



**Offsite BOE Report:
Indiana State University
June 1, 2012 1:00 pm - 5:00 pm**

Offsite BOE Team Members

Dr. Anne M. Bauer, Chair
Dr. Cynthia B. Barta, Member
Dr. Mary O. Dasovich, Member
Dr. Marcia K. Fetters, Member
Dr. Douglas D. Hatch, Member
Dr. Lienne F. Medford, Member

Offsite BOE Team Observers

Flo Barnes, State Consultant
Stephanie Kowal, NCATE Staff

The following 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.

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 Statement about the evidence

The unit's overarching theme, which is incorporated in its mission statement and conceptual framework, is "Becoming a Complete Professional." The theme implies three broad themes according to the unit. The three themes are: educator as expert or mediator of learning; educator as person; and educator as member of communities. Using these three themes as a backdrop, the unit has designed an assessment system to assess candidates in initial, advanced, and other school personnel programs. The unit included four forms of assessment evidence: program recognition reports in Accreditation Information Management System (AIMS); state test score data; key unit assessment data; and alumni and employer surveys.

State certification test data indicate that initial programs have passing rates greater than 80 percent in all programs over the three years span. State certification test score data as reported in the Institutional Report (IR) indicate that advanced program candidates pass at the 80 percent or greater level.

The unit offers five key assessments for initial programs that indicate that candidates demonstrate content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills. The five assessments are: work sample assessment; diversity assessment; technology assessment; field evaluations; and student teaching evaluation. These key assessments include three levels of description of candidate attainment in the associated rubrics. In every assessment candidates averaged over 2.24 on a 3-point scale on every assessment rubric category. Since a 2.0 is considered 'Meets Expectation,' it is clear that candidates meet or exceed program faculty expectations on these assessments.

Advanced program candidates are assessed for content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and pedagogical and professional content knowledge on four key assessments. The four assessments are: work sample assessment; diversity assessment; technology assessment; and

program field evaluation. Advanced candidates have also been assessed as Meets or Exceeds Expectations in all categories of these four assessments.

The unit has collected information about its candidates in two follow up surveys. One survey is of program alumni. The other follow up survey data come from employers of unit candidates. For initial candidates, alumni survey data indicate that candidates believe that the unit prepared them at either the 'Well Prepared' or 'Very Well Prepared' levels on almost all categories. One category that hovered between 'Well Prepared' and 'Somewhat Prepared' was developing productive relationships with parents or guardians to support student learning. In all other areas, unit candidates rated their preparation favorably or better. Employer surveys of initial candidates further support the belief that unit candidates are well prepared for their professional roles.

Advanced program alumni candidates are surveyed also. The advanced candidate survey included five levels of ratings of the programs' effectiveness. In all categories, advanced candidate alumni rate their programs Effective to Very Effective (3.48 to 3.97).

Both initial candidates and advanced candidates are assessed by program faculty for professional dispositions. Initial candidates are assessed on dispositions based on the three unit themes: educator as mediator of learning; educator as person; and educator as a member of communities. Candidates are assessed at three points in the program; upon admission to the programs, at the mid-point in the program in designated courses within each program, and at the end of the programs during student teaching. Initial candidates were rated at the Meets Expectations level or higher for all categories of dispositions during each of the points in the program. Candidate ratings of dispositions increased as they passed through the program.

Advanced candidate disposition assessment data show that candidates meet and exceed expectations for professional dispositions. These data are mostly taken in specific courses in the various programs and during any clinical activities in the programs. Advanced candidates are clearly assessed for dispositions and seem to exhibit appropriate dispositions according to dispositions assessments in each program.

Initial and advanced candidates are assessed for diversity and technology knowledge and performances. In both cases candidates demonstrate abilities at the Meets Expectation levels or higher.

Initial and advanced candidates are assessed for their impact on student learning. In initial programs, candidates are assessed for impact on student learning on the work sample assessment, field evaluations, and student teaching evaluations. In all three assessments candidates meet or exceed expectations on elements that indicate candidate impact on student learning.

Advanced candidates are assessed for impact on student or client learning in the work sample assessment and field evaluations. Advanced candidates are mostly rated at the Exceeds Expectations level for impact on student/client learning on these assessments.

In most cases it seems that other school personnel are included in the advanced candidate data. State test score data are separate for other school personnel and some key assessments are

reported by program or course. It is not as clear how candidates in these programs fare in relation to this standard due to these reporting anomalies.

1.1.a How were unit programs reviewed by the BOE? What trends emerged from this review?

The unit includes several programs at the initial, advanced, and other school personnel levels although it is not entirely clear which programs fall into each of these categories. Accreditation program reports from professional specialty area associations (SPAs) included in AIMS indicate that eight initial programs are nationally recognized, four initial programs are recognized with conditions or are in further development needed stage, and seven programs are in the recognition process. One advanced program has attained national recognition while three advanced programs are recognized with conditions and one is in the ‘further development needed’ category. One advanced program is in the process of attempting to attain national recognition. Two other school personnel programs, school counseling and school psychology, are nationally recognized. One program, Transition to Teaching-Alternative Licensure for Secondary Education, does not have a specific SPA and is not nationally recognized. The music education baccalaureate program indicated in AIMS says ‘Other’ for the Reviewed By category, but there is no document or report listed.

Generally, the programs that have gained national recognition have strong content, pedagogical content and pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills as noted in their program review reports. Programs that are under development or recognized with conditions primarily have been cited for having assessment rubrics that need modification to better match SPA standards. Program faculty are currently working to improve assessments and assessment rubrics to meet these conditions. A clear trend that emerged in examining these programs is that the programs are clearly on the right track according to the program reports and were merely in need of further refinement to meet national recognition level. The SPA reports were reviewed by the team member responsible for Standard 1 and the back up team member for Standard 1.

1.2 Progress toward meeting the target level on this standard

Not applicable to this standard.

1.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

AFIs corrected from last visit: (Pending onsite confirmation)

AFI Number and Text	Apply to	AFI Rationale
1. Candidate dispositions are not clearly articulated and assessed across all programs.	ITP, ADV	Dispositions are clearly described and data are systematically collected across programs.
2. Candidate effect on student learning is not clearly assessed across all programs.	ITP, ADV	Candidates at the initial and advanced levels are

	systematically assessed on their impact on student learning.
--	--------------------------------------------------------------

1.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

Not applicable to this standard.

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

- (1) Ascertain if all programs have contributed data to the assessments.
- (2) Attempt to find disaggregated assessment data for other school personnel programs.
- (3) Clarification on the list of programs and their level (Initial, Advanced, or Other School Professionals).

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 Statement about the evidence

The unit has developed and implemented an assessment system that collects, disaggregates, and provides the basis for analyses of data on both initial and advanced candidates, including applications, program progress (admission and midpoint), program completion, graduate performance, program effectiveness, and unit operations.

Alignment among the components of the system is clearly described. Data sources are interconnected and are identified and utilized in the Unit Assessment System (UAS) to form a common core to evaluate and monitor development of candidates, and performance of the unit, “in the areas of educator as expert or mediator of learning, person, and member of communities.” Field experience evaluations, student teaching evaluations, portfolio evaluations, educator work samples, and post graduation data verify the unit’s success in fulfilling its vision of graduating candidates who exemplify the characteristics of a dedicated educator. The Professional Education Program Assessment Handbook provides an overview of the UAS, the key assessments, and decision points.

The assessment system is designed to provide assessments and data analyses in two categories: candidate development and unit operations. The Teacher Education Committee (TEC), the Bayh College of Education (BCOE) Congress, the unit’s Professional Development Schools, and departmental committees are the formal structures providing extensive and ongoing review of programs. Together these structures provide flow of data into the assessment system and ensure changes at the unit level are implemented. A planning committee representing a wide body of constituents at both the initial and advanced levels and empowered by the TEC oversees administration of the UAS, creates and modifies key assessments, and coordinates annual collection, analysis, and dissemination of data. This committee also has primary responsibility

for ensuring that assessments have content validity and meet standards of fairness, accuracy, and reliability.

Within the 29 initial and advanced programs offered by the unit, four programs for P-12 educators are offered through distance learning modalities, three in part and one entirely. Assessment data collected for distance learning offerings are the same as the assessment data collected for on-campus programs.

The assessment system allows for the aggregation and disaggregation of data. Aggregated data are utilized to develop unit-level findings that inform the unit-level decision making process. Professional standards across programs are addressed via the inclusion of integrated assessments specific to these standards. All initial and advanced programs are required to identify six to eight key assessments which are used to assess candidate proficiencies in relation to professional standards.

Data collection decision points are approved by the TEC and are aligned with the unit's conceptual framework in support of the belief that the purpose of educator preparation programs is to move candidates along a continuum of Becoming a Complete Professional (BCP). At the initial level, the transition points for this continuum are: admission to teacher candidacy (BCP1); entrance to student teaching (BCP2); and recommendation for licensure (BCP3).

Likewise, at the advanced level a continuum approach of achieving the conceptual framework is implemented without the use of the BCP labels: admission to program; entry to professional experience; and exit from program.

The key UAS assessments at initial and advanced levels are organized as follows: Candidate admission and testing data; Candidate dispositions; Work sample from candidates working in the field; Evaluation of candidate efficacy in fieldwork; Candidate utility with technology; and Candidate ability to work with diverse populations.

Data dissemination occurs with consistency across academic years, across the unit, and among the unit's external stakeholders. Primary vehicles for outcomes dissemination are forums including a formal Assessment Day, regularly scheduled TEC meetings, Unit Assessment Planning Committee (UAPC) meetings, and department-level meetings.

Programmatic changes resulting from data collection, analyses, and dissemination have led to unit-level changes that impact both initial and advanced programs. For candidates, system assessments are designed to indicate ability to support P-12 learning, use technology to support learning, develop appropriate dispositions, interact and support diverse learners, and meet specific performance standards. With respect to unit operations, system assessments are designed to evaluate faculty effectiveness, faculty and student diversity, field operations, faculty advising, graduate placement effectiveness and retention as educators, and candidate retention in programs. Specific assessments are earmarked to address each of these factors.

Faculty members are evaluated on a course by course basis by program candidates. Data are used to identify program, and/or unit strengths and weaknesses, to validate diversity activities of the

faculty, and to monitor the development of technology skills. Data driven changes that have occurred over the last several years include changes in course content, course additions, policy changes, personnel changes, unit committee reorganization, and unit assessment modifications.

The Assessment Handbook clearly defines the unit's commitment to the use of assessment instruments and data collection procedures with respect to fairness, accuracy, consistency, and freedom from bias. The use of common assessment items at the initial and advanced levels and the use of common metrics, whenever appropriate, provide the assurance for consistency across program and unit measurement. Orientation to the assessment system, assessment instruments, and to the relationship among the systems, the instruments, and the conceptual framework is provided to candidates at both the initial and advanced level as well as to faculty and the unit's stakeholders.

2.2 Progress toward meeting the target level on this standard

The IR provides adequate examples of changes undertaken over the past several years by programs at the initial and the advanced levels. In 2010, Indiana moved away from a state accreditation and adopted the Specialized Professional Association (SPA) option offered to institutions within the state. According to the IR and AIMS, seven programs are SPA accredited, 10 are nationally recognized, and nine programs have conditions requiring re-submission to a SPA.

A plan for establishing the reliability and validity of UAS instruments and data is clearly outlined in the Assessment Handbook. Implementation of the plan is in the initial stages. This plan "focuses predominantly on establishing consistency within instruments (internal consistency), inter-rater reliability, content validity through UAPC review, and connections across data points (criterion related validity)." Further, the handbook states: "when possible based on the information available and population sample sizes, the UAPC in collaboration with the Assessment Director will carry out studies specifically designed to test for differences in performance evaluation based on gender and ethnicity."

Supported by the Director of Instructional and Information Technology Services and the Assessment Director, multiple technologies are used to maintain data for the UAS. The IR and the Assessment Handbook report TK20, the University Student Information System (Banner), and Qualtrics survey software are the primary data assessment systems. TK20 is the primary database and technology system utilized for UAS data; its use allowing the UAS database to go beyond merely storing, deploying, and retrieving data to running detailed reports on the data for use in data analytic activities.

The unit follows the University's policies and procedures for candidate complaints with official grievance records being maintained. Candidates are apprised of their rights and responsibilities via multiple communications. Policies and procedures are disseminated via the Assessment Handbook.

2.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

AFIs corrected from last visit: (Pending onsite confirmation)

AFI Number & Text	Apply to	AFI Rationale
1.The unit has not fully implemented a system for regularly compiling, summarizing, analyzing, and using data from the assessment system to improve unit operations.	ITP,ADV	The unit has in place and has implemented a system for regularly compiling, summarizing, analyzing, and using data to improve unit operations.
2.The unit does not have regular and systematic procedures for ensuring that its assessment measures and procedures are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias.	ITP,ADV	The unit has in place and has initiated implementation of systematic procedures for ensuring that its assessment measures and procedures are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias.

2.1 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

Not Applicable to this standard.

2.2 Evidence for the Onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

- (1) Clarification of the use of the terms “student” and “candidate” within the unit.
- (2) Description of the potential adverse impact of the assessments on a diverse pool of teacher candidates.

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 Statement about the evidence

Evidence in the exhibits indicates that candidates are provided relevant and rigorous field experiences and clinical placements through collaborative efforts with local and statewide school corporations. The unit, school partners, and other members of the professional community design, deliver, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practices at both the initial and advanced level. The unit has established a nationally recognized Professional Development Schools (PDS) partnership. Five local public school corporations have entered into PDS partnerships. These partnerships provide candidates with the opportunity to participate in elementary, middle, or high school field experiences and clinical practices where school and university personnel work together to facilitate higher levels of learning by all students. The PDS are expected to promote a better school environment for preparing teachers and other educational professionals and to create a more supportive site for renewal of and inquiry by experienced teachers, administrators, school service personnel, and university faculty. Information on clinical practice school agreements and early field experiences were also provided.

PDS partnership members participate in joint meetings among all partners including colleagues from public schools, content departments on campus, and the unit. In addition, departmental meetings with school partners allow for discussion and modification of programs for candidates. The collaborative meetings have been used to consider all aspects of the partnership, including the design, implementation, and evaluation of the conceptual framework.

The PDS network has provided grants to support professional development activities for school partners. Small research grants are also offered, which support public school and university faculty research teams as a means of discovering best practices at individual sites that enhance P-12 student learning.

Information included in the exhibits on candidate criteria for entry and exit for clinical practice was limited to the Student Teaching Handbook and Application for Student Teaching. Specific entry and exit criterion for candidate prior to clinical practice was not available.

Evidence of field experiences that facilitate in a candidate's development as a professional educator were provided. Candidates have several opportunities to observe in schools and other agencies prior to clinical practice. Elementary, special education, and secondary education programs now have at least one course that includes a field experience opportunity every semester that becomes progressively more intense prior to clinical practice. Preservice candidates enter field placements prepared to plan and deliver instruction that is responsive to specific curriculum needs and state mandates as well as school improvement initiatives and P-12 student success. The preservice candidates remain at sites sufficiently long enough to positively impact student achievement, to practice positive classroom management, and to share in the day-to-day operations of the school. Examples of the field experiences included the Teachers of Tomorrow Advancing Learning (TOTAL) program and the Immersion Early Field Experience (EFE). The TOTAL program provides candidates with continuous immersion in schools prior to the clinical practice semester, allowing them to be better prepared to engage fully as student teachers. The TOTAL and EFE programs also ensure that teacher candidates have experiences in multiple settings that include the following: low socio-economic, special education inclusion, cultural diversity, and language diversity. During an instructional period for five days a week for five weeks the candidates are engaged in a variety of experiences. Candidates begin the field experience as classroom aides and then take on the role of teachers for a five to eight day unit of instruction. The candidates plan, deliver, assess, reflect upon outcomes, and provide remediation for the instructional unit.

Information on policies and practices on initial candidate placement in field experiences and clinical practice was included in the student teaching handbook, university supervisor training, student teaching orientation, and enrollment meeting. Data on placement of candidate for field experiences and clinical practices were limited.

All collaborative efforts between the P-12 Educational Leadership programs and school partners are focused on the conceptual framework component of educator as member of communities. Field experiences and clinical practices are designed so candidates are "immersed" in the life of the school, such as participating in professional development activities and instructional

programs, and are considered members of the learning community, including being involved in professional decisions that impact the school setting.

Evidence of initial and advanced candidates using information technology to support teaching and learning was evidenced in the field and clinical practice evaluations and handbooks.

Clinical practices for the initial candidates are sufficiently extensive and intensive to develop and demonstrate proficiencies in the professional roles for which they are preparing. Clinical experiences are a full semester in length in one of the Professional Development Schools. Exhibits provided included guidelines/handbooks on field experiences and clinical practice for candidates and clinical faculty. Also included in the exhibits were evidence of support provided by the unit and opportunities for feedback and reflection.

Exhibit information provided on the criteria for the selection of clinical faculty, higher education faculty, and P-12 school faculty was limited to the university employment policies and supervisor position description. Specific criterion for school faculty who serve as clinical practice supervisors was not available. A lengthy list of exhibits was present on the in-depth training, support, and information provided to school faculty who supervise candidates during clinical practices. An evaluation of clinical faculty was also provided. Evidence on school faculty being accomplished professionals was not available.

Evidence was provided on how clinical faculty provide regular and continuing support for candidates and interns through observation, conferencing, group discussion, email, and the use of other technology. Coaching and supervisor files, assessment instruments, and scoring guides used for data collected during field experiences and clinical practice for all programs provided specific evidence on how candidates receive support from clinical faculty.

Evidence was provided on how candidates in advanced programs participate in field experiences that require them to apply course work in school settings, analyze P-12 student learning, and reflect on their practice in the context of theories on teaching and learning. Specific evidence includes the administrative program field experience design, which includes a nine month period with 300 hours of field experiences/internship. Candidates serve as interns in the district/school where they are employed. Those who choose not to work in their own school districts are assisted by the university supervisor to find a setting. Given the license is composed of grades P-12, candidates are required to document experiences at all levels. The site mentor assists the candidate in setting administrative objectives, completing required objectives, identifying individuals to enhance administrative experiences, and identifying settings for additional administrative experiences. Additionally, both the M.Ed. and Ed.S. administrative programs have created school partnerships with university faculty, which include Sycamore Educator Day, the annual Law Conference, and university supervisor visits to the host schools. Candidates in advanced programs for elementary and special education complete an action research project in their classroom. As part of this project, they must complete research, synthesize the findings to develop a project to support instruction in their classroom, collect pre and post data, and reflect upon the results.

Evidence was provided on how candidates in programs for other school professionals participate in field experiences and clinical practice that require them to engage in structured activities related to the roles for which they are preparing. Specific evidence included in the exhibits were field experience handbooks for advanced students in communication disorders, school counseling, and school psychology. Candidates in the M.S. in Educational Technology with Library Media specialization program also complete 120 hours of practical experience shared between a public school library and a public library.

Exhibits were provided on activities involving the analysis of data, the use of technology and current research, and the application of knowledge related to students, families, and communities. M.Ed. candidates develop a collaborative leadership activity in which they demonstrate the skills and behaviors to successfully design and complete a long-term project that will directly benefit the host school. Candidates in advanced Curriculum, Instruction, Media, and Technology (CIMT) programs are required to analyze and synthesize research related to a learning environment through an action research project. These action research projects require that a problem-based challenge within the school environment be identified, a treatment applied, results analyzed, and results are considered in light of the knowledge base so that implications for practice are appropriately synthesized. This is in service of school improvement and advancement of P-12 student achievement.

Candidates complete a student teacher application and attach a transcript audit to insure they have completed content areas and pedagogical and professional knowledge courses before admission to and during clinical practice. Secondary and all-grade level initial programs are currently auditing course offerings for fidelity to the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) being adopted by P-12 schools across the state and nation.

Evidence provided included assessments used in clinical practices, which indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards identified in the unit's conceptual framework and affect student learning.

Evidence of multiple assessment strategies used to evaluate candidates' performance and impact on student learning was provided. The initial and advanced program work sample assessment focuses on school and community, objectives/student outcomes, lesson plans and reflections, an assessment plan, analysis of student learning, and reflection about teaching and learning. Other assessments used to evaluate candidates' performance on their impact on student learning included in the exhibit were diversity, lesson plans, technology, field evaluation, and clinical practice evaluations.

Initial and advanced candidates are jointly assessed and reflect on their practice several times during the clinical practice by supervising teachers and university supervisors. Periodic evaluations are completed during the clinical practice. The periodic evaluation is intended as a formative instrument, which assesses progress of the candidate during the clinical practice and facilitates growth during that experience.

Evidence of candidates and clinical faculty systematically examining results related to P-12 learning was provided. During clinical practice, candidates complete a teacher work sample,

which requires reflecting upon their practice using data collected before and after teaching. Pre/Post tests during clinical field experiences were used to measure the unit's teacher candidates' impact on P-12 student learning and revealed significant effects.

Evidence presented showed that candidates begin a process of continuous assessment, reflection, and action directed at supporting P-12 student learning. Initial candidates reflect throughout their undergraduate experience after teaching, in seminars, via work samples, during weekly reflective conferences, and in formative and summative evaluation settings. Candidates must reflect in a cognitive coaching reflective conference after each instructional event. Regular seminars occur that provide the opportunity for candidates to reflect with their colleagues on what is working and what is not. Candidates make meaning of their experiences and construct best-practice teaching and learning outcomes collaboratively.

Evidence was provided on the expectation that field experiences and clinical practices provide opportunities for candidates to develop and demonstrate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping all students learn. Teacher candidates are provided with multiple opportunities to learn pedagogy through their actual practice in a supervised classroom experience. Data were provided on initial and advanced candidate work sample assessments, diversity assessment, technology assessment, field experience evaluation, and student teaching evaluation. A copy of the Disposition Assessment for initial and advanced candidates was also provided.

After or during the extended field experiences and prior to the student teaching semester, the unit's faculty meet with candidates to determine their preferred placement for clinical practice. Placements are made relative to their previous field experiences to provide candidates with a variety of opportunities to work with diverse P-12 students. The candidates' requests are then sent to respective departments for approval. After approval is received from the content departments, staff members contact school corporation contacts to determine appropriate placements.

3.2 Progress toward meeting the target level on this standard

Evidence provided indicated that both the unit and PDS school-based faculty are involved in designing, implementing, and evaluating the unit's conceptual framework and the school program; they each participate in the unit's and the PDS partners' professional development activities and instructional programs for candidates and for students. The unit and PDS partners share expertise and integrate resources to support candidate learning. They jointly determine the specific placements of student teachers and interns for other professional roles to maximize the learning experience for candidates and P-12 students.

In the evidence provided in the exhibits, 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. Both field experiences and clinical practices extend the unit's conceptual framework into practice through modeling by clinical faculty and well-designed opportunities to learn through doing. During clinical practice, candidate learning is integrated into the school program and into teaching practice. Candidates are expected to

observe and be observed by others. Candidates are expected to interact with teachers, families of students, administrators, college or university supervisors, and other interns about their practice regularly and continually during their field experience and clinical practice. According to the evidence provided in the exhibit, candidates are expected to reflect on and justify their own practice. Candidates are considered to be members of instructional teams in the school and are expected to be active participants in professional decisions. Evidence indicated that there is an expectation for candidates to be involved in a variety of school-based activities directed at the improvement of teaching and learning, use information technology, and engage in service learning. Candidates in advanced programs for teachers are expected to participate in field experiences that require them to critique and synthesize educational theory related to classroom practice based on their own applied research. Evidence provided indicated that candidates in programs for other school professionals are expected to 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. The projects are expected to be theoretically based, involve the use of research and technology, and have real-world application in the candidates' field placement setting.

According to the evidence presented, candidates are expected to work collaboratively with other candidates and clinical faculty to critique and reflect on each others' practice and their effects on student learning with the goal of improving practice. Field experiences and clinical practice are designed to facilitate candidates' exploration of their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions related to all students. Exhibits provided evidence that candidates are expected to 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.

3.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

Not applicable to this standard.

3.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

Not applicable to this standard.

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

- (1) Entry and exit criterion for candidates for field experience and clinical practice.
- (2) Criteria for school faculty who serve as clinical practice supervisors.
- (3) Evidence on school faculty being accomplished professionals.
- (4) Data on placement of candidate for field experiences and clinical practices
- (5) Clarification on the process and tracking used to ensure that candidates participate in field experiences or clinical practice that include students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic groups.
- (6) Examples of candidate work during field experiences and 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 Statement about the evidence

The unit clearly and systematically developed policies and procedures to ensure that they prepare teacher education candidates who are ready to help all students learn. The unit's mission and vision statement states and defines proficiencies related to diversity. The unit has also developed a diversity plan that emphasizes three main goals: Build and maintain an inclusive campus environment; Recruit, support, retain, and graduate a diverse student population; Maintain and enhance diversity in employment of staff, faculty, administrators. In 2007, a Cultural Audit Committee examined cultural responsiveness and overall diversity climate of the unit. In spring 2009, a Diversity Task Force was formed to analyze available data, develop a new diversity plan and present these findings to the unit. A diversity implementation team currently works to ensure that the diversity plan is enacted.

Diversity is infused throughout the curriculum and in field experiences. Each course addresses specific themes related to diversity. Matrices provided highlight specific diversity related themes and goals for each course. Candidates in initial programs must demonstrate proficiency in six areas related to diversity. Curriculum and field experiences multiple opportunities for candidates to develop understanding of diversity, including English language learners and students with exceptionalities. Multiple forms of assessment during coursework and fieldwork are utilized to monitor candidate progress as they develop their understanding and skills needed to develop classroom environments that foster and support the learning of all students. Candidates are prepared to use different learning styles and adapt instruction and develop support structures for all students, including linguistically and culturally diverse students and students with exceptionalities. Candidates are expected to develop lessons, and use instructional strategies that utilize and honor students' family structure, experiences, and cultures. This is assessed in coursework and during field experiences. Candidates must demonstrate their ability to communicate with students and families with appropriate sensitivity to cultural and gender differences. A review of methods course syllabi indicate that candidates are expected to incorporate multiple perspectives and representations of disciplinary knowledge, acknowledging and celebrating the contributions of a diverse society. Candidates are expected have the skills needed to develop a classroom and school climate that values and celebrates diversity. Throughout their program candidate proficiencies related to diversity are assessed, and faculty use that data to provide feedback and support to candidates for improving and expanding their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping students from diverse populations learn.

Currently 52 of the 62 faculty members who teach in the initial programs; and 37 of 38 faculty who teach in the advanced programs are white. The recruitment and retention of diverse faculty has been identified by the units as a crucial goal and needed growth area for the future. A review of syllabi and unit assessments indicate that professional education classes and clinical practice support candidate growth in knowledge and experiences related to work with diverse student populations, including English language learners and students with exceptionalities. Affirmation of the value of diversity is shown through good-faith efforts to increase or maintain faculty diversity, and has become strategic plan has been developed at the institution to focus on increased recruitment and retention of faculty of color.

The unit has developed multiple strategies and policies to increase the diversity of their candidates and therefore candidate opportunities to work in a diverse learning community. While Indiana State University, as a state university, has the largest percentage of African American students compared to other state universities, the unit has a lower than expected representation, and this is particularly true of graduation rates. The unit recognizes that retention needs to be a priority for the program and has been working on steps to provide the support needed to recruit and retain a diverse candidate population. Targeted programs to recruit candidates have been developed, and a new student group, African American Student Educators, has been established to support the needs of teacher education candidates and to help recruit candidates of color to the teaching profession.

The School Psychology program has actively sought candidates from universities with high minority student enrollment, and has developed support structures to support candidates in their program. The advanced and graduate programs also actively pursue and recruit international candidates. These programs provide quality opportunities for candidates to work and study with a diverse learning community.

4.2 Progress toward meeting the target level on this standard

Not applicable to this standard.

4.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

AFIs continued from last visit:

AFI Number & Text	Apply to	AFI Rationale
1.Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with diverse peers.	ITP,ADV	A good faith effort has been made to have candidate interactions with diverse peers, but the opportunities are still lacking.

4.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

- (1) Have the unit’s efforts resulted in recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty (professional education and school faculty).

Rationale: Though a plan is described, the impact of those efforts is not clear.

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

- (1) More evidence (in addition to the minutes that were presented) that the committees that are working on diversity are active and working.
- (2) Data on candidate access to diverse peers in other subject areas.
- (3) Data on diversity efforts that extend beyond racial diversity and into other areas of diversity (geographical, religious, socioeconomic, etc).
- (4) Timeline or aggregated data showing diversity trends within the unit over time.
- (5) Data on diversity of the school faculty during field experience and clinical practice. Do candidates have an opportunity to interact with diverse faculty in the field?
- (6) Interviews with candidates to confirm that they are interacting with diverse P-12 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 Statement about the evidence

Vitae and descriptions of teaching, research, and services indicate that professional education faculty members in the unit are qualified for their teaching assignments and other responsibilities. The data indicate that 14 percent of regular faculty hold a Master of Arts or a Master of Science and 86 percent hold a terminal degree of Ph.D. or Ed.D. Those faculty members without terminal degrees are either former faculty who hold tenure due to past assignments with the University Lab School, or are doctoral candidates. All faculty members demonstrate expertise in their areas and those who work closely within licensure programs have or have held a license in the field related to that which they teach.

The unit describes clinical faculty as part-time faculty. Due to this description, the use of adjunct faculty members is not clear. The clinical (i.e. part-time) professional education faculty are expected to hold at least a master's degree and current licensure. Clinical faculty members have contemporary professional experiences that qualify them for supervision of field experience placements, with a wealth of experience in P-12 schools. Expectations are communicated to clinical faculty members through contracts, handbooks, or letters depending on the program. Training was described for the Department of Elementary, Early, and Special Education. All school based faculty members have at least three years of teaching or school experience, hold a masters' degree, and typically are highly qualified.

Descriptions are provided of faculty members' efforts in research and scholarship. Faculty members are expected to participate in service at the departmental, college, and university level. In addition faculty members are engaged with professional organizations and provide active service in P-12 schools.

Though professional development activities related to needs have been described, clearer information related to the funds provided for professional development is needed. In addition, the quality and application of professional development efforts are not clear.

5.2 Progress toward meeting the target level on this standard

Not applicable to this standard.

5.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

Not applicable to this standard.

5.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

Not applicable to this standard.

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

- (1) Data on yearly faculty evaluations and teaching evaluations.
- (2) Data on availability and quality of professional development opportunities.
- (3) Interviews with candidates and other data about faculty performance (evaluation results, surveys, etc).
- (4) Feedback from other constituents (public school personnel, faculty in other areas) about collaboration with faculty.
- (5) Data on the use of adjunct faculty within the unit and the methods used to assess adjuncts.

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the prep AFIs corrected from last visit:

6.1 Statement about the evidence.

There is a governance structure in place, including a Teacher Education Council which includes faculty representative of the profession educator faculty, the unit, alumni, and candidates. The organization chart and bylaws provide evidence that the unit has a structure that allows for planning, delivering, and managing coherent programs. Recruiting and admission policies appear clear and are consistent across handbooks and the website. It appears that academic calendars, catalogs, publications, and catalogs are frequently reviewed and updated. Candidates have access to the Education Student Services Office for advising, and have access to their degree audits online.

Though budgets are provided for all colleges, it is difficult to judge the comparability of funding. However, the college does receive 12 percent of the total university expenditures and 8.7 percent of the student credit hour productivity. It would be possible to conclude that this funding

supports the clinical nature of these programs. Resources appear to remain sufficient to support programs.

Teaching load is 12 undergraduate teaching hours; graduate teaching load is nine hours. Release for projects must be negotiated with program chairs. The policy of no more than 1.5 student teachers per credit hour is within the guidelines of 18 full time students teachers equaling a full load. Support staff is stated to be adequate. Facilities have been recently updated, and all classrooms are wireless with technology stations. Distance learning programs have appropriate supports.

6.2 Progress toward meeting the target level on this standard

Not applicable to this standard.

6.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

Not applicable to this standard.

6.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

Not applicable to this standard.

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

- (1) Data on comparability of budget to other professional schools.
- (2) Confirm that faculty workloads permit completion of service and research.

Sources of Evidence

Indiana State University's Institutional Report
Annual Reports and Program Reports in NCATE's Accreditation Information Management
System (AIMS)
Website and Exhibits of Indiana State University