



**INDIANA UNIVERSITY  
SOUTHEAST**

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

February 10, 2014

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation  
National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education  
2010 Massachusetts Ave NW, Suite 500  
Washington, DC 20036

Dear Board of Examiners:

This letter acknowledges the receipt of the Board of Examiners (BOE) report as posted on the AIMS website on January 9, 2014. The Indiana University Southeast School of Education NCATE Coordinator Robin Fankhauser requested an extension for submission of the rejoinder. Our semester did not begin until January 13, 2014. Since the time the semester began and faculty availability for input, the campus was closed for two days due to weather, we had several days of two-hour delays, and a holiday. An extension was requested and given to write the rejoinder.

The BOE visit was, and continues to be, beneficial for our faculty, staff, candidates, and stakeholders. We appreciate the hard work and dedication of the members of the team.

Sincerely,

Gloria J. Murray  
Dean, School of Education  
Indiana University Southeast

## **Indiana University Southeast School of Education**

### **Institutional Rejoinder to NCATE Board of Examiners Report for the Continuous Improvement Visit: November 3-5, 2013**

Page 1 of this document is the letter from the unit head acknowledging receipt of the BOE report.

The remaining pages of this document are responses to two areas of improvement that the unit believes were erroneously cited. The evidence in the rejoinder describes “what existed at the time of the on-site visit review” and the evidence was “available to the BOE team.” The evidence also relates “directly to the NCATE standards and procedures that applied at the time of the on-site review.” The appendices are examples and excerpts from evidence available for the team prior to the visit in electronic form as an original exhibit or as an addendum exhibit or during the on-site visit as hard copies in the evidence room or as an electronic exhibit on a jump drive.

Standard 2 Area for Improvement:

The first area cited for improvement in the report was found in Standard 2: 2.3.c: “Unit-wide data are not aggregated for review by the entire unit”. The “AFI rationale” reads, “program by program data are collected and reviewed but for common assessments, such as those used for student teaching and dispositions, data are not aggregated for review by the entire unit”.

However, the unit in fact reviews the following common data: alumni surveys, employer surveys, enrollment, Unit Assessment surveys, and assessments of the undergraduate pre-requisite course F200. The Program Evaluation and Unit Evaluation Quality Team (PAUE committee) is responsible for monitoring data collection and analysis, facilitating unit and program admission data analysis, and overseeing the UAS. These duties were noted in Addendum Exhibit 2.1, which also delineates the duties of the other Quality Teams. Each team’s responsibilities for unit operations were highlighted therein (Appendix A).

Alumni surveys are administered to degree completers of undergraduate and graduate programs and Transition to Teaching (T2T) post-bac completers. The survey contains 16 questions that assess the conceptual framework themes, content knowledge, pedagogy, assessment, relationships, and classroom management. The data were reviewed by the faculty on the data days of May 9, 2011, and December 14, 2012. The PAUE team developed the protocols for

both days and provided the analyses as found in the Original Exhibit 2.3.d. Policies, Procedures, and Practices for Ensuring that Data are Regularly Collected, Compiled, Aggregated, Summarized, Analyzed, and Used for Continuous Improvement as items A through F. Two examples are found in Appendix B. Minutes for PAUE were available in the exhibit room during the on-site visit. Sections of minutes for April 4, 2011, September 22, 2011; and January 22, 2013 are found in Appendix C.

Employer surveys are administered to principals and supervisors of graduates and program completers of undergraduate and graduate programs. The survey contains 16 questions that assess the conceptual framework themes, content knowledge, pedagogy, assessment, relationships, and classroom management. The data were reviewed by the faculty at the data days of May 9, 2011, and December 14, 2012. The PAUE team provided the analysis as found in original Exhibit 2.3.d.( Appendix B).

The Unit Assessment Survey assesses advising, the Conceptual Framework as applied in coursework, facilities, technology, online/hybrid courses, and communication. The survey has been given to candidates during the last class of their degree or license program. The results were available to the BOE as part of Exhibit 2.3.d.F . These data were reviewed by the faculty during a data day on December 14, 2012. The PAUE team summarized the faculty responses on January 30, 2013. This summary was provided in original Exhibit 2.3 d (Appendix B).

Enrollment data are collected for each degree and license program. Data on program completers was reviewed by the faculty on May 9, 2011. Enrollment data were reviewed by the faculty during a data day held December 14, 2012. The PAUE team summarized the analysis as found in original Exhibit 2.3.d. (Appendix C)

Candidate data for F200, a required course for undergraduate candidates, was initially analyzed by PAUE as part of its duty to monitor assessments. This analysis was then taken to the undergraduate programs. Minutes reflecting this activity were available in the exhibit room during the BOE's onsite review. Sections of PAUE minutes from April 4, 2011; September 22, 2011; and October 13, 2011 record these discussions and are found in Appendix D.

Student teaching results have not been aggregated because different instruments are used by each program. The results of SPA Assessment 4 for the clinical experience are analyzed by all programs during the October faculty meeting along with all other SPA data (key assessments), decision points data,

and dispositions data. This activity is reflected on pages 9 and 10 of the original Exhibit 2.3.a Unit Assessment System found as Appendix E. The cycle of faculty involvement in the analysis is designed and facilitated by PAUE. Results of the October 2013 work were located in a binder in the exhibit room during the BOE's onsite visit. The PAUE minutes for September 18, 2013 and October 2, 2013 reflect the process that was developed. (Appendix F)

PAUE also ensures that dispositions data are analyzed. While a common instrument is used, dispositions data are collected at different points in each program and by different evaluators (faculty, candidates, mentors/supervising teachers/counselors, and/or university supervisors). The processes for disposition data collection for each program was reported in the Original Exhibit 1.3.e.Key Assessment and Scoring Guides, B. Program Descriptions of the Systematic Assessment of Dispositions. Dispositions reports for each program were included in Exhibits for Visit: Standard 1, UPDATED Program Data from Assessments of Candidates' Professional Dispositions—3 years Evidence. Examples of two programs' descriptions of the processes used to assess dispositions demonstrate the variations in the processes implemented by programs (Appendix G). Dispositions results are analyzed as part of the cycle described on pages 9 and 10 of the original Exhibit 2.3 a, Unit Assessment System (Appendix E).

We believe that review of this evidence will show that unit-wide data are systematically aggregated for review. The evidence also shows that the aggregation of student teaching data is not possible due to the nature of the student teaching evaluations. Also, dispositions data, while possible to aggregate, does not provide the basis for meaningful or reliable findings because of variations in evaluators and time of assessment by each program.

Standard 4 Area for Improvement:

The second area for improvement recommended in the report was found in Standard 4, 4.3.c: "In initial programs, candidates have limited opportunities to interact with candidates from different ethnic/racial groups". The "ARI rationale" reads, "Table 4.4 indicates that the unit has a lower percentage of candidates who are ethnically/racially diverse than does the institution. During interviews, the initial certification candidates stated there were few ethnically/racially diverse candidates in their classes and programs."

Table 4.4 was updated for the visit and titled "Updated/Revised Diversity of Candidates in Professional Education". It reflected corrected data for Fall 10,

Fall 11, and Fall 12. The data are located in Appendix H. The following chart contains data on the enrollment of white candidates from that chart:

Percentage of White Students in Initial Programs and the Institution as Reported in Table 4.4 “Updated/Revised Diversity of candidates in Professional Education

Year	Initial	Institution
Fall 10	89.85%	85.30%
Fall 11	94.32%	85.80%
Fall 12	89%	86.03%

Data for the years from Fall 2005 to Fall 2009 reflect less diversity as presented in the Addendum Exhibit 4.4 “Candidate Diversity numbers Fall 2005 through Fall 2009” (Appendix I). The percentages of white candidates were reported as 95.3%, 94.8%, 95.62%, 94.4%, and 94.62% in the Addendum Exhibit 4.4.. The percentage of white students for the last three years (Fall 2010, Fall 2011, Fall 2012) has been lower than in any of the five previous years.

Numbers of Ethnic/Racial Groups in Initial Programs and the Institution as Reported in Table 4.4 “Updated/Revised Diversity of candidates in Professional Education

Year	Initial	Institution
Fall 10	5	5
Fall 11	5	5
Fall 12	4	6

These data provide evidence that candidates have engaged in experiences with at least two ethnic/racial groups in each of the last three years. The number of non-white candidates has increased.

The NCTE Standard 4 Rubric 4c states that “affirmation of the value of diversity is shown through good-faith efforts by the unit to increase or maintain a pool of candidates, both male and female from diverse socioeconomic and ethnic/racial groups”. Evidence of good-faith efforts of the unit and the institution were provided for examination as described in the following paragraphs.

The unit’s Diversity Plan 2007-2012 was presented as Addendum Exhibit 4.14. It addressed the alignment of the plan to the theme “diverse society” in the conceptual framework, the adoption of diversity proficiencies, and the strategic plan. Page 9 of the plan is found in Appendix J. An updated work plan from the Diversity Team was submitted as Addendum Exhibit 4.3 and the elements related to diverse candidates appear in Appendix K.

The IU Board of Trustees' Campus Diversity Committee Annual Report was provided as Addendum Exhibit 4.8. Pages 4 through 8 describe campus good-faith efforts to recruit and retain minority students (Appendix L).

Two additional exhibits reflect campus good faith efforts for recruiting and retaining diverse candidates to Indiana University Southeast. Campus Policies and Practices for Recruiting and Retaining Diverse Candidates was provided as the original Exhibit 4.3h (Appendix M). Eighteen activities led by the Office of Admissions were also found in the original Exhibit 4.3h. The first page of the exhibit is found as Appendix N.

Our data show that diversity has increased since the 2005 onsite visit and BOE Report where the unit was found "acceptable" in the 2001 NCATE Standard 4 rubric for "experiences working with diverse candidates". We have met the changes found in the 2008 rubric by ensuring that candidates represent four or more racial/ethnic groups. We believe that good-faith efforts to increase diversity have continued to be made. These efforts will continue to be made, by both the unit and the campus, to ensure that diversity is increased to meet the new CAEP Standards.