NCATE
The Standard of Excellence in Teacher Preparation

INSTITUTIONAL REPORT ADDENDUM

Indiana State University
August 15, 2012

Bradley V. Balch, Dean
Denise Collins, Associate Dean
Eric Hampton, Adams Assessment Director

INSTITUTIONAL REPORT ADDENDUM

The members of the professional education unit at Indiana State University wish to express our appreciation to the Board of Examiners for their review and comments regarding our Institutional Report. This addendum is in response to the Offsite BOE Report of June 1, 2012, and provides further information on the areas requested by the Board of Examiners.

This Addendum is organized by standard, including responses to areas of concern and further evidence as requested in the Offsite BOE Report. Exhibits to support this Addendum have been added to the Exhibit Center and are noted there as *additional exhibits*.

The electronic Exhibit Center is password protected because it contains some personally identifying information about candidates and faculty. The password is available from the NCATE Coordinator, Associate Dean Denise Collins, denise.collins@indstate.edu, 812-237-2888.

A USB drive containing electronic copies of materials will be provided to BOE members during their onsite visit, to include (a) the revised Institutional Report, (b) the Offsite BOE Report, (c) the Addendum, (d) a list of exhibits, (e) a folder containing only those exhibits added for the Addendum, (f) a folder containing all other Exhibit Center materials, and (g) additional orienting information that BOE members may find helpful during the onsite visit.

Questions regarding this Addendum or reports of any difficulty accessing materials may be directed to the NCATE Coordinator, Denise Collins, at denise.collins@indstate.edu or 812-237-2888.

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

1.4: Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard.

No areas of concern were identified.

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.

There are nine key assessments identified in the unit for initial programs: Disposition Admit to BCP, Disposition Midpoint, Disposition Student Teaching, Educator Work Sample, Early Field Experience Evaluation, Student Teaching Evaluation, Diversity Midpoint, Diversity Student Teaching, and Technology Assessment.

Advanced and other school personnel (OSP) programs collect seven assessments: Disposition Self Assessment, Disposition Course Based, Disposition Field Based, Work Sample, Field Evaluation, Diversity Assessment, and Technology Assessment.

Assessment data were collected from each program. Assessments are collected in courses as identified in the Assessment Handbook (Exhibit 2.3.a.1), Table 7 (initial programs) and Table 8 (advanced programs).

To clarify the list of programs and verify that all programs contribute data to the assessments, an additional document has been added to the Exhibit Center, 1.3.x.1. In this exhibit, Table 1 provides assessment data collection points for 18 initial programs. Table 2 provides data collection points for six OSP programs. Table 3 lists data collection points for four advanced programs.

2. Attempt to find disaggregated assessment data for other school personnel programs.

The tables in Exhibits 1.3.d include all advanced and OSP programs. We have separated OSP programs in separate tables by program. Disaggregated data are in the Exhibit Center, along with additional information for the third year of data collection for all programs. These are Exhibits 1.3.x.3 through 1.3.x.27.

Exhibits 1.3.x.3 through 1.3.x.12 include disaggregated data for OSP and advanced programs on all assessments for the two years of data collection (2009-2011) reported in the Institutional Report.

Exhibits 1.3.x.13 through 1.3.x.18 include the third year (2011-2012) of data collection for initial programs on all assessments.

Exhibits 1.3.x.19 through 1.3.x.27 include the third year (2011-2012) of data collection for OSP and advanced programs on all assessments.

3. Clarification on the list of programs and their level (Initial, Advanced, or Other School Professionals).

Table 1 lists each program, its level, and its program review status. It is also included as Exhibit 1.3.x.2.

Table 1. *List of NCATE Programs*

NCATE Program	Program Level	Program Review Status	Final Review Deadline	Rescission Date
Elementary Education	Initial	Recognized	3/15/2020	8/1/2020
Science Education	Initial	Recognized	3/15/2020	8/1/2020
Social Studies Education	Initial	Recognized	3/15/2020	8/1/2020
Special Education-Undergrad	Initial	Recognized	3/15/2021	8/1/2021
Technology Education	Initial	Recognized	3/15/2020	8/1/2020
English Education	Initial	Recognized with condition	3/15/2014	8/1/2014
Health Education	Initial	Recognized with condition	3/15/2013	8/1/2013
Math Education	Initial	Recognized with condition	9/15/2013	2/1/2014
Physical Education	Initial	Recognized with condition	3/15/2013	8/1/2013
Special Education-Graduate	Initial	Recognized with condition	3/15/2013	8/1/2013
Art Education	Initial	NASAD Accredited	In process	2014
Business Education	Initial	AACSB Accredited	2014-2015	2015
Family and Consumer Sciences	Initial	AAFCS Accredited	2/1/2013	Spring 2014
Music Education	Initial	NASM Accredited	2018-2019	2019
Speech Language Pathology	Initial	CAA/ASHA Accredited	Annual reports	5/31/2017
Transition to Teaching	Initial	State approved	3/15/2014	Spring 2014
English as a New Language	Initial	Further development required	3/15/2013	8/1/2013
Middle School Math Minor	Initial	Further development required	3/15/2013	8/1/2013
World Languages	Initial	Further development required	3/15/2013	8/1/2013
School Building Leadership	OSP	Recognized	3/15/2020	8/1/2020
School Psychology	OSP	Recognized	3/15/2020	8/1/2020
Educational Technology	OSP	Recognized with condition	3/15/2013	8/1/2013
School District Leadership	OSP	Recognized with condition	3/15/2014	8/1/2014
School Counseling	OSP	CACREP Accredited	Visit: 9/9/2012	10/31/2012
School Library Media Concentration	OSP	State approved until program closes	9/15/2012	2/1/2013
Special Education	Advanced	Recognized with condition	9/15/2013	2/1/2014
Gifted and Talented Certification	Advanced	Further development required	3/15/2013	8/1/2013
Curriculum and Instruction	Advanced	No program review required		
Elementary Education	Advanced	No program review required		

2. Description of the potential adverse impact of the assessments on a diverse pool of teacher candidates.

The potential for bias based on diverse identities in assessing teacher candidates has been widely discussed (see, for example, Marbley, Bonner, & Berg, 2008). Differential ratings of candidates could occur as a result of (a) bias in test items or rubric definitions (as studied by Denner, Norman, & Lin, 2009) or (b) cultural insensitivity of evaluators. Safeguarding against bias and insensitivity involves two approaches: analyzing assessment data for evidence of differential results and training evaluators (both test/rubric developers and faculty/clinical supervisors) on cultural sensitivity.

Beyond the efforts described in the IR and the Assessment Handbook (e.g., establishing psychometric properties and using common assessments across programs), we analyzed assessment data from 2011-2012 assessments of disposition, fieldwork and student teaching, and diversity for evidence of bias based on race/ethnicity and gender. The complete report is included as Exhibit 2.3.x.1. The findings indicate that there were no significant differences in scores on any assessment based on race/ethnicity. There were small but significant differences between women and men on student teaching and diversity assessments. These findings are consistent with Denner et al.'s (2009) study of teacher work samples, which also found no differences on race/ethnicity and small differences on gender. It will be important to repeat these analyses and track whether subsequent findings are consistent. It is not clear from this study if the gender findings are indicative of performance differences between men and women or measurement bias. Further investigation of gender across licensure developmental levels and content areas is warranted as well.

Training evaluators is the second safeguard against bias. To address this, in part, we require every person who supervises fieldwork or student teaching to complete a training module, *Welcoming Diversity,* offered by ISU's Human Resources department. Additionally, every adjunct faculty member in the unit will be required to evidence completion of the module during annual performance evaluations. All regular faculty have been requested to complete the module, and we will be working with the Teacher Education Committee to develop policy guidelines requiring diversity training for all teacher educators.

The combination of data collection and analysis and ongoing training for cultural sensitivity is key in evidencing and advancing the BCOE's commitment to our value of Social Justice and Diversity: "We work to create environments that support and enable all members of our community to thrive."

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

3.4: Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard.

No areas of concern were identified.

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

1. Entry and exit criteria for candidates for field experience and clinical practice.

The Becoming a Complete Professional (BCP) process provides a series of checks to ensure that candidates for teacher education courses and field experiences are adequately prepared for their progressive experiences, presented in Table 2.

Table 2. *Becoming a Complete Professional Criteria*

Stage	Measure	Criteria
BCP I: Becoming a Student of Education - Admission to teacher candidacy	Praxis I	Reading: 176 Writing: 172 Math: 175 or 527 combined score or SAT: 1100 or ACT: 24
	ISU Cumulative GPA	2.50
	Professional Education Coursework	C or better in all classes; 2.50 GPA
BCP II: Becoming a Student Teacher - Eligibility for the Student Teaching Semester	BCP I	Satisfy all criteria
	ISU Cumulative GPA	2.50
	Professional Education Coursework	C or better in all classes; 2.50 GPA
	Recommendations	Favorable recommendations from major department and review department
BCP III: Becoming a Licensed Teacher - Clearance for graduation and recommendation for licensure	BCP II	Good standing
	ISU Cumulative GPA	2.50
	Major and licensure area GPA	2.50
	Professional Education Coursework	C or better in all classes; 2.50 GPA
	ISU Program Requirements	Completed Foundational Studies, professional education, and major requirements
	Recommendations	Favorable recommendations from major department, school faculty, university supervisor, and review department, including diversity and dispositional assessments

If indicated by a candidate's performance, faculty—including BCOE, content, and school-based personnel—make recommendations for remediation. Remediation may require repeating a field experience before proceeding in the program, or specific areas of concern may be identified for monitoring and development in a subsequent field experience.

2. Criteria for school faculty who serve as clinical practice supervisors.

The unit works diligently to collaborate with school and community partners and place teacher candidates in high quality schools or agency settings for their clinical practice. The selection criteria for clinical practice supervisors in a school setting include the following:

1. Must have a standard or professional teaching license, which requires a minimum of two years of classroom experience;
2. Must be licensed in the content area of the student teacher's major;
3. Must exhibit teaching excellence in a classroom and be recommended by the building principal;
4. Must attend an orientation or a training program; and
5. Must review rules and regulations printed in the Student Teaching Handbook or TOTAL Handbook.

Orientation and training programs for clinical practice supervisors are provided by school principals, ISU department faculty, university supervisors, or Education Student Services personnel. In the TOTAL elementary clinical immersion semester, school faculty who serve as supervisors must attend training in co-teaching and coaching. The agenda for the most recent training meeting is included as Exhibit 3.3.x.1. University Supervisors who supervise student teaching are former school faculty and administrators with extensive experience in evaluating teachers. They also attend training in co-teaching and supervision. The agenda for the most recent University Supervisors training is included as Exhibit 3.3.x.2.

Building-level and district-level internships are provided by the persons who are currently the leaders in those positions; in other words, the candidates are serving the internships under their instructional leaders. The following process provides assurances regarding mentor quality:

1. Candidate submits application for internship placement at which time the mentor is listed.
2. Program coordinator reviews application and supervisor information. Supervisors must be principals/superintendents currently employed who are in good standing in the Indiana Department of Education.
3. At the end of their internship, candidates evaluate their internship experiences, to include mentor support, using the Program Evaluation form, Exhibit 3.3.x.3.
4. Program faculty review these evaluations and determine the value of the mentor's input and, therefore, determine the mentor's eligibility for future placements.

Summer discussions related to program effectiveness address situations that concern mentors. A determination is made regarding the degree to which each situation was an intern issue or mentor issue. Future candidates who work for instructional leaders who have been disqualified as internship supervisors are counseled to use alternative settings as their internship sites.

3. Evidence on school faculty being accomplished professionals.

The Indiana Department of Education has a rigorous evaluation system for school faculty, including annual performance evaluations that demonstrate teachers' influence on student learning. Although the state guidelines allow for school districts to develop their own evaluation models, most are adopting the Indiana RISE evaluation. Table 3 maps the Indiana Teacher Effectiveness Rubric from the RISE model to the *Becoming a Complete Professional* conceptual framework.

Table 3. *Conceptual Framework Mapping to RISE Standards*

Educator as Expert or Mediator of Learning	Indiana Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (RISE)
Bases instruction on high but realistic expectations	1.1 Utilize assessment data to plan 1.2 Set ambitions and measurable achievement goals 1.5 Track student data and analyze progress 2.7 Maximize instructional time 2.9 Set high expectations for student success
Helps individual students achieve their potential	2.6 Develop higher level of understanding through rigorous instruction and work 2.8 Create classroom culture of respect and collaboration 2.9 Set high expectations for academic success
Uses instructional strategies (including appropriate technologies) involving active learning	1.3 Develop standards-based unit plans and assessments 1.4 Create objective-driven lesson plans and assessments 2.2 Demonstrate and clearly communicate content knowledge to students 2.3 Engage students in academic content 2.4 Check for understanding 2.5 Modify instruction as needed 2.6 Develop higher level of understanding through rigorous instruction and work
Is open to change in professional practice	2.5 Modify instruction as needed 3.3 Seek professional skills and knowledge
Employs inquiry and assessment to investigate and improve educational practice	1.1 Utilize assessment data to plan 1.5 Track student data and analyze progress 3.3 Seek professional skills and knowledge
Educator as Person	
Is an exemplar of lifelong learning	3.3 Seek professional skills and knowledge
Is a model of effective communication	2.2 Demonstrate and clearly communicate content knowledge to students 2.4 Check for understanding 2.8 Create classroom culture of respect and collaboration 3.1 Contribute to school culture 3.2 Collaborate with peers 3.4 Advocate for student success 3.5 Engage families in student learning
Demonstrates care for students as individuals	2.3 Engage students in academic content 2.7 Maximize instructional time 2.8 Create classroom culture of respect and collaboration
Acknowledges his or her influence on student values	2.8 Create classroom culture of respect and collaboration 3.1 Contribute to school culture 3.5 Engage families in student learning

Educator as Member of Communities	
Collaborates to achieve educational goals	3.1 Contribute to School Culture 3.2 Collaborate with peers 3.4 Advocate for student success 3.5 Engage families in student learning
Responds to the social context in which he or she works	3.1 Contribute to School Culture 3.5 Engage families in student learning
Promotes social responsibility among students	2.8 Create classroom culture of respect and collaboration
Demonstrates commitment to the profession	3.3 Seek professional skills and knowledge
Exercises leadership in formal and informal roles	3.1 Contribute to School Culture 3.2 Collaborate with peers 3.3 Seek professional skills and knowledge 3.4 Advocate for student success 3.5 Engage families in student learning

For school-based clinical placements, we rely on the professional judgment of the principals, as they ultimately approve all assignments. In order to accept a student teacher, a school faculty member must have completed his or her two-year residency with an initial license, as required by the state. After these two years, the principal of the building confirms that the teacher has successfully met the competencies for a beginning teacher and the state then issues a proficient practitioner license. For early field experiences, the PDS partnership and the understanding of each party's responsibilities and shared goals (Exhibit 3.3.x.4) allows for reliance upon building principals' professional judgment.

Current school faculty members will be available during the onsite visit to provide further information about their qualifications and their work with candidates.

4. Data on placement of candidates for field experiences and clinical practices.

Tables 4 and 5 provide an overview of candidate placement in field experience and clinical practice. Tables 6 and 7 include information on the diversity of teachers and students in schools where candidates are placed. Exhibit 3.3.x.5 contains specific information on each school or district.

Table 4. *Placement of Candidates in Clinical Practice, 2009-2012*

Year	Initial Candidates in Field Experiences	Initial Candidates in Student Teaching
2009-10	665	174
2010-11	655	173
2011-12	602	192

Table 5. *School Placements for Field Experiences and Clinical Practice*

School Information	N	%
Title 1 Designation		
Title 1 School	75	43.9
Non Title 1 School	96	56.1
School Type		
Elementary School	88	51.5
Intermediate School	4	2.3
Middle School	35	20.5
High School	29	17.0
Elementary/Middle School	3	1.8
Middle/High School	12	7.0
School Locale		
Large City	12	7.3
Mid-Size City	27	16.5
Urban Fringe of Large City	26	15.9
Urban Fringe Mid-Size City	13	7.9
Large Town	0	0
Small Town	16	9.8
Rural Outside MSA*	23	14.0
Rural Inside MSA*	47	28.7
*MSA: Metropolitan Statistical Area		

Table 6. *School Placement Site Frequency and Percentage of Percentage Ranges on Diversity Variables*

Percentage of Schools/Placement Sites	0-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%
Minority Teachers	152 92.1%	6 3.6%	5 3.0%	1 0.6%	0	0	0	0	1 0.6%	0
Minority Students	91 53.2%	31 18.1%	18 10.5%	10 5.8%	2 1.2%	7 4.1%	1 0.6%	1 0.6%	4 2.3%	6 3.5%
Free and Reduced Lunch	5 2.9%	9 5.3%	24 14.0%	27 15.8%	38 22.2%	27 15.8%	17 9.9%	13 7.6%	8 4.7%	3 1.8%
Special Ed Students	16 9.4%	112 65.5%	39 22.8%	4 2.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0
ELL Students	160 93.6%	9 5.3%	2 1.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 7. *School Placement Site Descriptive Statistics on Diversity Variables*

	Site N	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.	Range
Minority Teacher %	165	3.06	8.28	0	82.10	82.10
Minority Enrollment	171	143.66	283.14	2	2596	2594
Minority Enrollment %	171	18.49	23.14	0.60	99.60	99.00
Free and Reduced Lunch Enrollment	171	657.00	612.41	30	4443	4413
Free and Reduced Lunch %	171	46.25	19.98	0	95.40	95.40
Special Ed. Enrollment	171	98.66	76.34	6	488	482
Special Ed. Enrollment %	171	16.51	5.49	7.10	33.90	26.80
ELL Enrollment	171	18.10	37.88	0	269	269
ELL Enrollment %	171	2.36	4.03	0	25.10	25.10

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.

Early field experiences, including the elementary TOTAL semester and the secondary EFE immersion, are limited to our PDS partner schools. In 2010, we reduced the number of PDS schools from 20 to 10 so that we would be able to ensure candidates have experience in high-need, diverse environments. The current PDS partners are all high-need, high-poverty schools. Further information about the ISU PDS partnership is available at http://coe.indstate.edu/pds.

For early field experiences, data are kept in departments and are shared, as requested, with Education Student Services for student teaching placement so that diverse field experiences can be assured. Data are also supplied to the assessment director. Content area coordinators for secondary student teaching placements are provided a list of requested student teaching sites for their majors. These lists must be approved by the coordinators prior to placement to assure diverse experiences.

During the secondary immersion experiences, individual placements are evaluated by CIMT faculty to ensure that all students have experiences with students with exceptionalities. Should such a placement not be possible for the full-time immersion experience due to the constraints of the settings, all students are still required to complete structured observations in collaborative classroom settings. In student teaching, all candidate placement requests are sent to content area coordinators to assure that the student teaching requested site is different from the placements the student has already completed. Students are advised, during the student teaching enrollment meeting, to select student teaching sites that are different from the sites where students completed field experience placements.

All building-level and district-level administrative candidates have been evaluated with respect to ELCC 2001 Standard Element 4 which requires, in part, that the intern demonstrates competence "to understand and accommodate diverse community dynamics, while providing leadership to programs serving students with exceptional and diverse needs," and "capitalize on conditions of community diversity, . . . and advocate for students with special or exceptional needs." If we encounter candidates who do not work in diverse environments, we provide them with opportunities to visit other settings. Typically the more diverse settings are those of other candidates who reciprocate by visiting settings that tend to be less diverse. Those conversations and meetings are arranged early in the internship. We debrief those experiences at future intern seminars.

Other school professionals have similar requirements for field placements. For example, all candidates in the school counseling program are held to CACREP standards (Exhibit 3.3.x.6) that specifically address

social and cultural diversity (see p. 10 of the CACREP standards). Students are expected to demonstrate and experience "attitudes, beliefs, understandings, and acculturative experiences, including specific experiential learning activities designed to foster students' understanding of self and culturally diverse clients." Specific activities are required in experiential courses, particularly internship, COUN 739B (Exhibit 3.3.x.7). For every P-12 student that our graduate candidates work with, they are to note multicultural issues facing the student. Additionally, they are required to spend a minimum of seven hours with special education students (Exhibit 3.3.x.8). During class presentations, candidates must report on work with clients from diverse populations. Because our candidates are placed in a variety of school corporations, classroom dialogue addresses the challenges of very urban schools as well as very rural schools.

6. Examples of candidate work during field experiences and clinical practice.

Candidates will attend the roundtable meetings during the onsite visit to present examples of their work. Candidate work samples will include unit plans for secondary subjects, week-long lesson plans for elementary classrooms, and teacher work samples produced during student teaching. Guidelines and rubrics for these assignments are included in the Exhibit Center: 1.3.c.1, 1.3.c.7, and 1.3.c.9.

Standard 4: Diversity

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)?

As noted in our IR, recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty is a strategic goal for the BCOE, emphasized in the Diversity Plan, Exhibit 4.3.g.1. We have had limited success, however, in attracting diverse faculty, especially people of color, to Terre Haute. This is a broader concern for ISU, and concerted efforts have been made through two university-wide initiatives: Diversifying the Faculty and Opportunity Hires. The number of faculty hired at the university over the past three years (noted in Table 8) indicates that, although the first year of these programs (2010-11) yielded more diverse faculty, maintaining that success has been challenging. It is important to note that the ISU strategic plan has identified African American faculty as the institutional priority for its recruitment efforts; therefore, the institutional data available are limited to this population. However, as noted in the data table on faculty demographics submitted with the IR (Exhibit 4.3.d.1), diverse faculty in the unit also includes Hispanic and Asian faculty members.

Table 8. *Indiana State University Faculty Hiring, 2009-10 to 2011-12*

Year	Faculty Hired	Women	Men	White	African American	Other Groups
2009-10	21	10/47.6%	11/52.4%	19/90.5%	0	2/9.5%
2010-11	54	35/64.8%	19/35.2%	39/72.2%	5/9.3%*	10/18.5%*
2011-12 (as of 4/30/12)	25	14/56.0%	11/44.0%	23/92.0%	0	2/8.0%

** Includes two faculty members hired as part of the Opportunity Hires program.*

In the BCOE, we added one African American faculty member to our teacher education faculty in 2010-11. As shown in Table 9, we fared well compared to other colleges in attracting applicants to open positions.

Table 9. *2010-11 African American Faculty Hiring*

College	Number of Faculty Positions	Number of Applicants	Number of African American Applicants	Number of African American Finalists	Number of African American Hires
Bayh College of Education	7	121	21/17.3%	2	1
College of Technology	6	85	10/11.8%	2	1
College of Nursing, Health, and Human Services	11	130	7/5.4%	1	1
College of Arts and Sciences	15	520	25/4.8%	0	0
Scott College of Business	4	188	6/3.2%	0	0

We remain committed to attracting diverse faculty and have provided training and support for search committees around these efforts.

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.

The BCOE Diversity Implementation Team has been active throughout the year, as noted in the minutes presented. On July 25, 2012, the team convened for a half-day retreat to set the agenda and measurable outcomes for efforts in 2012-13. This retreat included reporting on team members' work during the year. A full report is included as Exhibit 4.3.x.1, with a supplemental research report on African American candidates' perceptions of the teacher education program in Exhibit 4.3.x.2. The measurable objectives for meeting our Diversity Plan goals were finalized at the retreat and are included as Exhibit 4.3.x.3.

ISU's Council on Diversity is charged with overseeing diversity efforts across the university; the BCOE is well represented on the Council, with two at-large members, one of whom serves as the Council's co-chair. The Council's annual reports are available from the Office of Diversity website. The BCOE

representatives serve an important liaison function, advancing diversity goals in a two-way relationship between the College and the Council.

Members of the Diversity Implementation Team and the Council on Diversity BCOE members will be available during the onsite visit to provide further information about their work.

2. Data on candidate access to diverse peers in other subject areas.

Undergraduate candidates, like all ISU students, are required to complete Foundational Studies (general education) courses. The ethnicity of enrollees in these courses is the only measure of diversity for which there are institutional data. These data, however, indicate that Foundational Studies courses taken by teacher education candidates, as noted on the four-year plans of study (Exhibits I.5.x.3-I.5.x.23), include a higher proportion of students of color than are enrolled in teacher education programs or at the university in general. In a representative sample of courses offered in the fall semesters of 2009, 2010, and 2011, White students comprised 54-71% of enrollees. This is compared to the percentage of White students at ISU, which ranged from 70 to 75% during the same semesters. These data are presented in Tables 10 and 11, with more detailed tables in Exhibits 4.3.x.4, 4.3.x.5, and 4.3.x.6.

Table 10. *Enrollment in Foundational Studies by Race/Ethnicity, 2009-2011*

Class	Year	Total	White	African American	Other Race/ Ethnicity*
COMM 101	2009	1054	718/68.1%	244/23.1%	55/5.2%
	2010	1164	800/68.7%	231/19.8%	42/3.6%
	2011	1187	803/67.6%	191/16.1%	51/4.3%
ENG 101	2009	1295	842/65.0%	363/28.0%	57/4.4%
	2010	1508	917/60.8%	446/29.6%	70/4.6%
	2011	1477	803/54.4%	381/25.8%	77/5.2%
HIST 201	2009	364	251/69.0%	87/23.9%	13/3.6%
	2010	426	286/67.1%	98/23.0%	11/2.6%
	2011	408	279/68.4%	49/12.0%	19/4.7%
MATH 102	2009	591	410/69.4%	124/21.0%	36/6.1%
	2010	414	292/70.5%	83/20.0%	18/4.3%
	2011	383	267/69.7%	70/18.3%	17/4.4%

* Other Race/Ethnicity includes Asian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic/Spanish, Multiracial, Native American, and Native Hawaiian. Foreign/International and those whose ethnicity is unknown are not included.

Table 11. *ISU and Teacher Education Students by Race/Ethnicity, 2009-2011*

ISU Undergraduate Students				
Year	Total	White	African American	Other Race/ Ethnicity
2009	8460	6446/76.2%	1238/14.6%	403/4.8%
2010	9373	6603/70.4%	1496/16.0%	407/4.3%
2011	9449	6905/73.1%	1459/15.4%	611/6.5%

Teacher Education Undergraduate Students				
Year	Total	White	African American	Other Race/ Ethnicity
2009	1305	1176/90.1%	79/6.1%	36/2.8%
2010	1392	1180/84.8%	85/6.1%	42/3.0%
2011	1277	1117/87.5%	86/6.7%	55/4.3%

ISU Graduate Students				
Year	Total	White	African American	Other Race/ Ethnicity
2009	2074	1486/71.6%	160/7.7%	187/9.0%
2010	2121	1451/68.4%	199/9.4%	159/7.5%
2011	2079	1442/69.3%	192/9.2%	127/6.1%

Teacher Education Graduate Students				
Year	Total	White	African American	Other Race/ Ethnicity
2009	763	594/77.9%	50/6.6%	37/4.8%
2010	725	537/74.1%	55/7.6%	27/3.7%
2011	703	515/73.3%	58/8.3%	29/4.1%

Advanced candidates generally do not take classes outside their programs; however, these candidates do take the statistics course, EPSY 612, with students from other graduate programs. The data presented in Table 12 show that there is generally a higher proportion of international students and domestic students of color in EPSY 612, offering a small measure of opportunity for interaction with diverse peers.

Table 12. *Enrollment in EPSY 612*

Year	Total	White	African American	Other Race/ Ethnicity	International
2009	113	82/72.6%	14/12.4%	7/6.2%	7/6.2%
2010	126	77/61.1%	13/10.3%	9/7.1%	20/15.9%
2011	143	111/77.6%	10/7.0%	7/4.9%	10/7.0%

Current candidates will be available during the onsite visit to speak about their experiences with diverse peers.

3. Data on diversity efforts that extend beyond racial diversity and into other areas of diversity (geographical, religious, socioeconomic, etc.).

As noted in the BCOE Diversity Position Statement,

> The Bayh College of Education affirms that diversity is fundamental to excellence. Valuing diversity means actively using the strength of the different perspectives that individuals bring from the vantage points of their culture, religion, ethnicity, gender, race, national origin, disability, sexual orientation, and age.

Attention to multiple aspects of diversity for initial candidates is evident in several ways. First, all candidates are required to successfully complete courses that explore the range of human diversities, including EPSY 202-Psychology of Childhood and Adolescence and EPSY 341-Education in a Multicultural Society. The syllabus for EPSY 202 (Exhibit 4.3.x.7) indicates that "students study the practical applicability of different theories across diverse cultures and historical, local and global contexts." The syllabus for EPSY 341 (Exhibit 4.3.x.8) demonstrates attention to "identities predicated on race, ethnicity, culture, social class, gender, language, religion, sexual orientation, and exceptionalities."

Candidates are further required to demonstrate awareness of and adaptations for multiple diversities in the Teacher Work Sample, as noted in the scoring rubric (Exhibit 1.3.c.1). Similarly, advanced candidates must demonstrate competence in diversity, broadly defined, through the Advanced Program Diversity Assessment (Exhibit 1.3.c.4).

As noted in 3.5.5 above, our PDS partner schools are all high-poverty settings, providing candidates experience in working with socioeconomic diversity. However, these Vigo County schools reflect only a portion of the diversity that our candidates are likely to see in their professional careers. Therefore, in order for our teacher candidates to be aware of and have relevant experiences with diverse students, we must go outside of Vigo County to find those experiences. We have chosen to work with Logansport Community School Corporation (LCSC) for a pilot program of virtual field experiences. LCSC has a population of students very different from Vigo County. For example, according to the Indiana Department of Education, LCSC data show that the percentage of students who have limited English proficiency is 19.4%, their gifted and talented population is 22%, and their free and reduced lunch rate is 59%. All of these are important as they are higher in each category than the numbers in Vigo County. The special education population is lower than Vigo County at 14.7%. To provide candidates with virtual field experiences in diverse settings different from those available in the Terre Haute and the contiguous county areas, our pilot program will place two-way video cameras in a diverse school setting. ISU candidates will be able to view and interact with students and teachers in authentic settings through this technological solution.

4. Timeline or aggregated data showing diversity trends within the unit over time.

Table 11 in response to Item 2 in this standard presents data on the diversity trends over time for the teacher education unit, both at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Extending those data for the two prior years, Table 13 demonstrates that we have made slow but steady gains in the racial or ethnic diversity of undergraduate teacher education candidates. Graduate student diversity has also showed slight improvement over the same period.

Table 13. *Diversity Trends for Teacher Education Students, 2007-2011*

Teacher Education Undergraduate Students				
Year	Total	White	African American	Other Race/ Ethnicity
2007	1329	1211/91.1%	65/4.9%	35/2.6%
2008	1285	1174/91.4%	59/4.6%	33/2.6%
2009	1305	1176/90.1%	79/6.1%	36/2.8%
2010	1392	1180/84.8%	85/6.1%	42/3.0%
2011	1277	1117/87.5%	86/6.7%	55/4.3%
Teacher Education Graduate Students				
Year	Total	White	African American	Other Race/ Ethnicity
2007	726	557/76.7%	59/8.1%	30/4.1%
2008	798	630/78.9%	60/7.5%	29/3.6%
2009	763	594/77.9%	50/6.6%	37/4.8%
2010	725	537/74.1%	55/7.6%	27/3.7%
2011	703	515/73.3%	58/8.3%	29/4.1%

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?

Tables 6 and 7 and Exhibit 3.3.x.5 in response to Standard 3 provide information on the diversity of schools and faculty where candidates are placed in field experiences and clinical practice. Candidates will be available during the onsite visit to describe their experiences with diverse faculty in the field.

6. Interviews with candidates to confirm that they are interacting with diverse P-12 students.

Candidates will be available during the onsite visit to describe their experiences with diverse P-12 students.

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

5.4: Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard.

No areas of concern were identified.

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

1. Data on yearly faculty evaluations and teaching evaluations.

From 2006 until 2009, faculty annual reports were standardized into Digital Measures, a web-based database from which administrators, department chairpersons, and institutional researchers measured the aggregated activity of faculty across a range of variables. Since that time, different information management systems have been piloted, but not adopted. During the 2010-11 academic year, the unit developed an internal Faculty Effectiveness Questionnaire as a means of evaluation until an institution-wide process could be agreed upon; these were included with the IR as Exhibits 5.3.f.25 and 5.3.f.26. During the 2011-12 academic year, a Qualtrics survey format was adopted and an aggregated summary was generated for each academic unit's review, included in Table 14.

Table 14. *Faculty Performance Evaluation by Academic Unit, 2011-12*

College	Total	Overall Performance Evaluation		
		Contributing Exceptionally	Contributing	Contributing Below Expectations
Bayh College of Education	34	3/8.82%	30/88.24%	1/2.94%
College of Arts & Sciences	150	0	150/100%	0
College of Nursing Health and Human Services	34	4/11.76%	30/88.24%	0
College of Technology	25	0	25/100%	0
Cunningham Memorial Library	12	0	12/100%	0
Scott College of Business	29	5/17.24%	24/82.76%	0
Total	**287**	**12/4.18%**	**274/95.47%**	**1/0.35%**

Individual faculty evaluations were not maintained as per the terms of the pilot. At the end of the pilot, all evaluations were returned to the faculty members for further reflection. ISU will begin implementation of Sedona, an online reporting system, effective fall 2012. Beyond these efforts, activity reports are completed by departments each fall semester to more fully understand actual teaching, research, and service loads as well as administrative assignments. Aggregated information by college is included in Exhibit 5.3.x.1; additional data by faculty member are available in the Dean's Office.

Annual faculty evaluations for all tenure-track, multi-year contract, and adjunct faculty are maintained in the Dean's Office. Additionally, students are given the opportunity to review their instructors using the Student Instructional Report II (SIR). Beginning in the fall semester of 2009, a pilot was implemented for a sample of distance education students to submit their evaluations electronically (i.e., e-SIR). This pilot was extended to all distance education students in the spring 2010 and is now part of the institutionalized appraisal system. As such, SIR feedback is now collected for all courses (e.g., online, hybrid, face-to-face) via online survey and paper–pencil survey. Individual SIR course evaluations are maintained by the Testing Office and available upon request. Since the submission of the IR, fall 2011 and spring 2012 SIR data have been released, and the first iteration of e-SIR summary data has been released as well. These artifacts have been uploaded to the Exhibit Center (5.3.x.2, 5.3.x.3, 5.3.x.4, 5.3.x.5). The average of the new summaries indicates that instructor-related questions on the SIR and e-SIR average in the *effective* (4) range.

As a representative example of the positive benefits of the evaluation process, an educator preparation faculty member's teaching was found not to have met the standards of effectiveness for the unit. In particular, the courses being taught had "drifted" from the course syllabus, and multiple means of feedback supported this challenge. These means of feedback included self-reflection, peer feedback, chairperson feedback, student feedback, and consultation with the dean. As a result, goals and an improvement plan were established and the chairperson regularly monitored progress during the ensuing year. As part of the overall system of support for the faculty member, the Center for Instruction, Research, and Technology (CIRT) was encouraged as a resource for effective instruction. The CIRT staff worked directly with the faculty member to improve instruction. The faculty member has now received three consecutive years of unanimous support for reappointment and is now a valued and respected member of the academic community. Further evidence to support this example is available in the Dean's Office.

2. Data on availability and quality of professional development opportunities.

Multiple means are employed to ensure quality professional development opportunities exist. New faculty are provided a $3000 professional development account and participate in an intentional, interactive, semester-long orientation with senior faculty guiding them through what is expected of them at ISU.

Faculty travel and faculty development resources exist to provide ongoing assistance for faculty growth. Faculty are encouraged to build upon their disciplinary knowledge by publishing and presenting in scholarly venues as well as by participating in academic conferences and other professional growth experiences. Over $625,000 was spent supporting more than 1,000 faculty travel occurrences between 2009 and 2012. The purposes of that travel varied widely. Some of the travel resulted from courses taught away from campus or field supervision. The majority of the dollars and the majority of occurrences are attributable to faculty attending professional conferences. Table 15 contains summary data for professional development in the BCOE.

Table 15. *Travel Support for Faculty*

Bayh College of Education	2010	2011	2012
Number of Professional Development Trips	100	151	141
Number of Operational Trips	219	206	239
Total Dollars for Professional Development Trips	$ 54,459.04	$ 88,923.39	$ 74,807.88
Total Dollars for Operational Trips	$ 140,479.11	$ 112,685.22	$ 154,450.53

Table 16 provides self-reported data about the types of professional development faculty within the unit are engaging in. Also included in this table are data about the sponsors of the professional development activity as well as the category and funding source.

Table 16. *Faculty Professional Development Activities, 2009-2012*

	2009-2010			2010-2011		2011-2012	
Number of reported activities	177			232		271	
Sponsor:	**Department**	**BCOE**	**ISU**	**State/ Regional Campus, Agency, or Association**	**National Campus, Agency, or Association**	**International Campus, Agency, or Association**	**Other**
	33	54	85	141	146	63	40
Type:	**Seminar/ Class**	**Workshop/ Presentation**	**Conference/ Convention**	**Sabbatical Leave**	**One-on-One Consultation**	**Webinar/ On-line Module**	**Other**
	64	242	238	4	16	46	13
Category:	**Teaching**	**Research**	**Service**	**Community Engagement**	**Other**		
	332	226	147	82	74		
Funding Source:	**Department/ College**	**Grant**	**Personal**	**Free/No Funding Required**	**Other**		
	204	56	104	194	50		

The survey instrument is included as Exhibit 5.3.x.6, with the raw data in Exhibit 5.3.x.7. Names were removed from the data for the exhibit, but the full information is available for review in the Dean's Office. Types and categories of professional development in the survey were based on Centra's (1978) work. From 2009 through 2012, 680 professional development activities were reported by 77 individuals. Fifty-one percent of the reported activity was sponsored by campuses, agencies, or associations at the regional, state, or national levels. The remaining 49% was distributed across ISU sponsorship, international sponsorship, or the category of *other*. Regarding the type of professional development, workshops and conferences accounted for 77% of the reported activity. Seminars and webinars amounted to an additional 18% of reported activity. The remaining 5% of the professional development activity

was attributed to sabbatical leaves, consultation, and other. As it regards how the professoriate was influenced by professional development activity, which represented a duplicate count (i.e., one activity may have contributed to five different categories of professional growth), teaching was most greatly impacted (39%). Research (26%), service (17%), community engagement (10%) and other (8%) were also elements of the professoriate impacted by professional development activity over the three-year period. Finally, five areas of funding were indicated. The largest funding source came from institutional sources (i.e., department, college, sponsored program support) at 43%. Thirty-two percent of the activities had no cost. Personal funding accounted for 17%, with the remaining funding coming from other sources.

Central to faculty professional growth is the Center for Instruction, Research, and Technology (CIRT), which was created in 2005 as a reorganization of the previous Center for Teaching and Learning. The CIRT offers technology-based workshops with a strong pedagogy focus. Workshops assist faculty with course management software (WebCT, Blackboard), statistical software (SAS, SPSS), educational portfolio software (LiveText, Tk20), as well as Microsoft Office products and other general-use software. CIRT played an important role in working with faculty during the development of a laptop initiative, and it offers the Course Transformation Academy, a program to assist faculty in their transformation of on-campus courses for distance delivery. Through a brown-bag series and online tutorials, CIRT provides professional development on using a variety of technology learning tools and provides access to a digital sandbox where instructors can play with technology and determine its potential uses prior to purchase. Although currently in a process of reorganization, the CIRT, in conjunction with the Office of Information Technology and the Office of Extended Learning, will continue to provide ongoing pedagogical and technical support for faculty.

3. Interviews with candidates and other data about faculty performance (evaluation results, surveys, etc.).

In addition to the preceding information, Table 17 illustrates evaluation information about pre-tenured faculty for a three-year period. From 2009 through 2012, 33 probationary faculty were reappointed without reservations or conditions, four faculty received conditional evaluations, three faculty were non-reappointed, and eight faculty received tenure and/or promotion.

Table 17. *Summary Information on Tenure-Track Faculty Evaluations*

Tenure-Track Evaluations	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Reappointment	15	8	10
Conditional Appointment	1	2	1
Non-reappointment	0	1	2
Tenure and/or Promotion	3	3	2
Total	**19**	**14**	**15**

Candidates and faculty members will be available during the onsite visit to discuss faculty performance.

4. Feedback from other constituents (public school personnel, faculty in other areas) about collaboration with faculty.

Opportunities will be organized during the BOE visit to interact with constituents about collaboration with faculty.

5. Data on the use of adjunct faculty within the unit and the methods used to assess adjuncts.

Table 18 provides a summary table evidencing the use of adjunct faculty within the unit for the last three academic years. Data collected by semester for each individual instructor are available for review in the Dean's Office.

Table 18. *BCOE Adjunct Faculty, Fall 2009-Spring 2012*

	Fall 09	Spring 10	Fall 10	Spring 11	Fall 11	Spring 12
Number of Adjunct Faculty	46	44	40	37	45	44
Number of Different Courses Taught	30	32	31	22	28	23
Number of Credit Hours Generated	179	272.5	177	188	188	214

On average, the unit employs 43 adjunct faculty per semester who teach across 28 different courses and generate a combined total of 203 credit hours. It is noteworthy that approximately 52% of the total credit hours generated are student teaching and clinical supervision assignments.

All adjunct faculty are evaluated at least once per year. The appraisal form may be found at http://www.indstate.edu/academicaffairs/temporary_faculty.htm. Those who have performed their duties satisfactorily remain in a pool of qualified candidates to fill temporary positions as needed. Evaluation policies for adjunct faculty are maintained in the *ISU Handbook* at Section 305.11. Annual evaluations are maintained in the Dean's Office.

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

6.4: Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard.

No areas of concern were identified.

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

1. Data on comparability of budget to other professional schools.

Table 19 (also included as Exhibit 6.3.x.1) illustrates total expenditures per academic unit and the associated student full-time equivalencies (FTE). This comparative exhibit is supported by expenditure, revenue, and grants/contracts information from Business Affairs (Exhibit 6.3.x.2) and enrollment data from Institutional Research (Exhibit 6.3.x.3).

Table 19. *Expenditures by College by FTE, FY2010-FY2012*

FY2010	CAS	SCOB	BCOE	CNHHS	COT
Total Expenditures	$ 21,422,580.00	$ 6,614,457.00	$ 6,111,164.00	$ 4,429,492.00	$ 4,167,580.00
Fall 2009 Student FTE	3579	1018	1018	1419	907
Expenditures per FTE	$ 5,985.00	$ 6,497.00	$ 6,003.00	$ 3,121.00	$ 4,594.00
FY2011	**CAS**	**SCOB**	**BCOE**	**CNHHS**	**COT**
Total Expenditures	$ 20,803,693.00	$ 7,751,721.00	$ 5,682,835.00	$ 5,020,211.00	$ 4,567,606.00
Fall 2010 Student FTE	3863	1057	1061	1793	991
Expenditures per FTE	$ 5,385.00	$ 7,333.00	$ 5,356.00	$ 2,799.00	$ 4,609.00
FY2012	**CAS**	**SCOB**	**BCOE**	**CNHHS**	**COT**
Total Expenditures	$ 21,931,445.00	$ 6,184,152.00	$ 5,995,531.00	$ 5,769,764.00	$ 5,190,739.00
Fall 2011 Student FTE	3273	1120	1047	2186	1342
Expenditures per FTE	$ 6,700.00	$ 5,521.00	$ 5,726.00	$ 2,639.00	$ 3,867.00

Among the four professional units at the institution, the BCOE consistently ranks second and, in some instances, the expenditure per FTE for the BCOE is more than twice that of other professional units (e.g., FY2012, College of Nursing, Health, and Human Services). These data help affirm the institution's commitment to clinically-based programming.

2. Confirm that faculty workloads permit completion of service and research.

Opportunities will be organized during the BOE visit to confirm that workloads permit completion of service and research. Release time for scholarship, internal and external grants/contracts activity, fellowships, and discussion of the 12-hour teaching expectation related to general workload expectations will be described by faculty.

References

Centra, J. A. (1978). Types of faculty development programs. *Journal of Higher Education, 49,* 151-162.

Denner, P., Norman, A., & Lin, S.-Y. (2009). Fairness and consequential validity of teacher work samples. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Accountability, 21,* 235-254. doi: 10.1007/s11092-008-9059-6

Marbley, A. F., Bonner, F., & Berg, R. (2008). Measurement and assessment: Conversations with professional people of color in the field of education. *Multicultural Education, 16*(1), 12-20.