies and implement them in meaningful ways while using technology. These are evaluated using assessments of instructional planning. Student teaching evaluations are also sources of evidence for meeting this area as are exit interviews. However, within the area of secondary mathematics, it was noted within the SPA review that while sufficient evidence was provided for assessments 4-7 in the understanding and application of pedagogical knowledge, further evidence is needed with regard to the use of concrete materials, professional organization resources and research. With regard to secondary language arts, there is significant evidence and data presented for assessment 6, however, assessments 3 and 7 are too new to provide the requisite data submissions. Also, regarding the Special Education Licensure program at the Baccalaureate level, SPA reports indicate that assessments 3 and 4 provide some evidence for this area but do not "reflect the breadth and depth of the standards in apparent ways." Similar concerns were raised within the SPA report at the Post Baccalaureate level for the special education program which would indicate further evidence is needed to validate this area.

Programs at the advanced level that have available SPA reports have shown evidence that candidates demonstrate in-depth understanding of pedagogy and learning, are engaged in professional activities and are aware of current research & policies. Evidence for these areas with regard to the reading licensure program is found in data from Assessments 4, 5 and 7 where candidates demonstrate impact on student learning as well as perform case studies. Regarding the technology facilitator licensure program, assessments 3, 4, 6 and 7 provide evidence in these areas. In the gifted and talented program, while assessments 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8 document alignment with understanding and application of knowledge, it has been noted that insufficient

data have been presented to determine if candidates have achieved this criterion. Regarding the administrative licensure program, assessments 3, 4 and 7 are designed to address these areas, however, there are significant gaps with regard to the presentation of evaluative criteria and data presentation. In this program, more evidence is warranted in these areas particularly with regard to sufficient data submission.

Regarding the MEST and counseling programs who do not submit to SPA review, while certain assessments such as the Teacher as Research (TAR) action research project are referred to, data are needed to support that candidate pedagogical and professional knowledge are systematically assessed.

Initial programs at the Secondary level for the areas of language arts, mathematics, science, special education (at the baccalaureate level) and social studies as well as for elementary education have documented evidence of the assessment of student learning, use of assessments in instruction and the development of meaningful learning experiences. These are noted within teacher work samples and other assessments that evaluate candidate impact on student learning. However, in the area of language arts, it has been noted that there is not documentation of work with professional organizations or collaboration with others and therefore this evidence will need to be reviewed.   The special education program at the post baccalaureate level also provides evidence for student learning within assessment 5, however it is noted within the SPA review that assessments need to be refined in order to more adequately assess candidate performance with students in the area of mild/moderate disabilities.

At the advanced level, in the area of reading, the SPA review indicates that sufficient evidence has been provided within assessments 5 and 7 regarding impact on student learning. The SPA review of the technology facilitator program notes that evidence is provided, but limited in this area. This would seem to indicate that additional evidence will need to be reviewed. Regarding the gifted and talented program, the SPA review raises significant concern with regard to lack of evidence for P-12 student learning. More data are necessary in this area. Likewise, the administrative licensure program SPA report indicates that P-12 student impact is very loosely evaluated with little data provided. As such, it would seem that in order to assess how well these candidates can create positive environments for student learning, and build upon the developmental levels of students with whom they work; the area will need to be further evaluated as well.

Regarding the MEST and counseling programs which do not submit to SPA review, there appears to be little or no documentation or data with regard to candidate impact on P-12 student learning. Further documentation in this area is required for further evaluation.

Regarding documentation for both initial and advanced programs, more specific documentation and explanation are needed with regard to consideration of family and community contexts, students' developmental levels and consideration of prior experience, in order to demonstrate that candidates consider these areas as they design and implement meaningful student learning experiences.

Within the conceptual framework, the unit has identified several dispositions which include the areas of ethical and legal responsibilities, interaction of colleagues, equitable treatment of all individuals, appropriate personal management behaviors, inquiry and application of the knowledge base of education, enthusiasm and respect for education as a profession, database decision making, fair practices and continuous self-evaluation and improvement. It is noted within the IR that these dispositions are assessed behaviorally. It appears that this "behavioral assessment" takes place during decision point assessments and within student portfolio submissions. Across all programs, both initial and advanced, evidence suggests that candidates are familiar with expected dispositions. Also provided is the Scantron "summative evaluation of professional dispositions." It appears that the data for these are provided within the depositions reports found in the exhibits. Additional evidence with regard to the assessment of dispositions occurs within the student teaching component for all initial programs. Associated data for this within the exhibits, a document entitled, "recommended elements for disposition to assess the belief that all students can learn," includes suggested areas for assessment across all programs. A similar document addresses dispositions associated with the "caring" educator.   However, it is not clear where these items are assessed. As such, the elements described within these documents need to be aligned to specific assessment information for each program.   Overall, program dispositions appear to be assessed systematically throughout and across all programs at both the initial and advanced levels. One area that seems to be lacking would be with regard to how candidate dispositions are reflected in work with students, families and communities. Further evidence in this area across all programs appears warranted.

1.1.b **How were unit programs reviewed by the BOE? What trends emerged? What do these trends reveal about the unit's programs?**

The unit has provided a summary of each program and candidate performance, SPA results and recognition. The candid discussion in the IR addresses strengths and areas of weakness for each program as outlined in the individual SPA reports. The unit has shown a conscious effort to accept, address and improve upon noted weaknesses while enhancing strengths. Following the evaluation of the IR and SPA reports, evidence provided within these documents has been verified within several exhibits provided in the electronic portfolio for the unit. The evidence suggests that each program is carefully implemented, evaluated and revised based on data driven decisions. The programs are based on the implementation of state and national standards as well as the conceptual framework of the unit.

Those programs with no SPA were reviewed via the Indiana Program Review Protocol. Of those programs, the Elementary Transition to Teaching (T2T) and the Masters in School Counseling were approved. The Masters in Elementary or Secondary Program (MEST) does not submit to any review. This program uses NBPTS and CF alignment and course grades to determine proficiency.

1.2   Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

1.2.b Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The unit consistently evaluates data and uses this information to implement change and growth measures within its programs. "Change documents" are utilized to record and monitor the effectiveness of these changes. Sources of these data include candidate transcripts, licensure test results, SPA reviews, graduate and employer surveys and stakeholder feedback. The documented changes show a genuine interest in program improvement, candidate success and ultimately p-12 student learning. Specifically, course changes such as those made to implement a new "impact on student learning project" into the elementary student teaching component, rubric redesign (such as those made in the counseling program to better define basic and proficient ratings) and course revisions (such as the addition of new special education courses within the secondary program) demonstrate consistent and methodical evaluation and implementation of strategies for further program development.

1.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

No areas for improvement were cited at the previous visit.

1.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

1. It is not evident that the MEST has been approved or reviewed by the state or other agency.

Rationale: The institution stated in the IR that the program has not been reviewed by the state and there is no evident that the program has been reviewed by any program approval organization.

1.5 Evidence for the BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

1. Within AIMS, verify that the SPA listed for individual program categories is correct. It appears that they may not have been entered into the table correctly and this makes the evaluation of specific programs confusing.
2. Clarification of the MEST program with regard to assessment. Specifically how does the program align its assessments to NBPTS and the conceptual framework?
3. Demonstration that candidates consider school, family and community contexts and base the learning experiences that they create on these contextual references.
4. Demonstration that dispositions are reflected in candidate work with students, families and communities.
5. The link to Title II data was inaccessible and needs to be provided by the unit. (Team members cannot access the Unit's AIMS account.)
6. Information is needed regarding why decision points for the Gifted/Talented, Reading and Technology programs were not developed until 2012-13.
7. Exhibit 1.3.b is not accessible.
8. Exhibit 1.5.e is not accessible.

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

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

2.1 Preliminary Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The unit has developed an overall assessment system and also a specific assessment system for each initial and advanced program. The overall and individual assessment systems include three or four decision points (transition points), depending on the program. While the labels for the various programs are somewhat different decisions are made for initial and advanced programs at program admission, clinical practice admission, completion of clinical practice, and program completion. The assessment system demonstrates an alignment with the four conceptual framework themes: High Quality Educators, Caring Professionals, Continuous Transformation of Schools, and Diverse Society. The development of these themes, and a list of corresponding outcomes, are based on national standards such as INTASC and NBPTS as well as the standards developed by Indiana Office of Educator Licensing and Development (OELD). An alignment of key assessments to the conceptual framework and the diversity proficiencies is provided for each program. As shown in SPA and state reports, key assessments to evaluate candidate proficiency have been developed for each program.

A flowchart for assessment of unit operations has been developed and incorporated into the overall assessment system. Unit operations being assessed are not identified in the assessment system but according to the IR unit operations are identified and evaluated by six quality teams (QTs) aligned to each of the NCATE Standards. QT 2 Program Assessment and Unit Evaluation (PAUE) has a defined protocol for reviewing assessments and unit operations for bias, fairness, accuracy, and consistency. A recent report from PAUE provided a review of each program for fairness and avoidance of bias.

Multiple key internal and external assessments are used by the unit to assess candidates and collect data for program improvement. They include GPA, course grades, Praxis I, survey of candidates at various stages of the program, dispositions and impact on student learning ratings, special projects, Praxis II, field experience and clinical practice rubrics, survey of graduates, and survey of employers. These assessments provide data for decision making throughout the program and at program completion and include data from candidates, departments, unit, graduates, and school personnel.

The six QT teams regularly look at data collected and compiled to determine the success of candidates, program quality, and unit operations and to identify needed improvements. Data for the one alternate route program is reviewed and assessed separately from the traditional programs. Goals and action plan documents verify that data are being used but not all documents could be interpreted because of the different formats used. Some coursework is offered off-campus but full programs are not offered off-site and no programs are offered fully online.

There is a campus grade appeal procedure and the unit has a policy for program and field placement appeals. QT 2 is responsible for seeing that candidate complaints are on file in the Dean's office. QT 2 and QT 6 are considering a policy to handle complaints that do not fit into any of these existing policies.

The unit has used Scantron forms to collect decision point data since 2002. In 2004, an alignment to the conceptual framework was added, and reflected on the Scantron forms. However the unit has determined that Scantron forms are not adequate for collecting data for SPA assessments. PAUE is studying the possible use of iRubic, an electronic rubric, piloted by three programs since summer 2012. The software programs WEAVE and Qualtrics are also being considered along with the continued use of Scantron forms. Onestart is the IU student information management system but it isn't clear if this system provides useful data for the unit. The NCATE coordinator plans to work with Office of Institutional Research and Assessment to ensure the campus uses SPA data to complete the required campus reports. Overall, there is little detail about how technology is being used to maintain assessment system data.

The unit has a Unit Database Coordinator. 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. The IR indicates that data are shared with candidates throughout all programs in writing and face-to-face during advising, with some results posted in Onestart. Based on the assessment system and information in the IR, data are shared in meetings of the QT, NCATE Steering Committee, and advisory committees. The Council on Preparing Education Professionals whose members are faculty in other disciplines and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs meets each semester to discuss changes being made in the School of Education. The Council reviews program data and identifies issues to be addressed to better serve education candidates. Although it appears data are shared with the professional community, there is no information about how faculty and students access information through the use of technology.

2.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

2.2.b Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

Through the Quality Teams and advisory committees there is involvement of the professional community in maintaining the assessment system. Decisions about candidates are based on a number of assessments and different types of assessments. These assessments occur throughout the program and specifically at the end of the program. The unit protocol for maintaining fair and non-bias is well defined and a detailed report is provided to program coordinators.

Surveys of candidates, school personnel, graduates, and employers provide data on program quality and suggestions for improving programs. The unit has used these data to improve programs.

There is evidence that data are collected systematically and reviewed on a regular basis. Through Quality Teams, Council on Preparing Education Professionals, NCATE Steering

Committee, and advisory committees, data and program changes are reported to the professional community. Currently, the use of information technology to maintain candidate records seems to be in in a state of evaluation and possible change.

The unit not only makes changes based on data collected from faculty and the professional community but the IR indicates that the unit evaluates those changes to determine they are effective. This is also evidenced by the goals and action reports.

2.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

No areas for improvement were cited at the previous visit.

2.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

None

2.5 Evidence for the BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

1. In interviews, validate the historical development and updating of the assessment system.
2. Validate that the unit operations that are listed in the IR, but not identified in the assessment system, are actually being reviewed by the QTs.
3. Since they are not all the same format, need some clarifications of exhibit 2.3i goals and action plan documents.
4. Validate the process used to maintain records of student complaints
5. Verify through interviews that data are shared with faculty and candidates.
6. Details are needed about how technology is used to maintain the assessment system and collect, store, and analyze assessment data.
7. Need information regarding about how faculty and candidates access data using technology.
8. Provide information about Onestart.

9.   Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

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

3.1 Preliminary Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The unit's 10 initial preparation and advanced programs collaborate with school partners to design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practices. Advisory groups meet or communicate regularly with six of the programs to review program data, discuss and recommend program changes, and offer advice pertaining to the programs' assessment and Conceptual Framework (CF). The four licensure programs are scheduled to begin receiving input from the advisory groups in summer 2013.

P-12 clinical faculty for undergraduate programs is selected by the unit. The field placement office determines and apprises principals of the criteria for undergraduate supervising teachers. The unit selects schools based on criteria ranging from each school program's reputation to the credentials of the faculty. Goals, outcomes, and expectations of partnerships are discussed with the unit and school administrators prior to final selections of all candidates. Clinical placement for interns in at least three of the four licensure programs is determined by either the receiving school's administrator or superintendent.

The unit and school partners share expertise to support candidates' learning experiences through professional development opportunities, Brown Bags, and varied conferences. Graduate licensure candidates are further required to design and deliver professional development for their school faculties.

Summative Decision Points (DPs) such as, meeting prerequisites and GPA requirements and assessments of dispositions and information technology highlight the requirements candidates must achieve to enter and exit extensive and intensive clinical practice. SPA reports indicate candidates are provided numerous field experiences prior to clinical practice. Curriculum maps (1.3m) reveal alignment to the CF, dispositions, professional standards, and types of assessments used.

Highly quality school faculty, as validated by the school administrator or superintendent, is a requirement for all programs. P-12 clinical faculty must possess a master's degree or evidence of professional development experiences, an appropriate license, and experience in the supervised area.

All programs use multiple assessments for candidate performance such as, reflection entries, capstone project (i.e., Teacher as Researcher), coursework, GPA, Praxis I and II, dispositions and impact on student learning ratings, surveys, and other key assessments also aligned to the CF and diversity proficiencies. Clinical practice candidates in all programs are assessed by P-12 school faculty named School-based Supervisors (SS) and/or by the unit's clinical faculty called University Supervisors (US). Candidates in initial preparation programs meet at least five times

with their US and daily with their SS. Transition- to-Teaching candidates meet with their US at least 10 times and with their SS at least 20 times throughout their field and clinical experiences. Candidates in the four graduate licensure and counseling programs meet with their SS and/or US at least once each semester. As outlined in program or clinical handbooks (3.3.j), all programs provide regular support for student teachers and practicum candidates in clinical field experience.

Candidates in the Masters of Elementary Education, Masters of Secondary Education, (MEST), Gifted and Talented, and Reading teaching programs are required to apply what they know in their classrooms and reflect on the application of their learning and dispositions. MEST candidates are also required to complete a capstone project using data and current research. Candidates in Educational Leadership, Technology, and Counseling programs for other school professionals apply knowledge related to using technology, working with families, analyzing data, and using current research in assignments that reflect positions they are considering.

Candidates in initial preparation and advanced programs have field experiences and clinical practice opportunities to work with students from diverse populations, which are aligned to the diversity proficiencies in the curriculum maps (1.3m). Possibilities to work with diverse students consist of some candidates completing a service learning project with LEP students, Gifted and Talented candidates completing an assignment called Project AHEAD that meets NCATE's definition of race and gender, and Technology candidates studying and writing about what the digital divide means and explaining how technology can empower learners from diverse background with different abilities. The unit also indicates that some candidates complete other varied assignments in schools that meet NCATE's diversity definition (i.e., Differences among groups of people and individuals based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation, and geographical area.)

3.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

3.2.a Movement Toward Target. Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

Clear, convincing, and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is **developing** a movement toward target. There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. Of the unit's 10 programs (3.3.i), six or more programs meet the target level while the remaining programs have devised a plan for reaching target.

As gleaned through the unit's rubric in a self-study, the unit and its school partners share expertise and integrate resources to support candidate learning in six programs. 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 in eight programs. 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 in eight programs.

During clinical practice, candidate learning is integrated into the school program and into teaching practice in at least seven programs. Candidates observe and are observed by others in at least six programs. Candidates interact with teachers, families of students, administrators, college or university supervisors, and other interns about their practice regularly and continually in nine programs. Candidates reflect on and can justify their own practice in nine programs. Candidates are members of instructional teams in the school and are active participants in professional decisions in eight programs. 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 in six programs.

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 in two programs. 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 in two programs. Field experiences and clinical practices facilitate candidates' exploration of their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions related to all students in eight programs. Candidates develop and demonstrate deficiencies 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 in at least eight programs.

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

NO EVIDENCE	MOVING TOWARD TARGET		AT TARGET
	EMERGING	DEVELOPING	ATTAINED
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. ***AND*** There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. ***OR*** There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. [BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.]	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the rubric for this standard. ***AND*** There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard. ***AND*** There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.

3.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

No areas for improvement were cited at the previous visit.

3.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

None

3.5 Evidence for the BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

1. Verify professional development opportunities offered to partner school faculty, including professional learning communities.
2. Verify candidates' assessments through interviews.
3. Discuss technology use and digital divide project with candidates.
4. Validate that diverse field experiences take place as described in IR.
5. Validate examples of activities cited under Moving towards Target.
6. Verify if the unit allows school partners to determine placement of student teachers and interns.
7. Verify SPA reports, etc. for variety of field experiences before clinical practice.

Standard 4: Diversity

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 Preliminary Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Within its conceptual framework, the unit made a revision to prepare candidates to work in a diverse society in order to clearly articulate all forms of diversity. This revision involved changing the fourth strand of its CF from preparing candidates to work in a "multicultural society" to preparing them to work in a "Diverse Society". This change was implemented in response to stakeholder feedback and in order to more accurately define all of the elements of diversity.

The unit has implemented requirements within each of its programs requiring that candidates become well versed in these different forms of diversity. One example of this is the M300 course which is taken by undergraduate elementary and secondary candidates that addresses issues related to racism, sexism, homophobia, disabilities and socioeconomic diversity. Candidates work with ELL students as a practicum requirement. Further field experiences require candidates to develop and teach lessons that incorporate diversity which includes cultural, gender and socio-economic differences. Exhibit 4.3a, the diversity proficiency map, outlines where each of the diversity dispositions is met within the specific program by each candidate. Within this map requirements regarding inclusive classroom environments and special regard for diversity are addressed. The curriculum and experience components of these dispositions are further outlined in Exhibit 4.3b which specifically addresses which type of diversity is being represented. It is not clear, however, exactly how some of these dispositions are specifically implemented within the p-12 environment.

Regarding diverse faculty, there is very limited evidence that students are exposed to any form of diversity within the program or the institution as a whole. One document which outlines faculty demographics entitled diversity of professional education faculty (4.3) suggests that approximately 15 percent of the faculty in the institution as a whole have some cultural diversity. Within the school of education that number is closer to 12 percent with no diversity within initial program faculty. This data is only provided for full time faculty. There is no indication with whom initial or advanced candidates have an opportunity to interact. There is documentation of unit policy that demonstrates good faith effort for recruiting and retaining diverse faculty.   This document simply outlines the intent of this effort. Changes in faculty demographics are not provided so there is no indication of trends within this area.

Exhibit 4.3e states that candidates in the initial education programs (~6% candidates of color) and the advanced education programs (~12 % candidates of color) are generally less diverse

than students at the institution (~14% students of color) and the geographical area served by the institution (~20% people of color). These percentages indicate that many candidates have limited opportunities to interact with diverse peers within their respective education programs.

Field experience and clinical practice provide opportunities for candidates in the initial certification programs to tutor, observe, and teach P-12 students of differing socioeconomic and racial/ethnic groups, and males and females, as evidenced by the diversity of students in the SOE's partner schools. Candidates also have the opportunity to work with English language learners and students with exceptionalities during their field experiences and/or clinical practice. The demographic data for schools used in clinical experiences reveal that 90 percent of all schools (85% for Indiana and 98% for Kentucky) have student populations that reflect diversity as defined by NCATE. There is limited evidence however, that candidates in some of the advanced programs are systematically required to engage in experiences with diverse students in P-12 schools.

The SOE offers an annual Diversity Conference that most programs require their candidates to attend. The conference focuses on issues relating to working with students in all areas of diversity. Coursework throughout the initial and advanced programs include assignments that focus on diverse learners, and include a range of assessment tools and practices. Collectively these experiences allow candidates to develop and implement their knowledge, skills, and dispositions for working with all students.

4.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

4.2.b Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The unit has a specific strand within its conceptual framework that addresses diverse society. Within this component, the unit has aligned its programs to incorporate this theme. It has placed high value on the "central human values of social justice, equal opportunity, and respect for the dignity of all, regardless of their backgrounds and individual characteristics." Each program has implemented strands which embed this belief in various forms. Special coursework, specific field experiences and documented program requirements such as projects and reflective papers all are geared to the development of this component.

Faculty in each program evaluated the curriculum and experiences that prepare candidates to work effectively with diverse students. Changes were made in programs where evaluations revealed gaps and/or challenges in ensuring that all candidates worked with diverse students. The SOE participated in good faith efforts to increase candidate diversity by holding graduate advising sessions in Jefferson County (JCPS), 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 and advising materials help diverse candidates recognize that the SOE has a welcoming environment that supports diversity.

4.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

No areas for improvement were cited at the previous visit.

4.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

1. Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with diverse peers.

    Rationale: Evidence provided indicated that candidates in the SOE are less diverse than students enrolled at the institution and have limited opportunities to interact with diverse peers. Also, there is greater diversity within the geographic area than among SOE candidates.

2. Candidates have limited opportunities to work with diverse faculty.

    Rationale: There is no diversity within initial program faculty and there is no indication with which faculty initial or advanced candidates have an opportunity to interact.

4.5 Evidence for the BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

1. More specific assessment data with regard to diversity proficiencies being reviewed.
2. How does the unit provide exposure for candidates to faculty from diverse backgrounds?
3. How have the demographics of faculty of diverse backgrounds changed?
4. How does the unit obtain and retain diverse faculty?
5. What evidence demonstrates that faculty has the knowledge and experience to help candidates work with students from diverse groups?
6. Field experience placements for each candidate: How are the placements tracked and by whom? Need to review and verify the process for advanced candidates in particular.
7. Do all advanced program candidates have field experiences in diverse settings?
8. More specific assessment data with regard to diversity proficiencies being reviewed.
9. How does the unit provide exposure for candidates to faculty from diverse backgrounds?
10. How have the demographics of faculty of diverse backgrounds changed?
11. How does the unit obtain and retain diverse faculty?
12. What evidence demonstrates that faculty has the knowledge and experience to help candidates work with students from diverse groups?
13. Field experience placements for each candidate: How are the placements tracked and by whom? Need to review and verify the process for advanced candidates in particular.
14. Do all advanced program candidates have field experiences in diverse settings?
15. Has diversity of candidates increased or stayed the same?
16. What is being done to recruit/retain diverse students?

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

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

5.1 Preliminary Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Table 11 states that the SOE employs 18 tenure-track faculty members, 8 full-time lecturers (non-tenure track), and 31 adjunct instructors. All full-time tenure-track/ tenured faculty in the SOE hold a doctorate in the discipline in which they are assigned and have been or are currently certified in their areas of expertise. Most full-time lecturers and adjunct faculty hold a master's degree in the discipline in which they are assigned and/or have contemporary experiences and teaching certifications that qualify them for their assignments. As evidenced by the *Best Practices in Teaching Survey*, faculty demonstrate best practices in teaching using a variety of instructional delivery models. They encourage reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, and the development of dispositions through such activities as field experiences, group learning, focused activities, facilitated discussions, and guided lectures. In addition, faculty model the use of technologies such as blogs, interactive white boards, web modules, and electronic portfolios.

When hired, a new faculty member is paired with an experienced faculty member to serve as their mentor and help guide them through the Promotion and Tenure process. Adjunct faculty members are mentored by the dean. Procedures for faculty evaluation and guidelines for tenure and promotion are in place. Faculty are evaluated on their teaching performance through multiple evaluations- student evaluations of teaching effectiveness, an annual report with identified goals aligned to the Conceptual Framework, and the annual Promotion and Tenure process.   Adjunct faculty performances are reviewed by the dean. All faculty must receive an excellent rating in teaching to be recommended for promotion and tenure. Teaching excellence in the SOE has also been recognized through awards and nominations for awards. Five current SOE faculty members are members of Faculty Colloquium on Excellence in Teaching (FACET); 3 have earned the Trustees Teaching Award; one received the Distinguished Teaching Award as the outstanding teacher for the campus; one received the award for innovative use of technology, and one faculty member was awarded a Fulbright Fellowship for Teaching and Research.

Faculty can request one course release each semester to engage in scholarly work and tenured can request a sabbatical every 7 years. A review of the evidence indicates faculty are actively engaged in scholarship specific to their disciplines and teaching areas within the education programs. Faculty demonstrate scholarly productivity as evidenced by the list of journal articles, books, book chapters, presentations, grants, and other awards. Data indicate this high level of productivity has been maintained over a number of years. In addition, faculty members collaborate with their colleagues, both inside and outside the institution, and provide service to local schools and educational agencies through consultation and professional development. They are also engaged in professional organizations, serving as members, as well as officers, in discipline specific organizations. Many SOE faculty participate in professional development

opportunities sponsored by the campus Institute for Learning and Teaching Excellence (ILTE) and by their state, regional and national professional conferences.

Overall, the evidence indicates faculty have a high level of involvement and commitment to their teaching, scholarship, and service responsibilities. They provide high quality, standards-based instruction consistent with the conceptual framework of the unit and responsive to the needs of the faculty and students in the P-12 community.

5.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

5.2.b Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The SOE has participated in many activities to demonstrate continuous improvement. The areas targeted for improvement/ change included such areas as faculty teaching performance, candidate learning, faculty professional development, technology, and the peer mentoring program. Faculty regularly reviewed candidate feedback and performance data to improve the quality of their teaching and candidate learning.   Examples of changes made included revisions to syllabi, scoring rubrics, program curricula, and the action research project. The campus upgraded technology in the SOE classrooms to include collaborative workstations and the Institute for Learning and Teaching Excellence is currently providing training to 8 SOE faculty members with the purpose of developing online courses. It is anticipated that all participating faculty will develop an online or hybrid course by fall, 2013. In Spring 2012 full-time faculty peer reviewed all course syllabi to ensure they included the required syllabus elements and were aligned to the CF, SOE outcomes, Diversity Proficiencies, and program standards. Faculty then revised and updated their fall, 2012 course syllabi.

5.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

No areas for improvement were cited at the previous visit.

5.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

None

5.5 Evidence for the BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

1. Faculty Annual Reports (onsite review of sample annual reports completed by faculty)
2. Full and part-time faculty evaluations (onsite review of sample full and part-time faculty evaluations)
3. Technology available in unit classrooms, and used/modeled in instruction
4. Exhibit 5.3.a is not accessible and must be available to the team.

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

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

6.1 Preliminary Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The School of Education is the unit and is headed by a dean who provides the leadership and authority to the unit. The organizational chart provided in the electronic exhibit room indicates the dean is supported by five coordinators. The unit has five programs, each one is headed by a coordinator: Elementary, Secondary, Special Education, Reading and Counseling. There are monthly meetings of the dean with the coordinators and the graduate director. This group is called the School Council which makes up the unit leadership team of the unit. Each program has their monthly team meetings in which faculty identify the program level issues such as curriculum, assessment, and program changes.

The unit has ten standing committees: six quality teams, merit, school review, promotion and tenure committees. The documents in the e-exhibits indicate that the six quality teams help in planning and implementing the Strategic Plan, and work to ensure meeting various accreditation requirements. Other committees help with merit and tenure, promotion decisions at unit as well as the campus level. In addition, there are two advisory boards and two councils. School of Education Advisory Board consists of representatives from the P-12 schools and meets once a year with the unit Dean and the program coordinators; and the School of Education Student Advisory Board informs the unit of the concerns of the candidates. These two councils are Council on Preparing Education Professionals and Indiana University Education Council. The organizational chart also indicates the existence of a Regional School Superintendents group or committee but it is not clear if it is a separate committee or if they are a part of the School of Education Advisory Board. The level of P-12 personnel's involvement in these standing and other committees and councils is not very clearly discussed in the e-exhibit documents.

The exhibits provide the information about the handbook for each program containing relevant information for candidates who are interested in that program or are already in the program. There are various links for the main institution website. These are links to the Campus Bulletin, academic and event calendars, schedules, publications, Student Codes of Rights and Responsibilities and other relevant information.

The information given in the IR and in the budget documents in the exhibits indicate that the unit budget is comparable with similar units. The unit uses the Schools of Nursing and Business for their comparison. According to the budget documents, during the period 2010-2012 the unit professional development budget has increased, while the nursing and business school budgets have decreased during the same period. It is, however, not clear if the increase in the unit budget is permanent, or it reflects a temporary increased directed at costs for the accreditation visit. The unit also receives some foundation funding which is, according to budget documents, smaller than the Business and the Nursing units. According to these documents, the IT funding has been

similar for all the units as mentioned in the IR. The budget documents also indicate that overall funding for the unit is double as compared to the nursing unit. However, it is not clear if the number of faculty in both units is similar. Moreover, the budget documents do not clearly discuss the budget allocation for technology in the Unit Assessment System.

Exhibits also provide various information related to unit policies and procedures for candidates, faculty as well as staff members. All of the full-time faculty are expected to have 12 credit hour teaching loads for each semester. Undergraduate and graduate faculty can request release time for scholarship. Faculty members with administrative responsibilities or research and grant projects can have 3-6 credit hours of release time depending upon the nature of their duties and research work. From the documents it appears that currently almost all full time faculty have some release time. In addition, all full-time faculty are expected to help candidates in advising and in the registration process. No information was provided related to the existence and roles of support personnel for the unit.

The IR provides information that the unit faculty and candidates have access to technology. All faculty and staff members have computers provided by the university. For students there are computer labs throughout the campus. All the computers are connected through a high speed 1Gb fiber Optic local area network called I-Light network. All campus buildings and their adjacent areas also have wireless capabilities. All classrooms have a computer for instructor use, a digital projector, and video payer.

According to the IR, there are two classrooms and five general purpose rooms on campus that have video conferencing facilities. It is not clear how many of these rooms are in the School of Education and what percentage of the unit faculty uses them. All candidates, faculty and staff in the institution can obtain various software programs at discounted prices.

The unit provides its candidates access to the institution's library which contains a Curriculum Material Center and a Center for Cultural Resources. There is a wide collection of textbooks, trade book, hands on material for all content areas and for all grade levels is available for the candidates use for their lesson planning and teaching. It was, however, not clear if the center also provides candidates with audio-visual material and technology to be used in their field experiences. As a part of one of their classes, candidates also learn how to use various library databases to find instructional and other academic resources.

6.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

6.2.b Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The IR provides information related to the activities and changes made in the unit during last few years. These include changes in the resources such as in library by making the collection of the material more relevant to both faculty and candidates. The unit has added a new advisor to help candidate advising. Now the unit has three advisors working for the School of Education candidates. There are updates in the technology which include purchase of software programs and new hardware such as iPads in the unit.

The IR also lists changes in various programs within the unit which include changes in the credit hour and other requirements for initial candidates and changes in the policies for some advanced level programs. The IR also discusses plan for improvements such as more information technology on campus, more technology for candidates, upgrades to available technology in classrooms.

6.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

No areas for improvement were cited at the previous visit.

6.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

   None

6.5 Evidence for the BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

1. How does the unit base its comparison of the unit's budget and the budget of comparable units?
2. What are sources and uses of external funding?
3. More information is needed related to library resources and holdings including technology specific to education programs. A visit t to the library will be useful.
4. It is unclear how the unit delineates and uses its various advisory bodies to ensure P-12 school partners, alumnae and other community partners (e.g. administrators who hire IUS graduates) have a role in the governance of the unit.
5. Information is needed related to the roles and sufficiency of unit support personnel.
6. Information is needed regarding the sufficiency of support of the assessment system, especially the use of technology.
7. Information is needed to validate the advising process for candidates.

Sources of Evidence

Institution's Institutional Report

Annual Reports and Program Reports in NCATE's Accreditation Information Management System (AIMS)

Website and Exhibits of Institution