

**INSTITUTIONAL REPORT:
CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT OPTION**

**Indiana State University
September 23-25, 2012**

Updated July 11, 2012

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

INSTITUTIONAL REPORT: CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT OPTION

I. Overview and Conceptual Framework

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

The origins of Indiana State University (ISU) date back to December 20, 1865, when Indiana State Normal School was created by the Indiana Legislature. The primary mission was the “preparation of teachers for teaching in the common schools of Indiana.” The first bachelor’s degrees were awarded in 1908, the first master’s degrees in 1928, and the first doctorates in 1965. “University” status was achieved in 1965 and the name was changed to Indiana State University. Today, ISU is a comprehensive, [doctoral/research university](#) that includes Colleges of Arts and Sciences; Business; Education; Nursing, Health, and Human Services; Technology; and Graduate and Professional Studies. Institutional accreditation has been achieved from 27 accrediting bodies. Community engagement and experiential learning are core elements of ISU’s identity, and the university participated in the Carnegie Foundation’s “Curricular Engagement and Outreach and Partnerships” elective classification. In October 2009, ISU President Daniel Bradley introduced a five-year [strategic plan](#) with six goals for institutional transformation. Now in its third year of implementation, the strategic initiatives are moving forward with effects across the university and community.

1.2 What is the institution's mission?

[Indiana State University](#) combines a tradition of strong undergraduate and graduate education with a focus on community and public service. We integrate teaching, research, and creative activity in an engaging, challenging, and supportive learning environment to prepare productive citizens for Indiana and the world.

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

The [Bayh College of Education](#) (BCOE) and its dean are designated by the university as holding primary authority and responsibility for educator preparation. The professional education unit also includes all the colleges in the university that hold content areas in which we prepare educators: Arts and Sciences; Business; Nursing, Health, and Human Services; and Technology. These content areas all have faculty who have pedagogical content knowledge and have worked in P-12 schools.

The [Teacher Education Committee](#) (TEC; [I.5.a.7](#)) is charged with the overall responsibility to assist in planning, approving, and coordinating the various undergraduate and graduate programs that prepare licensed educators for the preschool through high school settings (P-12). Of the 18 voting members on TEC, eight come from the content faculty outside of the BCOE. Additionally, each college’s associate dean serves as an ex officio member of TEC.

Several significant changes have occurred since the last NCATE review. First, the BCOE has moved into a newly renovated facility, [University Hall](#). This historic building served as the University Lab School and has been transformed into a state-of-the-art teaching and learning center with technology-rich classrooms, a comprehensive clinic, and an impressive enclosed atrium. Second, structural and personnel changes have occurred across the university that have impacted educator preparation. The department of Family and Consumer Sciences moved from the College of Arts and Sciences and its teacher education program joined the College of Health and Human Services. Changes in unit leadership include a new dean of the College of Arts and Sciences (July 1, 2010) and a new associate dean of the BCOE and NCATE coordinator (July 1, 2011). A faculty fellow for assessment in the BCOE began in Fall 2010. Third, changes to the curriculum occurred; the intensive clinical field experiences that were explored as part of our three-year teacher quality grant from the USDOE have all been fully implemented. Finally,

significant licensure changes from the state in 2010-11 have impacted curriculum and enrollment for educator preparation programs. Additional licensure changes are currently in the state promulgation process.

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

The overarching theme of Indiana State University’s educator preparation programs is “**Becoming a Complete Professional**” ([1.5.c.2](#)). Initially adopted in 1991, the theme has undergone significant modifications over time and has been reaffirmed. In its original rendering, the theme encompassed five broad areas that framed program outcomes. As the profession moved to adopt standards developed by professional organizations and learned societies to guide its development, the theme and three focus areas emerged as the conceptual framework. Today our theme encompasses three broad areas that recognize the essential work of an educator: *educator as expert or mediator of learning, educator as person, and educator as member of communities.*

Inherent to Becoming a Complete Professional (BCP) is the unit’s commitment to diversity, technology, and professional dispositions. For technology, our programs utilize national educational technology standards. We work hard to provide professional development for faculty on the integration of technology and have excellent resources to support technology utilization for teaching and learning. The unit is committed to diversity within itself and the diversity proficiencies of our faculty, staff, and candidates. The BCOE has completed an extensive cultural audit and created a diversity plan. The unit has aligned all dispositional assessments with the conceptual framework and has assured that they are legally defensible, reflect the state standards, and are indicative of the candidates, faculty, and staff who represent the institution.

No major revisions have been made to the conceptual framework since the last visit; however, the document was reviewed and reaffirmed by the TEC and the BCOE Congress with minor revisions made. The BCOE mission and vision statements were both revised by the faculty as a whole in 2007, and our commitment to “Becoming a Complete Professional” factored into the development of the BCOE *Constancy of Purpose* ([1.5.c.1](#)), encompassing our mission, vision, and values.

II. Unit Standards

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

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

The initial and advanced unit-wide assessment systems (UAS) provide a framework for evaluating what candidate assessment data demonstrate about standards achievement and impact on P-12 learning. The findings as a whole indicate that, overall, both initial and advanced programs are producing graduates who are well-prepared to assume roles as professional educators and who embody the attributes of educator as *expert or mediator of learning, person, and member of communities.* Faculty at both program levels are initiating efforts to strengthen their assessment practices in a way that is linked to P-12 student learning needs, improved candidate performance, and data usage to inform practice and program refinement (see [1.3.d](#); [1.3.f](#); [1.3.i](#))

With regard to **content knowledge**, licensure exam data associated with initial and advanced teacher candidate programs indicate that candidates perform at an acceptable level. Praxis II ([1.3.k.1](#)) performance on statewide teacher licensure exams has moved consistently to the 80% pass rate. Furthermore, data from graduate and employer surveys ([1.3.i](#); [1.3.j](#)) indicate that noted strengths of ISU's teacher education programs are the instilling of a commitment to regular reflection on teaching to improve candidate learning and the ability to create meaningful learning experiences based on content knowledge.

Pedagogical content knowledge and skills are assessed via candidate in-class performance, early field experience, and end-of-program student teaching (see [1.3.c](#)). Furthermore, the integration of the Teachers of Tomorrow Advancing Learning (TOTAL) program for elementary and special education candidates has enabled those students an even greater intensive in-field experience prior to their student teaching ([3.3.a.100](#)). Assessments of these content-pedagogy elements indicate that candidates are performing at least to the acceptable level. Instructor and field supervisor evaluations (see [1.3.d](#)) are consistently strong, and work samples (see [1.3.h](#)) evidence ability to match content teaching to the appropriate developmental level of students and to meet the unique educational needs of students (e.g., working with poor children and students of color). Furthermore, technology assessments ([1.3.d.5](#); [1.3.d.6](#)) indicate mastery of technology integration for learning and generally strong and consistent performance in this arena.

For advanced teacher candidate programs, candidates are afforded opportunities for evidencing content-pedagogy linkages that optimize learning through both classroom and in-field activities and experiences. Instructor evaluations, field evaluations, technology assessments, employer surveys, and work samples (see [1.3.d](#)) indicate that candidates are performing adequately and utilizing appropriate pedagogical techniques that are developmentally appropriate for students. Action research project and case presentation work samples (see [1.3.h](#)) show that most candidates perform at the *meets* or *exceeds expectations* level.

In regards to **pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills**, candidate assessment data indicate that the unit is performing at an acceptable level. Within initial programs, candidates are assessed on lesson plan development, are provided micro-teaching lab opportunities, and receive a combination of peer, instructor, and field supervisor feedback on both professionalism and pedagogy (see [1.3.d](#); [1.3.f](#)). Furthermore, issues of diversity are integrated into the curriculum with assessments indicating candidates recognize that learning styles differ and are afforded opportunities to explore schools of thought through a combination of general education and educational foundations content through gateway courses ([1.3.d.3](#); [1.3.d.4](#)). For advanced programs, action research, program evaluation, and related data analysis elements are integrated that relate to the contexts for teaching as well as professionalism in that arena with candidate assessments indicating that the typical candidate at least meets expectations (see [1.3.g](#); [1.3.h](#)).

The assessment of student learning within initial and advanced programs, as evidenced through teacher work samples and unit reports (see [1.3.g](#); [1.3.h](#)), indicates that candidates have at least an acceptable grasp of the need for and application of data to assess student learning and use it to make teaching and content adjustments. Furthermore, they are afforded the opportunity to engage real data through their field experiences and observe how practicing teachers use it to improve instruction. Further attention is being devoted to making rubrics and assessments in this area stronger as a means of better preparing teacher candidates for the realities of the performance-based education environments they will confront upon graduation. These efforts have in part been stimulated by employer surveys (see [1.3.j](#)), indicating a desire for teachers better prepared to engage in more sophisticated classroom assessment of learning.

Other school professional training programs are delivered through master's and educational specialist degrees within the BCOE. Pass rates on the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA) for principal candidates have been consistently at or around 80% ([1.3.k.2](#); [1.3.k.3](#); [1.3.k.4](#)) while the pass rates for other professionals such as school psychologists and counselors is near or at 100% ([1.3.k.5](#); [1.3.k.6](#)), suggesting that performance overall is at least at the acceptable level. Employers state a desire for

professionals well versed in designing and conducting formative assessment. Analysis of syllabi, the recent addition of action research courses, and revamped research methods courses with a stronger focus on program evaluation have strengthened the unit's efforts in this regard.

For other professional programs, supporting learning for all students has also become a priority as evidenced by more intentional efforts at integrating diversity into courses and curricula and by a college-wide Diversity Plan ([4.3.g.1](#)) that emphasizes this as a crucial preparatory need for all graduates of the BCOE. School–community related content is strongly embedded in the programs for educational leaders.

Assessments of **professional dispositions** ([1.3.e.1](#)) are embedded in initial programs and indicate that candidates are performing at least at the acceptable level. Gateway courses serve as key assessment points with evidence that candidates generally meet or exceed expectations by the end of their programs. Dispositional remediation does occur within initial programs and, for some programs, undergraduate committees are convened and plans of action developed to provide candidates an opportunity to overcome deficiencies.

At the advanced level, dispositions are also assessed at key points in their studies, most importantly at the field experience point at the end of those programs. Data evidence for dispositions at the advanced level indicates that most candidates are evaluated as meets or exceeds expectations by the end of their programs ([1.3.f.2](#)). Results from employer and intern supervisor surveys ([1.3.j.2](#); [1.3.j.3](#)) also suggest that program graduates/candidates are respected for their professionalism and dispositional orientations.

1.2.b Continuous Improvement

A variety of assessment means are utilized to ensure the continuous improvement of candidate performance as well as program quality. Assessment data are used to inform programs, course content, curriculum, pedagogy, and unit-level changes.

A significant data-driven change included the integration of the TOTAL program as a means of enhancing elementary and special education candidates' knowledge and experience in actual teaching practice. Teachers of Tomorrow Advancing Learning (TOTAL) was established in 2009 following an ISU grant supported by the Lilly Foundation to recognize the Teacher Education Program as a Program of National Distinction ([1.3.1.1-1.3.1.6](#)).

The TOTAL program provides candidates continuous immersion in schools prior to the student teaching semester, allowing them to be better prepared to engage fully as student teachers ([1.3.1.5](#)). After two weeks of instruction, elementary teacher candidates in the semester prior to student teaching go into schools three full days a week for an immersion experience. They are paired with a classroom teacher and are not expected to be alone with pupils, unlike student teaching. Cooperating teachers are prepared by ISU faculty to supervise a preservice teacher before hosting a TOTAL intern. Throughout the semester, candidates are in schools all week and are supervised by faculty and the cooperating teacher. The TOTAL semester provides opportunities for remediation for those who are not meeting expectations before they enter the student teaching phase ([3.3.a.416](#)). This program also ensures that teacher candidates have experiences in multiple settings that include the following: low socio-economic, special education inclusion, cultural diversity, and language diversity. These are areas of high need in Indiana, and it is essential that our teacher candidates demonstrate diversity competencies ([1.3.d.3](#); [4.3.f.1](#)).

Also established in 2009 and driven by data was the Immersion Early Field Experience (Immersion EFE) for secondary and all grade programs, which pairs teacher candidates with a classroom teacher. The candidates are engaged for an instructional period a day for five days a week for five weeks. The candidate acts as classroom aide and then takes on the role of teacher for a 5-8 day unit of instruction. The candidate plans, delivers, assesses, reflects upon outcomes and provides remediation for the instructional unit. Moreover, the candidate produces a report of the unit and its effectiveness, basing conclusions on student academic engagement and achievement. Beyond this, the candidate learns the school improvement goals and incorporates these into the instructional practices as appropriate to the goals and

the setting. Finally, the candidate is engaged in the larger school culture through a series of learning modules designed to help the candidate understand how schools work across units to support the development and academic achievement of the student.

The TOTAL and Immersion EFE programs made three significant data-driven changes:

1. An increase in early field experiences for all teacher candidates through coordination with content faculty (see [3.3.a](#) exhibits). This was highlighted through the Teachers for a New Era site visit at ISU in summer 2011 ([1.3.1.7](#)).
2. Increased integration and enhancement of content and courses to prepare teacher and other professional candidates to use data to inform practice (e.g., [3.3.a.18](#), [3.3.a.100](#)).
3. Collecting information in order to know if ISU teacher candidates are having an effect on P-12 pupils. Regarding this challenge, secondary teacher candidates in their pre-student teaching field experience are required to present to their ISU supervisor evidence of having conducted formative and summative assessments throughout the course of five lessons they have taught. At this stage, candidates are not evaluated on the evidence of their effectiveness measured by these assessments, but must indicate that they have reflected on how to improve their practice if they have not been effective. Elementary teacher candidates in TOTAL complete an abbreviated teacher work sample, which requires candidates to focus on P-12 student learning. Additionally, in the Sycamore Readers program, ISU teacher candidates serve as reading tutors for elementary students. Tutors administer pre- and post-tests bracketing the school year; over three years, the average annual increase for Sycamore Readers students was 1.98 grade levels ([5.3.d.401](#)). Seventy-five percent of Sycamore Readers score at or above target on rate of improvement on the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) test. Tutors also conduct a Student Post Survey that asks pupils to rate the tutoring program and any improvements in reading engagement and motivation.

Another significant data-driven change includes the addition of a Clinical Faculty Associate (CFA; [6.3.h.8](#); [1.3.1.5](#)). The CFA model provides unique opportunities for ISU's P-12 colleagues to work as full-time special faculty in the Department of Elementary, Early and Special Education (EESE) or the Department of Curriculum, Instruction and Media Technology (CIMT) with other university faculty responsible for the elementary or secondary teacher education program. Because of an Indiana state statute, CFAs are allowed a one year sabbatical and return to their position with the school corporation with tenure intact. CFAs supervise interns and student teachers, work with veteran teachers, co-teach with regular university faculty, provide professional development for the TOTAL interns, and coordinate professional development opportunities for in-service teachers. In some cases, CFAs teach the introductory elementary or secondary education course, which exposes ISU teacher candidates to current classroom practice early in their course of study.

Another continuous improvement change focused on candidate success is an effort to strengthen a culture of assessment across the unit, including the refinement of data collection tools and their ease of use to enable better data entry, analysis, and report production ([1.3.1.8-1.3.1.10](#), [2.3.a.1](#), [2.3.d.3-2.3.d.8](#)). The BCOE changed vendors from LiveText to Tk20 for collection of assessment data and artifacts. Changes in the administration of Tk20, including ensuring all enrolled candidates have Tk20 accounts, have led to wider adoption and ease of use for faculty and candidates ([2.3.d.11-2.3.d.17](#)). Being able to access, through Tk20, all candidates in advanced programs should remove gaps found in the key assessments for graduate programs. Further, the unit has enhanced resources to assist faculty and programs build their culture of assessment through re-tasking of information technology personnel to assist faculty in their use of Tk20 in addition to the provision of assistance from the BCOE Assessment Fellow ([1.3.1.11](#)).

Evidence also suggests that further attention must be given to the integration of contextual factors affecting student learning, most especially issues of diversity ([1.3.1.12](#), [1.3.1.13](#)). For example, a major grant project is under development that will enable candidates to “virtually visit” partner school(s) with

significant student diversity ([4.3.i.2](#)). A campus-wide effort to diversify the faculty is also underway for which the BCOE has already benefitted via hiring two new African American faculty members ([4.3.g.4](#), [4.3.g.5](#)).

At the advanced level, the counselor educator program restructured course offerings based upon candidate feedback that indicated a May graduation better served their needs as opposed to an August graduation ([1.3.1.14-1.3.1.17](#)). The principal preparation program reduced its total program hours from 39 to 33 based on feedback from competing programs across the state as well as standards-driven changes in licensure at the state level ([1.3.1.18-1.3.1.20](#)).

At the course level, host teacher and candidate exit interviews at the CIMT 301-302 level indicated a need to create an education survey course (i.e., CIMT 200) at the sophomore level. Planning and coordination over the past year resulted in the course formation as of Fall 2011 ([1.3.1.24](#)).

Data-driven evidence also influenced the integration of a Tutoring Initiative as a means of enhancing secondary education candidates' knowledge and experience in the areas of literacy and numeracy as part of the professional development school project ([1.3.1.25](#)). Discussions with Sarah Scott Middle School led to a pilot project where CIMT 301-302 candidates engaged in tutoring biweekly, followed by reflective discussions. The success of this project has illustrated the need for this expanded cooperation between a PDS school and ISU.

In elementary programming, curriculum changes included changing ELED 100 to ELED 101, a new course designed to encourage exploration of teaching as a career choice. It provides community engagement with experiential learning where candidates will develop skills in observation and interaction with children. Over the course of several months and numerous meetings, all members of the EESE department participated in a review of the ELED program. A study of the data revealed a significant number of freshmen declared an interest in majoring in elementary education when first enrolling at ISU, but did not graduate from the program. This course was designed to provide early and continuous contact with the professional program to strengthen enrollees' experiences and provide them with more early support for their career choice.

Most recently, evidential feedback from the alumni survey ([1.3.i.1](#)), increased issues with initial placements ([1.3.1.21](#)), as well as new [accountability policy measures](#) at the state level for teachers and schools in Indiana have necessitated a greater role for our P-12 partners in the selection and placement of student teachers ([1.3.1.22](#)). As such, an advisory committee for student teaching has been developed to assist the unit in making informed placement decisions. It is hoped this advisory will be fully operationalized by July 1, 2012 ([1.3.1.23](#)).

In 2010 Indiana moved away from a state accreditation model as part of a larger array of educational reforms. In doing so, educator preparation units across the state had the opportunity to retain national accreditation of its programs through SPA, or select an annual statewide reporting method. Indiana State University enthusiastically moved to the SPA model. At the time of this report submission, seven programs are accredited, 10 are nationally recognized, and nine programs have conditions which they are addressing through re-submission of the SPA. A significant amount of continuous improvement data support change for candidate performance and program quality. These are available at the [AIMS site](#).

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

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

The BCOE maintains a unit assessment system (UAS) that enables stakeholders to evaluate initial and advanced candidates as they matriculate through programs to become complete professionals. The *Professional Education Program Assessment Handbook* ([2.3.a.1](#)) provides an overview of the UAS, the key assessments, and decision points. The key assessments identified and utilized in the UAS form a common core to evaluate and monitor development of candidates, and thus performance of the unit, in the areas of educator as expert or mediator of learning, person, and member of communities. Additionally, UAS assessments are organized along a developmental sequence: admission to the program, midpoint, completion, and post-graduation serve as decision points.

The UAS was formed in such a way as to continuously provide information to help the unit answer questions about candidate performance and effectiveness of unit operations. For candidates, the guiding questions include how well they (a) support P-12 student learning (work samples, [1.3.c.1](#), [1.3.c.2](#), and student teaching performance evaluations, [1.3.c.9](#)), (b) use technology to support learning (technology assessments, [1.3.c.5](#), [1.3.c.6](#)), (c) develop appropriate dispositions (dispositional assessment, [1.3.e.1](#)), (d) work with diverse learners (diversity assessments, [1.3.c.3](#), [1.3.c.4](#)), and (e) perform overall (Praxis I and II data, [1.3.b.1](#), [1.3.b.2](#), [1.3.k.1](#), program reports, and alumni and employer surveys, [1.3.i.1-1.3.i.5](#), [1.3.j.1-1.3.j.3](#)).

For unit operations, the guiding questions include how effective the unit operations are in terms of (a) faculty effectiveness (faculty effectiveness survey, [2.3.d.9](#)), (b) diversity of faculty and candidates (unit demographic data, [4.3.d.1](#), [4.3.e.1](#)), (c) field operations (field demographics, [4.3.f.1](#), and hours in field work), (d) advising (advising survey, [6.3.d.5](#)), (e) placement and retention of graduates (alumni survey, [1.3.i.2](#), [1.3.i.4](#), [1.3.i.5](#)), and (f) retention of candidates ([5.3.f.23](#), [5.3.f.24](#)). These data are aggregated into unit-level findings that inform unit-level decisions. Unit-level decisions are then introduced back into the programs, closing the loop.

UAS key assessments form a data core common to programs in the BCOE. Program-level data collection surrounds this core, involving comprehensive and integrated assessments related to professional standards. Key assessments at the program and unit-level produce data that enable the Teacher Education Committee (TEC), department chairs, dean's office, and faculty to review candidate performance, view trends, and address challenges and opportunities that arise from the analyses of these trends. Key assessments have been modified over the past seven years as a result of feedback from stakeholders. This feedback is formally gathered at the annual BCOE Assessment Day and through the communication loop among faculty, TEC, and the UAS committee.

TEC, the BCOE Congress, Professional Development Schools, and departmental committees are the formal structures providing extensive and ongoing review of programs. These structures serve as conduits for the flow of data into the system as well as being responsive to changes at the unit level. TEC has oversight and governance responsibilities over the UAS at both initial and advanced levels. TEC has empowered a UAS planning committee to oversee administration of the UAS, create and modify key assessments, and coordinate annual collection, analysis, and dissemination of data. This committee has primary responsibility for ensuring that assessments have content validity and meet standards of fairness, accuracy, and reliability. The Unit Assessment Planning Committee (UAPC) is composed of faculty representing TEC, content areas, teacher preparation programs, department chairs, and the BCOE assessment director.

The unit has active discussions about the use of assessment instruments. Forums provide opportunities for our professional community to provide input regarding the use of assessments. These forums include (a) Assessment Day (held annually in the fall), (b) TEC regular meetings, (c) TEC thematic seminars or discussion meetings, (d) UAPC meetings, and (e) department-level meetings ([2.3.d.18-2.3.d.24](#)). The unit-level changes that have occurred in the past seven years due to feedback from these forums can be found in Exhibit [2.3.h.1](#).

Assessment Day, occurring annually in September, is a major venue and focal point for the flow of UAS data to stakeholders and stakeholder feedback to the UAPC. The UAPC collects this feedback, makes necessary modifications to the UAS, and provides recommendations for change to the TEC for possible action. Traditionally, Assessment Day was organized around discussion of all aspects of the UAS. Although informative, presentation of the entire UAS at one Assessment Day was viewed as overwhelming by stakeholders. Starting in 2010, this annual forum was organized around the unit's conceptual framework, focusing on one theme each year. Year 1 of this cycle (2010) focused on *educator as person* and corresponding UAS key areas of disposition, diversity assessment, demographics of field placement sites, and demographics of candidates and faculty. Year 2 of the cycle (2011) focused on *educator as expert or mediator of learning* and corresponding UAS key areas of work sample, technology evaluation, supervised teaching evaluation, and field work assessments. Year 3 of this cycle (2012) will focus on *educator as member of communities* with corresponding UAS key areas of alumni data, employer data, and faculty effectiveness measures. When fully implemented, Assessment Day will be able to provide three years of data for each key UAS area.

Data collection decision points are approved by the TEC. The alignment with our conceptual framework and the belief that the purpose of teacher education programs is to move candidates along a continuum of *Becoming a Complete Professional* has led to the organization of assessment at the initial level around BCP levels. Steps along this continuum are labeled with the initials *BCP*, referencing the conceptual framework upon which our programs are built ([2.3.b.1](#)). This organization is outlined below.

- BCP1–Admission to teacher candidacy
- BCP2–Entrance to student teaching
- BCP3–Recommendation for licensure

At the advanced level, a continuum approach of achieving the conceptual framework is also used, though the *BCP* label is not used. This organization is outlined below.

- Admission to program
- Entry to professional experience
- Exit from program

Information technology plays a strong role in the functioning of the UAS. The BCOE originally used LiveText for this purpose, but transitioned to the use of Tk20 ([2.3.d.11](#)) as the predominant database for UAS and programmatic data collection and storage in 2006. All unit faculty members are activated as users of this system. This system allows key assessments to be deployed to faculty of courses identified by programs as UAS key assessment venues. Data are then collected on the candidates in these courses and stored on the Tk20 server. Faculty also have the resources of the assessment director to assist in the retrieval, aggregation, and analysis of data and information technology personnel in the BCOE for assistance with deployment of assessments to the system and access issues.

The key UAS assessments at initial and advanced levels are organized into the following areas:

- Candidate admission and testing data ([2.3.b.3](#))
- Candidate dispositions ([1.3.e.1](#))
- Work sample from candidates working in the field ([1.3.g.1-1.3.g.23](#))
- Evaluation of candidate efficacy in fieldwork ([1.3.d.7](#), [1.3.d.8](#))
- Candidate utility with technology ([1.3.d.5](#), [1.3.d.6](#))

- Candidate ability to work with diverse populations ([1.3.d.3](#), [1.3.d.4](#))
- Assessment of faculty effectiveness ([2.3.d.9](#), [2.3.d.10](#))
- Assessment of quality of faculty advising ([6.3.d.5](#))
- Surveys of alumni and employers ([1.3.i.1-1.3.i.5](#), [1.3.j.1-1.3.j.3](#)).

2.2.b Continuous Improvement

The UAS is an adaptive system ([2.3.a.1](#)). It is modified to respond to the changing needs and nature of curricula, candidates, faculty, and accreditation needs. With each adaptation of the system, we strive to better meet the needs of all users of the data. Notable changes include the data system utilized for the UAS, instruments developed and implemented as part of the system, implementation of an annual Assessment Day, and the structure and work of the UAPC.

In 2006, the unit began a transition from the use of LiveText to the use of Tk20 as the primary database for UAS data, with initial training and set up by Tk20 personnel occurring in December 2007 ([2.3.d.11](#)). This change was due to feedback from the community regarding the usefulness of the system relative to our needs. While there remains work to be done, the unit has made great strides in implementation of this data management system. Use of this system allowed the UAS database to go beyond merely storing data for retrieval into electronic storage, deployment of UAS assessment instruments, and comprehensive tracking of UAS data. This system further allows generating detailed reports on the data held in the system for use in needed data analytic activities.

Plans for increasing faculty usage of Tk20 in data management and enhancing the system are underway. Beginning with the 2011-2012 academic year, the support structures for Tk20 available to faculty have changed. The director of Instructional and Information Technology Services oversees and supports faculty usage of Tk20. The assessment director oversees and supports faculty and unit data and assessment needs. We also plan to explore possibilities with Tk20 of implementing online portfolios to benefit candidates.

Multiple accomplishments have been made in fully populating our assessment system with instruments. We have attempted to produce common assessments across programs when possible. Feedback gathered at Assessment Day 2007 indicated a need for common assessments in the areas of dispositions and diversity at the initial level ([2.3.d.2](#); [TEC 9-18-2007](#)). At the advanced levels, Assessment Day 2007 feedback indicated a desire for usage of an advising and faculty effectiveness survey, technology assessment, diversity assessment, dispositional assessment, and common rubric applied to diverse programmatic work samples. A common dispositional assessment for advanced programs was approved by TEC on [September 18, 2007](#). In [November of 2007](#) TEC approved usage at the advanced level of the advising and faculty effectiveness survey, the technology evaluation, the diversity assessment, and the common rubric for an educator work sample. Another accomplishment of the UAS committee was the creation of alumni and employer surveys at both the initial and advanced levels ([TEC 10-19-2010](#)). These surveys query recent graduates and employers of graduates every three years ([1.3.i.1](#), [1.3.i.3](#), [1.3.j.1](#)). The alumni and employer surveys for initial programs were distributed in spring semester 2011. Distribution of the surveys for advanced programs is planned for the 2011-2012 academic year. Also developed and implemented during the 2010-2011 academic year was a faculty effectiveness survey ([2.3.d.9](#); [2.3.d.10](#)). This was conducted to gather information necessary for unit operations. This will be conducted every three years. Plans for improvement to the UAS measures include development of a standard exit survey for advanced programs.

Some of the most exciting accomplishments have come from the implementation and evolution of our annual Assessment Day. Our first Assessment Day took place in January of 2007 ([2.3.d.3](#)). Since this time, Assessment Day has taken place in September ([2.3.d.4-2.3.d.8](#)), kicking off the academic year and allowing the summer for annual aggregation and analysis of data across programs. The first Assessment Day gathered data from all programs, and individuals across programs presented data organized around

UAS guiding questions. This was followed quickly in September of 2008 ([2.3.d.4](#)) with the second annual Assessment Day. From this, and all subsequent Assessment Days, feedback from the data analysis and from the community present at Assessment Day was formalized into a set of recommendations by the UAS committee for possible action by TEC. Assessment Day 2009 ([2.3.d.5](#)) included the use of breakout sessions following formal presentation of the unit data. Breakout sessions to discuss aspects of the UAS or other assessment issues have been a hallmark of Assessment Day since this time. These have allowed for collection of more in-depth feedback from the educational community around aspects of our UAS. Assessment Day 2010 ([2.3.d.6](#); [2.3.d.7](#)) marked two notable innovations. The day began with a keynote speaker, invigorating increased interest in the day's activities. Additionally, this was the first year of the previously noted three-year cycle organized around the conceptual framework. In this way, the UAS and Assessment Day have moved beyond provision of annual data based on guiding questions toward presentation of multi-year data on candidate and unit performance emphasizing the BCP conceptual framework. In the future, the structure of this day will continue to adapt to the needs of the community. Assessment Day 2011 provided our first look into shaping a culture that values assessment. An interactive survey was developed that has evolved into many discussions across the unit regarding the issues involved with changing the culture of the organization ([1.3.1.8](#), [1.3.1.9](#)).

Accomplishments have also been made in terms of establishing that the assessments used in the system are fair, unbiased, reliable, and valid. Admittedly, there is a great deal of work yet to be done, especially in establishing the exact psychometric properties of UAS instruments. Nevertheless, the UAS is advancing in this area. During Assessment Day 2008, a discussion about the inter-rater reliability and content validity of assessment tools emerged. Shortly thereafter, the UAS committees were formally charged by TEC to establish the reliability and validity of all measures ([TEC 9-16-2008](#)). In April 2009, a plan to guide this work was presented to and approved by TEC ([TEC 4-21-2009](#)). Although this plan lacked a corresponding timeline for implementation, it did initiate a process. With the appointment of a BCOE assessment director in Fall 2010 (suggested by participants in Assessment Day 2010), there should be sufficient resources to accomplish much of this plan during the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 academic years. The initial and advanced subcommittees of the UAPC have been combined to address assessment comprehensively across the unit. The newly combined UAS committee began a process of reviewing established instruments for face validity, content validity, fairness, and assessment issues during Spring 2011. This process began looking into the diversity assessment, dispositional assessment, work sample, and technology assessments at both the initial and advanced levels ([2.3.a.1](#)). This process will be ongoing and eventually exhaustive of all measures used in the UAS.

Additionally, the BCOE has adopted the NCATE SPA assessment model. All initial and advanced programs are now required to identify six to eight key assessments which are used to assess candidate proficiencies in relation to professional standards. All program reports are available in [AIMS](#).

Further, previous accreditation reviews have indicated the need for a database for registered candidate complaints. In 2007, this situation was rectified with the establishment of a database for storage of data on the nature of complaints and the resolutions reached in each case ([TEC 12-11-2007](#)).

While still at an introductory and discussion level, the unit is engaging in conversations and planning on enhanced efforts to assess candidates after they graduate and enter the workforce. The state is adopting a feedback model that will greatly assist these efforts. The degree to which our programs are successful can best be assessed through the performance of our graduates. Information is necessary on the hiring and success of these individuals in schools and with students. As a unit, we strive for a culture of assessment. The BCOE Dean has been instrumental in focusing our efforts as a unit to embrace the concept of assessment, to make it a larger part of the conversations we have at all levels, formal and informal. While cultures do not change quickly, Assessment Day 2011 ([2.3.d.8](#)) provided an optimal venue for a big step toward a shift in our culture that values assessment more. Data were collected, analyzed, shared, and discussed relative to the unit culture. These conversations have been sustained throughout the 2011-2012 year, to include the January retreat. We strive to be continuously data-driven. We attempt to create a

healthy and energetic dialogue around assessment issues. We desire an atmosphere where assessment is embraced, where it is a professional way of life.

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

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

ISU has long collaborated with local and statewide school corporations to provide relevant and rigorous field experiences and clinical placements for our initial and advanced candidates. One of the conduits for these partnerships is our nationally recognized ([5.3.e.512](#)) Professional Development Schools (PDS) partnership ([3.3.a.1](#)). Since its inception, the PDS partnership has maintained joint meetings among all partners in the unit including colleagues from public schools, content departments on campus, and the BCOE ([3.3.a.2](#), [3.3.a.3-3.3.a.8](#), [3.3.a.117](#), [3.3.a.114](#), [3.3.a.115](#), [3.3.a.11](#)). In addition, departmental meetings with school partners allow for discussion and modification of programs for teacher education candidates. The collaborative meetings have been used to consider all aspects of the partnership, including the design, implementation and evaluation of the BCP conceptual framework. During these discussions, special consideration is given to the alignment of public school curricula and the unit's conceptual framework. As our collaborative efforts mature, the unit's success or failure is inexorably tied to the success or failure of our P-12 partners.

The PDS network has provided block grants to support professional development activities for school partners ([3.3.a.9](#)). The block grants require substantive links between the grant initiatives and school mission and continuous improvement efforts. The grants are reviewed by members of the PDS Steering Committee and feedback given prior to approval. Grant outcomes are shared at subsequent PDS meetings so that findings and best practices discovered are shared among the community partners. Moreover, small research grants are also offered, which support public school and university faculty research teams as a means of more deeply discovering best practices at individual sites that enhance P-12 student learning ([3.3.a.10](#)).

Most recently, members of the PDS partnership have engaged in a redesign of the teacher education programs to facilitate longer clinically immersive early field experiences prior to student teaching. This redesign has resulted in better coordination in, and targeting of, these extended experiences ([3.3.a.100](#), [3.3.a.18](#), [3.3.a.19](#), [3.3.a.20](#)).

To complement the clinical field placement process, our EESE programs hold regular meetings with teachers, principals, and BCOE faculty to discuss program focus, direction, assessments, and placements ([3.3.a.115](#)). These meetings are intended to support TOTAL interns' learning and clinical practice and their socialization into a new professional community. Additionally, during regular trainings for TOTAL, coaching teachers, mentor teachers and EESE faculty work to implement clinical experiences that meet program goals, state requirements, and student needs ([3.3.a.201-3.3.a.252](#)). For TOTAL interns, coaching teachers and university faculty provide the formal evaluations for the semester, and these meetings affirm the evaluation design and expectations (e.g., [3.3.a.218](#), [3.3.a.320](#), [3.3.a.238](#)).

The preceding clinical field model is similar for the all-grade and middle/high school Immersion EFE. In these secondary programs, university content faculty, BCOE faculty, a building administrator, and the departmental chairperson are directly involved in placements for each site. This joint determination of placement allows for a "best fit" of the candidate and site to maximize mentoring and P-12 student learning ([3.3.a.23](#)).

It is during these placements that classroom teachers work with university faculty to determine the most appropriate learning opportunities for teacher candidates ([3.3.a.120](#)). Expectations for these clinical experiences are clearly outlined in handbooks which the classroom teachers receive during regular meetings with university faculty ([3.3.a.201-252](#)). Classroom teachers discuss with university faculty ways to better support teacher candidates' abilities to develop as a mediator of learning, a person, and a member of communities (e.g., [3.3.a.252](#), [3.3.a.201](#), [3.3.a.223](#), [3.3.a.19](#), [5.3.c.5](#)).

Of significance in the discussion regarding field experiences is the position of Clinical Faculty Associate (CFA) which emerged from the redesign efforts ([6.3.h.8](#)). The CFA supports programs by teaching methods courses, consulting with departments on current best practices among PDS partners, and in jointly ensuring program refinement with the programs' departments. Additionally, the CFA participates actively on university-wide teacher education curriculum committees as well as other committees designed improve the quality of programming and improve candidate performance to advance the mission and vision of the BCOE.

After or during the extended field experiences and prior to the student teaching semester, BCOE staff meet with candidates for student teaching to determine their preferred placement relative to their previous field experience placements ([3.3.b.4](#), [3.3.e.3](#)). The candidates' requests are then sent to respective departments (i.e., Elementary Education, special education, English, etc.) for department approval ([3.3.e.7](#)). After approval is received from the content departments, staff members contact school corporation contacts to determine appropriate placements. The contact may be between the staff member in the BCOE, between professional staff and school administrators, or between BCOE faculty and faculty in school corporations. The placements are then approved by the host teacher, the principal, and the central office personnel, where appropriate. It is imperative that our P-12 partners have a clear stake in the placement of candidates.

During the student teacher semester, a train-the-trainer model is used whereby adjunct faculty train individual host teachers. The requirements for the host teacher are outlined in the *Student Teaching Handbook* ([3.3.b.1](#)). The supervisors who provide this training attend an annual training session provided by the BCOE ([3.3.b.2](#)). Prior to their student teaching semester, all teacher candidates are required to attend a student teacher orientation meeting ([3.3.b.3](#)), where candidates are introduced to the expectations during the semester. They meet with a university supervisor who reviews all relevant paperwork and the requirements for the semester as well as the supports available. A contract exists to provide a basis for the policies during the student teaching semester ([3.3.a.11](#), [3.3.a.12](#)). Candidates are also advised of the rights of the school corporation in that candidates are required to observe all policies of the corporation ([3.3.a.307](#)).

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*. Additionally, both the M.Ed. and Ed.S. administrative programs have created school partnerships with ISU faculty, which include Sycamore Educator Day ([3.3.e.8](#)), the annual Law Conference ([3.3.e.9](#)), and university supervisor visits to the host schools. The evaluations required for both the school/district supervisors and candidates are rigorous and ongoing, supporting the BCP conceptual framework. Similarly, the M.Ed. program in School Counseling hosts a statewide Counselor Day on Campus ([3.3.e.10](#)) event, which is intended to strengthen partnerships across the state. Site supervisors and PDS partners are regular conference presenters ([3.3.e.11](#)).

Graduate candidates in communication disorders are placed in schools for part of their field experiences. Education Student Services has the primary responsibility to secure school placements for candidates. In the school counseling program and the school psychology programs, program coordinators work with school sites to secure field placements for each candidate. All three programs have close ties with the Vigo County School Corporation, and both school counseling and school psychology have a strong relationship with South Vermillion School Corporation and the Covered Bridge Special Services

Cooperative. Candidates have the opportunity to complete field experiences in a location of their choice. As such, the program coordinators have developed relationships with a variety of districts and schools across the state (e.g., [5.3.c.2](#)).

Implementation and Evaluation

EESE candidates reflect throughout their undergraduate experience after teaching, in seminars, via work samples, during weekly reflective conferences, and in formative and summative evaluation settings (e.g., [3.3.a.218](#), [3.3.a.238](#), [3.3.a.308](#), [3.3.a.316](#)). Teacher candidates, through TOTAL and Immersion EFE, are provided with multiple opportunities to learn pedagogy through their actual practice in a supervised classroom experience. Classroom teacher coaches and university faculty model effective teaching practices and then provide support to candidates as they teach lessons congruent with school academic standards.

During the TOTAL semester, undergraduates participate in school faculty meetings, instructional teams, intervention cohorts, and leadership advisory boards ([3.3.a.321](#)). They are considered members of the learning community and are involved in professional decisions that impact the school setting.

Undergraduates complete several service learning components prior to their immersion semester (e.g., [ELED101](#), [ELED200](#)). Candidates in advanced programs for elementary and special education complete an action research project in their classroom (e.g., [1.3.g.10](#), [1.3.g.11](#)). 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.

Because university faculty are in the schools weekly, they and the classroom coaches collaborate on a continual basis to create well designed learning opportunities for teacher candidates. Teacher candidates must reflect in a cognitive coaching reflective conference after each instructional event. During student teaching, candidates complete a Teacher Work Sample which requires them to reflect upon their practice using data they have collected before and after teaching ([1.3.c.1](#)). Regular seminars occur that provide the opportunity for teacher 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 ([3.3.b.1](#)).

For candidates in the CIMT Immersion EFE, the process is closely aligned with EESE candidate experiences. A recent redesign of the teacher education program to facilitate longer, more immersive early field experiences prior to student teaching prompted review of programs in both the university and PDS sites to identify and refine practices in which to engage candidates as mediators of learning, members of communities, and persons. During this experience, the candidates become aware of accountability issues that impact their practice, such as the A-F Accountability Model and statewide testing, such as ISTEP+ and IREAD-3. As a result, 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 to positively impact student achievement, to practice positive classroom management, and to share in the day-to-day operations of the school ([3.3.a.18](#), [3.3.a.19](#)).

Oversight of candidates' work is mutually carried out by public school coaches/hosts and university faculty in the BCOE and from the content disciplines ([3.3.a.20](#)). The Immersion EFE allows for stronger collaboration among partners as well as highly responsive collaborative mentoring of candidates. Moreover, the time spent collaboratively envisioning and realizing the immersion experience has resulted in trust and a common language between partners. These, coupled with the trust allowed to build between mentors and candidates as facilitated by an extended period of time to work together, result in more accurate evaluation and feedback for candidate development ([3.3.a.19](#)).

Host teachers for the secondary/all grade Immersion EFE were identified by school-based department chairpersons and administrators for the first iteration of the experience. An all-day training session was

held ([3.3.a.24](#)). New coaches are identified by education faculty, department chairpersons, and building level administrators. Training is held with the new coaches either individually or in a group session as needs demand ([3.3.a.19](#), [3.3.a.20](#), [3.3.a.21](#), [3.3.a.22](#)).

In advanced programs in CIMT, M.Ed. candidates carry out action research projects in their home schools (e.g., [1.3.h.13](#), [1.3.h.17](#)). Graduate programs in school counseling, school psychology, and communication disorders focus on meeting the needs of the schools in which they are placed (e.g., [1.3.h.29](#)). Candidates not affiliated with any school corporation request the schools in which they would like placement. University faculty and building level administrators jointly determine placements.

Candidates in the school psychology program begin field experiences their first semester on campus with the Read Program in the South Vermillion Community School Corporation (SVCSC). During their second year, they continue placement at SVCSC and add an additional school placement, determined by a combination of university faculty, special education co-operatives, and some candidate choice ([3.3.e.4](#), [3.3.e.5](#)). Evaluations are completed each semester by site supervisors and ISU faculty members.

As part of the ongoing relationship between the unit and the PDS partners, the current unit-wide assessment system is under continuous review by all parties involved (e.g., candidates, coaches, faculty and principals) and initiated by the candidates, which is then supported by the coordinator of the principal preparation M.Ed. program and director of the Ed.S. program in a more formal manner. The site mentor is selected prior to the internships and must be approved by the district school leader, the coordinator of the principal preparation program and Ed.S. director ([3.3.f.6](#)).

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

Areas at which the unit is currently performing at target level.

Currently, the unit is operating at target on all indicators for this standard. Working with school partners, providing extensive and varied field experiences, and following the unit's conceptual framework has provided for a system of preparing educators that is expansive yet introspective and structured but adaptable. Therein is the basis for sustaining the target performance. Having an effective unit assessment system and a body in place that can continually reflect on the outcomes of the system and make changes as necessary makes this also efficient and rigorous. This system of reflection and evaluation is one that is modeled for all our candidates as well.

Activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that have led to target level performance.

The educator preparation programs at ISU are based on a foundation of the extensive field experiences and clinically based commitments described above. Meaningful partnerships with internal and external stakeholders provide seamless pathways for successful implementation of high quality programs, with the result of excellent outcomes for the teacher candidates we serve and the P-12 students we impact.

The TOTAL program ([3.3.a.501](#)) and the secondary/all grade Immersion EFE ([3.3.a.25](#)) programs provide candidates with the opportunity to experience classroom instructions in a controlled and supported environment that ensures candidate success and enhanced P-12 learning ([3.3.e.12](#)). These commitments have been nationally recognized as innovative and as models for other university-based programs.

For advanced programs in principal and superintendent preparation, and in programs for school counseling, speech/language pathology and school psychology, extensive field experiences and interaction with mentors in the schools and from the university provide an opportunity for exchange of ideas and professional best practice discussions.

For the TOTAL program to maintain target, once per year public school teachers are invited to participate in the TOTAL program as coaches. To become a coach, teachers are required to participate in TOTAL

coaching teacher training ([5.3.c.4](#)). This training includes cognitive coaching, program requirements, and co-teaching. Each semester university faculty supervisors meet with TOTAL coaching teachers to present an overview of the program. Following a review of the *TOTAL Coaching Teacher Handbook* and program requirements, discussion focuses on the role of the coaching teacher, along with other day-to-day details of supervising and evaluating TOTAL interns.

Elementary, Early, and Special Education [majors](#) and minors have field experience components totaling more than 300 clock hours prior to student teaching and 525 hours during their student teaching semesters, contained in approximately 16 weeks of full-time teaching in both primary and intermediate settings.

To enable TOTAL undergraduate teacher candidates to improve, they are required to reflect on their practice with their coaching teachers, university supervisors, and peers during seminar opportunities ([3.3.a.230](#)). These seminars and reflections help candidates to determine their strengths and weaknesses, their content knowledge, and pedagogical skills ([3.3.a.252](#)). Data regarding professional dispositions are collected throughout all courses and field experiences ([3.3.a.213](#)).

For all-grade and middle/secondary programs, coaching teachers for the Immersion EFE experience were identified by school-based department chairpersons and administrators for the first iteration of the experience. An all-day training session was held at the outset of the initiative ([3.3.a.24](#)). Since the inception of the experience, new coaches are jointly identified by university faculty, department chairpersons and building level administrators; the potential coach having the ultimate right to accept. Training is held with the new coaches either individually or in a group session as needs demand. In all CIMT courses, with the exception of CIMT 200, extensive field experiences are required at the middle and high school levels. Candidates complete a minimum of 75 field work hours prior to student teaching and 600 hours inclusive of student teaching. The coaches for these experiences are in weekly contact with faculty as they maintain an on-site presence throughout the early field experiences. Critical to the mentoring conducted jointly by coaches and university faculty are the three components of the conceptual framework. It is through these authentic, well-designed and mentored experiences that candidate teachers grow as mediators of learning, persons, and members of communities.

Candidates who seek P-12 licenses complete [CIMT](#) coursework including CIMT 301 and 302 and CIMT 401 and 402 (or equivalent). These equate to 550 fieldwork hours minimum, exclusive of those fieldwork hours associated with individual major programs.

In the new programs (initiated Fall 2011) for P-12, English Learner and Art complete 10 hours of literacy fieldwork at a community center in addition to completing CIMT 400, 400L, 401 and 402 (or equivalent). Total fieldwork hours equate to 585, exclusive of those fieldwork hours associated with individual major programs. This does not apply to Music or Physical Education, whose faculty oversee their own fieldwork; however, those candidates will also complete 10 hours of literacy fieldwork associated with EDUC 368.

Student teaching for elementary, early, special education, middle level, junior high and senior high school licensures have a minimum of 15 weeks or 525 hours ([ELED 451](#)). All student teachers adhere to the school corporation calendar. The host teachers for the student teaching semester are provided with the *Student Teaching Handbook* ([3.3.b.1](#)) and are trained by the university supervisor on a one-on-one basis. University supervisors are trained upon hiring by professional staff in ESS, and all university supervisors then attend an annual all-day training on campus ([3.3.b.2](#)). Both host teachers and university supervisors provide an evaluation for all student teachers after each school placement ([1.3.c.9](#)). These evaluations are entered into Tk20 and are available to programs for review and program assessment. Tk20 assessments are also available to candidates for personal evaluation and for the unit assessment. It is during the student teaching semester that emphasis is focused on the tenets of the conceptual framework as these concepts will guide preservice teachers as they continue in their careers after graduation.

For candidates in the M.Ed. administrative program, the field experience design includes a nine-month period with 300 hours of field experiences/internship ([1.3.1.18](#)). 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 ([5.3.c.1](#)).

For assessment of the M.Ed. internship experiences, the candidates maintain a journal of all experiences by activity, date, time, setting, and relevant ELCC standards ([3.3.f.7](#)). Each candidate also develops a collaborative leadership activity in which the candidate demonstrates the skills and behaviors to successfully design and complete a long-term project that will directly benefit the host school ([3.3.f.5](#)). In addition, the candidate and site mentor is required to meet with the university supervisor four times annually throughout the internship. The M.Ed. candidates also complete an intensive portfolio which connects their intern experiences with the ELCC standards ([3.3.f.9](#)). At the end of the internship and coursework, candidates take the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA) which enables them to become licensed in the state of Indiana.

For the candidates in the Ed.S. administrative program, the field experience design includes a three-month period with 120 hours of field experiences/internship ([3.3.f.8](#)). Candidates serve as interns in the districts/schools 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. Candidates are provided a comprehensive list of field/internship activities required. EDLR 759, Seminar in School Superintendency, is a required course to prepare candidates for the internship ([EDLR759](#)).

During the secondary/middle/all grade Immersion EFE semester, teacher candidates spend structured time with special education teachers and faculty to see how students are served in instructional settings and how to adjust teaching to meet individual IEPs ([1.3.c.1](#), [3.3.a.233](#))

Data-based reflection is a key component of the Immersion EFE across all programs. Mentoring interactions are driven by data-based considerations as the candidate plans, delivers, assesses and remediates a unit of instruction, this captured in the work sample entitled the Unit Report ([3.3.a.21](#)). In concert with the classroom coach and university content discipline expert, and supported by the BCOE methods faculty and the clinical faculty associate, candidates identify a conceptual unit for instruction. Candidates provide a pretest for P-12 students to assess prior knowledge and use that as a baseline for planning. Moreover, time in the immersion experience allows observations for learning preferences to also drive instructional planning, along with appropriate information about learning abilities and challenges as documented through IEPs or anecdotal information provided by the coach ([3.3.a.18](#)).

Given the profile of students, contextual factors including pretest outcomes and school improvement initiatives, and goals for the unit as driven by curricular requirements of the school and district, candidates plan and receive approval for instruction and assessments prior to teaching. Each day, coaches and candidates reflect on the outcomes of instruction as captured by applied assessment tools and observations by the coach, and jointly address needs for subsequent instruction as the unit is delivered. Periodic observations and reflective discussions by content discipline experts and BCOE methods faculty are carried out with coaches and candidates as the immersive field experience transpires. Finally, at the conclusion of the unit, final outcomes data along with posttest data are captured and reflected upon by the candidate and coach ([3.3.a.18](#)). These, along with data on student engagement and behavior, become the foundation for reflections on the effectiveness of the instructional unit and for projecting needed refinements should the instructional unit be conducted again with a similar profile of students in an analogous context. The write-up of this is a major feature of the work sample, the Unit Report, and is reviewed by both content discipline experts and BCOE methods faculty. Appropriate feedback is given to further support candidate development prior to and in student teaching ([3.3.a.21](#), [1.3.g.1](#), [1.3.g.2](#)).

Candidates in advanced CIMT programs are required to analyze and synthesize research related to a learning environment through an action research project (3.3.f.11). These action research projects require that a problem-based challenge within the school environment be identified, a treatment applied, results analyzed, and results be 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 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. Practica are completed with the oversight and direct mentoring of a designated coach at the site (3.3.f.12). Coaches are designated on the basis of veteran status within the field as determined by the site-based administrator whether that be at the school, district, or public library. Candidates are evaluated on standards-based instruments by these site-based coaches, and mentoring is ongoing on a one-to-one basis as the practica hours are completed. No practicum is associated with the M.Ed. program as these are practicing teachers in public schools. Though no practicum is associated with the M.Ed. program, outcomes of the action research project are shared with appropriate individuals or teams (i.e., administrators, faculty, or both) as determined by the content of the action research.

Candidates in the M.Ed. and Ed.S. administrative programs are evaluated by the on-site mentors (3.3.f.4, p. 29), university supervisors (3.3.f.4), Advanced Unit Wide-Identification and Assessment of Student Disposition (3.3.f.6), and long-term project evaluation (3.3.f.8). In addition, the M.Ed. program candidates complete a portfolio which is evaluated by the university supervisor (3.3.f.9) and must complete the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA) to be licensed in the state of Indiana.

Candidates in the School Counseling M.Ed. spend two academic years at their site placements. This includes an elementary, middle, and high school placement. Candidates spend a total of 700 hours over the course of fieldwork, practicum, and internship (3.3.e.13, 3.3.e.14). They are assigned an on-site supervisor at the elementary, middle, and secondary levels in addition to an ISU faculty member. Candidates in communication disorders, school counseling, and school psychology complete a work sample that is specific to their discipline that requires them to analyze, synthesize, reflect, and develop a plan of action (3.3.e.15). Candidates work in collaboration with their site placements to determine the focus of this work. This work sample is aligned with the Unit Assessment System. Dispositional data is gathered via the UAS assessment. In addition, dispositional information from candidates is monitored through observation, supervision and candidates' response to supervision (3.3.f.16, 3.3.f.17, 3.3.f.18). All programs have remediation opportunities (3.3.e.17, 3.3.e.18). Candidates are also required to engage in professional development opportunities in their discipline to facilitate their professional identity and growth. This may be prescriptive in nature or candidate choice depending upon the program and candidate progression. Candidates are evaluated by on-site supervisors and ISU faculty members.

For assessment of Ed.S. internship experiences in educational leadership, the candidates maintain a journal of all experiences by activity, date, time, setting, and relevant Educational Leadership Constituents Council (ELCC) standards (3.3.f.7). Each candidate develops a collaborative leadership activity in which the candidate demonstrates the skills and behaviors to successfully design and complete a long-term project that will directly benefit the host school district (3.3.f.6). The candidate and site mentor are required to meet with the university supervisor two times during the internship. Candidates in advanced programs in communication disorders, school counseling, and school psychology have intensive field experiences beginning their first semester on campus (3.3.e.4, 3.3.e.14, 3.3.e.16). Placements occur in the P-12 setting as well as the University Hall Clinic. Candidates in communication disorders have three semesters of in-house practice in the University Hall Clinic prior to school placements. School counseling candidates have four semesters of field experiences, to include all grade levels. School psychology candidates have two years of field experience prior to a year-long internship. In all disciplines, candidates receive evaluations from both university faculty and licenses site supervisors. Candidates in all disciplines complete a work sample aligned with the unit assessment system (1.3.c.2).

Plans and timelines for obtaining and/or sustaining target level performance.

Since the unit is currently operating within target-level performance on all elements of this standard, emphasis will be on maintaining the target-level performance. This will be based on continual attention to the unit assessment system to assure that the UAS remains relevant, useful, and rigorous as the individual programs move forward under the UAS umbrella. This effort will be a coordinated one, with the Teacher Education Committee (TEC) charged with oversight and assessment review from individual programs.

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 of Indiana and across the nation. Of critical importance is ensuring preservice teachers are able to support the literacy and numeracy needs of P-12 students across the curriculum ([3.3.h.1](#)). Each content discipline will embrace this reality, especially as it is integrated into methods courses in the content areas and in the professional sequence. The current audit, aimed first at literacy, will identify holes and redundancies across programs so that curriculum alignment may be cogently addressed. Numeracy standards will be targeted next, likely this spring. This new P-12 education emphasis is a recent state-level reform and viewed as aligning with and further substantiating our conceptual framework in terms of promoting growth in capacity of mediator of learning *across disciplines*, as person, and as member of communities. This substantive effort across all three domains is required to best support more rigorous P-12 student development and achievement. A further area for program revision is tied to the new teacher evaluation model being instituted in Indiana, the RISE evaluation ([3.3.h.2](#)). Implications for our current evaluation rubric will be explored in the upcoming year to determine the need for revision, especially as it impacts the current evaluation aligned with our conceptual framework ([1.3.d.9](#), [1.5.c.2](#)). As has been the case with all secondary and all-grade program development initiatives, this will be envisioned and implemented by our tripartite partnership – public school, education, and content faculties and administration. Implications exist as well for our advanced programs, specifically the M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction. The work sample ([1.3.c.2](#)) will be reviewed to ensure it provides sufficient flexibility for the research needs that will exist as the CCSS are implemented. With the elimination of the library media programs, such assessment will not be required ([3.3.h.3](#), [3.3.h.4](#), [3.3.h.5](#)).

In communication disorders, school psychology and school counseling, on-going meetings focus on candidate data, professional standards, and quality programming (e.g., [3.3.h.6](#)). To that extent, the school counseling program has updated syllabi, program expectations, and candidate learner outcomes to reflect new CACREP standards ([1.3.1.14](#), [1.3.1.15](#), [3.3.h.7](#)). Additionally, a focus on training and supporting supervisors has emerged. This is a result of conversations with site supervisors. All programs regularly survey alumni to ensure strength in programming. SPA reports support these continuous efforts as well.

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

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

The members of the BCOE community value justice and equality for all people, which include embracing, understanding, and appreciating the differences among individuals and groups and using them as opportunities for facilitating learning and building a stronger community. This commitment to a true diversity that extends beyond skin color is evident in the college’s mission statement: “To prepare,

promote, and advance educational and human service professionals for a diverse and ever-changing world.” The college’s mission, vision, and values statement ([1.5.c.1](#)) affirms the value of “Social Justice and Diversity: Working to create environments that support and enable all members of our community to thrive.” This value is further manifested in the BCOE *Diversity Plan* ([4.3.g.1](#)):

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. We seek students, faculty, and staff who reflect the diversity of our pluralistic society in reaching their potential in *Becoming a Complete Professional*. Opportunities for enhancing diversity, community, and mutual trust are desired, encouraged, and supported by and for all within our community of educators. We are committed to promoting respect for human diversity, social justice, and equity. Our effective professional practice is rooted in awareness, knowledge, and skill in working with all peoples in our local, regional, national, and global communities.

Diversity is infused in the conceptual framework through all three areas of the BCP theme ([1.5.c.2](#)). As an *expert or mediator of learning*, educators must have the skills and knowledge to work effectively with *all* students. As a *person*, educators must display traits and dispositions that reflect openness, respect, and trust. As a *member of communities*, educators must contribute to all communities of which they are part, working effectively with the diversities therein.

The BCOE has been a campus leader in assessment and strategic planning around issues of diversity. A formal diversity plan was in place in 1999 ([4.3.g.6](#)) and later assessed and informed by a college-wide retreat in January 2005 ([4.3.g.7](#)). A Cultural Audit Committee was convened in 2007 to determine our cultural responsiveness and overall diversity climate ([4.3.g.8](#)). The audit committee’s work was three-fold. First, the committee determined appropriate means to assess the college’s diversity climate and overall capacity for cultural responsiveness. This was accomplished through survey analysis, focus group interactions, and an environmental scan. Second, an executive summary of conclusions and findings was developed for the revision and reconstitution of the college’s *Diversity Plan* ([4.3.g.9](#)). Third, committee efforts moved toward fostering and building capacity for a culture of diversity and inclusiveness consistent with our mission and values.

Following the work of the audit committee, a Diversity Task Force ([4.3.g.10](#)) was assembled in Spring 2009 to (a) analyze climate/data information, (b) formulate a new diversity plan, and (c) present findings to the college. The Task Force, composed of faculty, professional staff, support staff, candidates, and external members, drafted a new BCOE *Diversity Plan*, which set forth three clear objectives:

1. To build and maintain an inclusive campus environment.
2. To recruit, support, retain, and graduate a diverse student population.
3. To maintain and enhance diversity in employment of staff, faculty, and administrators.

To highlight work done to date, a day-long, college-wide diversity summit was held January 6, 2010, to present a draft of the plan, explore why diversity is important to the unit, and shape future directions ([4.3.g.11](#)). A set of clear baseline expectations for the BCOE and all departments within the college is articulated in the *Diversity Plan* including:

- Ensure diversity expectations are pervasive throughout the BCOE.
- Commit resources to creative and goal driven recruitment strategies to diversify the BCOE.
- Inventory and assess our efforts at enhancing diversity annually.
- Identify understanding of equity and diversity/multicultural issues as a required qualification in the development of position descriptions.

The task force completed its work in May 2010 and the college’s leadership team subsequently reviewed the plan, finalizing it in December 2010 ([4.3.g.1](#)). A diversity implementation team currently meets to ensure the plan is enacted ([4.3.g.12-4.3.g.15](#)). A system of accountability to ensure the periodic

evaluation and recalibration of our plan and strategies is also included in the document. The *Diversity Plan* is the first and only one of its kind created by a college at ISU, making the BCOE a torchbearer in such an effort.

Candidates for initial licensure are required to take several courses that address diversity in society as well as diversity in the classroom and its implications for instructional planning and delivery. The [Global Perspectives and Cultural Diversity](#) category in ISU's [Foundational Studies](#) (general education) program includes the following learning objectives: (a) demonstrate knowledge of cultures and worldviews; (b) identify social, economic, political, and environmental inter-relationships between cultures and worldviews; (c) use multiple lenses such as race and ethnicity, gender, social class, regional culture, and religion to evaluate one's culture in comparison to those studied; and (d) articulate how the social construction of culture and worldviews shapes contemporary social and political issues. [EPSY 341](#), Education in Multicultural Society, is an approved Foundational Studies course and is required of all initial candidates. In addition, candidates are required to take [SPED 226](#), The Exceptional Learning in the Regular Classroom.

Issues of diversity are infused throughout the curriculum. Exhibit [4.3.b](#) includes matrices of the specific diversity themes addressed in each course for each department in the BCOE.

Candidates in initial programs are expected to demonstrate six overarching proficiencies related to diversity: (a) sociocultural consciousness, (b) an affirming attitude toward students from culturally diverse backgrounds, (c) commitment and skills to act as agents of change, (d) constructivist views of learning, (e) learning about students, and (f) student-responsive teaching strategies ([4.3.a.1](#)). These proficiencies are assessed in field placements and student teaching experiences. Assessments in 2010-2011 field experiences demonstrate that candidates meet expectations on the proficiencies (mean scores ranged from 2.14 to 2.32; 2 = *meets expectation*, 3 = *exceeds expectations*). For student teachers, mean scores ranged from 2.60 to 2.80 in 2010-2011 ([1.3.d.3](#)).

Candidates in advanced programs are assessed on five proficiencies that demonstrate their abilities to work with diverse populations, including students and families; incorporate diversity and multicultural perspectives into their teaching, counseling, or administrative work; and develop self-improvement plans ([4.3.a.1](#)). Overall diversity assessment for advanced candidates rose from a mean of 2.32 in 2009-2010 to 2.58 the following year ([1.3.d.4](#)).

Our unit's commitment to diversity is reflected in our curriculum, the field experiences in which our candidates participate, the experiences they have of working with diverse faculty, and the deliberate measures that the unit takes at attracting and retaining faculty, candidates, and staff who hail from a variety of backgrounds. To enhance candidates' understanding of diversity, teacher candidates are expected to create a Teacher Work Sample to document their expertise in the educational community ([1.3.c.1](#)). A requirement for the project is for teacher candidates to describe at least three diversities they have identified in their classroom. These diversities are identified from interacting with the students, becoming involved in the learning community, and building relationships with the members of the learning community. After identifying at least three specific diversities, candidates follow-up by using their professional skills and knowledge to develop differentiations and accommodations to respond to the students' diversities and mediate learning for all students in the classroom.

Although candidates initially recognize skin color, ethnicity, and disabilities as diversities, as they enhance their understanding of diversity and become more integrated members of the learning community, they recognize diversities in the social economic status of diverse students and the different needs these students have for their learning environment. Candidates become acquainted with the diverse family structures within the classroom and the way students' learning and education can be impacted by different family structures. Rather than simply ensuring that materials, resources, and literature used in the classroom reflect the diversity of the classroom, candidates create meaningful responses to the diverse needs of their learners. Samples of candidates' submissions for the teacher work sample and candidates'

scores on the rubric's criterion for diversity demonstrate that our candidates are expert mediators of learning for diverse student populations (see Exhibits [1.3.g](#)).

The unit is actively seeking opportunities to increase the diversity of our candidates so that candidates can interact with diverse peers. We competed in an internal grant program for funding to support a Center for Cultural Learning that would link ISU candidates via technology to students in diverse classrooms. Although not funded by the university, we are now seeking external funding for this project ([4.3.i.2](#)). We know that ISU as a state institution has the largest percentage of African-American students as compared to other state institutions. However, the teacher education program has a much smaller percentage than would be expected from the institutional numbers, and both for the program and institution as a whole, we know the percentages slip considerably heading towards graduation, indicating a clear retention challenge.

Therefore, although retention is key and both the program and the institution have efforts targeted at that, our unit is actively pursuing ways to encourage students of color to pursue teaching. We have created a targeted program with admissions to bring students interested in teaching to campus for a day during the school year to explore the field of teaching and experience a college class in education ([Teachers for Tomorrow](#)), and we are actively honoring the field of education through [New Student Orientation](#), freshman welcome ceremonies, and other programs to spread the word with candidates and parents that teaching remains an honorable, distinguished field with many opportunities.

At the initial level, a new student group has been formed ([African American Student Educators](#)). They have received formal university recognition, and a faculty sponsor is working with the group in addition to two graduate students. In addition, they maintain a strong [Facebook presence](#). The group is dedicated to supporting the needs of diverse teaching candidates and to help recruit students of color into the teaching field. AASE has been provided an office with all the other student organizations and members have participated in our college-wide events (e.g., Homecoming, Ice Cream Social, Teachers for Tomorrow). We have regularly achieved high numbers of diverse students who indicate an interest in education at both the initial and advanced levels, but have difficulty retaining the students. The freshman retention issues stem from an overall institutional problem with retention, but within the unit also occurs at the point of admission to the teacher education program. To address one of the most pressing problems, the BCOE purchased a subscription to an online Praxis I training website ([4.3.h.1](#)). Students who are having problems passing Praxis I are provided an opportunity to use the system. The system has only been in place for a brief period, but has already helped at least two minority candidates who had previously struggled achieve the required scores ([4.3.h.2](#), [4.3.h.3](#), [4.3.h.4](#)).

Within the School Psychology program, recruitment efforts were focused on universities with high minority student enrollment ([4.3.h.5](#), [4.3.h.8](#)). Program materials ([4.3.h.6](#), [4.3.h.7](#)), faculty contacts, and faculty visits to some sites were made. Application reviews and interviews were conducted two times (February and May) to provide additional time and opportunity for application submission. On campus interviews consisted of time to meet and interact with both program and department faculty as well as current candidates, which is critical for demonstrating the level of cultural climate in the program and college.

Other graduate programs are in the process of reconsidering their traditional sources for students, which have become increasingly homogeneous. Most prospective international students have learned that ISU and a number of its academic programs are nationally ranked. These include the education programs of the BCOE: Early, Elementary, and Special Education; Curriculum and Instruction; Education Technology; and Educational Leadership, which has been identified as one of the top ten programs for scholarly productivity by the [Chronicle of Higher Education](#).

While international candidates are receiving a quality education and learning about American customs, they are also providing cultural experiences to their peers, working and studying with others of diverse nationalities through small class sizes, access to faculty and staff, and opportunities to join various

international clubs; participation in community service projects; or enjoying short-term home-stays with Terre Haute families.

For the academic year 2010-2011, 71 candidates (44 of these being in PhD programs) representing 16 nations were enrolled in BCOE programs ([4.3.h.5](#)).

Some of the candidates find that studying abroad is an appealing learning experience while earning credits towards an Indiana State University degree for academic coursework. Experiential learning through study abroad is not an easy undertaking but can be both challenging and rewarding at the same time. Living in another country enables the candidate to experience first-hand what might have only been seen in media or read about in books.

Through semester-long programs in 2010-2011, six education majors experienced life in Sweden, Chile, England, and Australia. Additionally, 12 BCOE candidates took spring break travel experiences to Taiwan and Ireland, providing opportunities to gain perspectives on how education is viewed in other countries while enjoying a different culture ([4.3.i.3](#)).

BCOE faculty and candidates are also active in Terre Haute life, enriching opportunities for local citizens. The BCOE sponsors an active Chinese language school that provides instruction to both international and domestic students ([4.3.i.4](#)).

4.2.b Continuous Improvement

Providing our teacher education candidates in conventional and distance programs with experiences of working with diverse faculty is a crucial goal for the BCOE. However, of the 62 faculty members who teach in the initial programs, 52 are White, six are of Asian origins, three are Black or African American, and one is of Hispanic/Latino origin. Of the 38 faculty who teach in the advanced program, only one faculty member is Asian whereas 37 are White ([4.3.d.1](#)). The low level of diversity in our faculty has led the BCOE to identify the recruitment and retention of diverse faculty as a crucial goal. We are aware that one reason for this gap is our location as a small city in a racially homogeneous part of the country that does not attract diverse candidates ([4.3.f.1](#), [4.3.f.2](#)). We also know well that our success in recruiting and retaining diverse faculty is contingent upon the inclusiveness and openness of the college climate.

The BCOE cultural audit conducted in 2007-2008 assessed the college's cultural climate to determine the level of our cultural sensitivity and competence to use as a baseline to design an intervention or sensitizing program. From this activity we determined that the climate of the BCOE is perceived by its staff, faculty, candidates, and external stakeholders as basically accepting of various racial, ethnic, and cultural groups with a fairly strong tendency toward focusing on commonalities and minimizing differences ([1.3.1.12](#), [1.3.1.13](#)). The executive summary of conclusions and findings served as the data point for the revision and reconstitution of the college's diversity plan that had been initially written in 1999 ([4.3.g.6](#)).

The new strategic plan for the institution has a target for increased recruitment and retention of faculty of color. A diversity council was formed at the institutional level in 2008-09 to begin development of a diversity plan. We now have an active diversity implementation team, composed of representatives from each academic and service department in the BCOE and student representatives. Meeting minutes are included in Exhibit [4.3.g](#).

In the area of recruitment of diverse faculty, the BCOE *Diversity Plan* ([4.3.g.1](#)) proposes a series of steps including exploring the potential to "grow our own" faculty, establish ties with HBCUs and institutions that graduate high numbers of students of color, use direct correspondence to groups that have connections with underrepresented minorities, advertise in publications with connections with underrepresented groups such as *Diverse Issues in Higher Education*, and ensure that faculty from underrepresented groups are involved in recruitment efforts. In order to improve retention the plan advocates steps such as social networking groups both virtually and in person, providing support,

collaboration, and mentoring for faculty, and establishing a formal mentoring program for new faculty that includes specific strategies to meet the needs of diverse faculty. The BCOE is vigorously engaged in implementing the Diversity Plan with the active support of the university, which is also focused on diversity-related efforts as part of its strategic plan. A committee has been appointed by the dean to ensure that we meet the goals for the first year of plan implementation.

In Fall 2010, ISU also implemented an aggressive new program called *Opportunity Hires* (4.3.g.5). The premise of the program was to overcome the deficiencies of independent searches and encourage departments to actively seek and recruit high quality, nationally competitive candidates who will diversify the faculty and would otherwise be lost to future searches if not immediately pursued. The particular focus on African American hires was an attempt to narrow the proportion gap between the percentage of African American students and faculty. These hires did not have to be part of the approved searches for the year. In addition to this, within conventional searches, new supports were developed to increase our ability to attract candidates from historically underrepresented backgrounds. Faculty members with experience in conducting faculty searches and with passion and expertise in issues surrounding diversity were involved as ex-officio guides or Search Team Process Partners (4.3.g.4).

Search Team Process Partners worked with search teams in the BCOE to enhance the quality of faculty searches by providing helpful support, advice, and process insights on issues of good search management, including, but not limited to, building deep, diverse, candidate pools. Through these two initiatives, and in congruence with the college's *Diversity Plan* and the value placed by the college on social justice and diversity, in Spring 2011, the BCOE successfully identified and hired two faculty members from historically underrepresented groups, one in the Department of Communication Disorders, Counseling, School and Educational Psychology and another in the Department of Educational Leadership. Offers were also made to two African American faculty candidates who declined.

Standard 5. Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

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

Professional education faculty in the BCOE and faculty in the content areas are experts in their fields of study and bring authentic and successful experiences to candidate preparation.

Regular (i.e., tenured, tenure-track, and multi-year contract) faculty in professional education, either in the BCOE or in content areas, who do not hold a terminal degree are either former faculty of the University Lab School who held tenure with the institution when the lab school was closed or are doctoral candidates with expertise and/or current teaching license in the area in which they are instructing. Exhibit 5.3.a.2 lists the degree or degrees held by unit faculty. The data indicate that 14% of regular faculty hold a Master of Arts or a Master of Science and 86% hold a terminal degree of Ph.D. or Ed.D. All faculty in the BCOE will have some level of interaction with all candidates. However, it is important to the unit that faculty who work closely within licensure programs have or have held a license in the field related to that which they teach.

The clinical (i.e., part-time) professional education faculty are expected to hold a minimum of a master's degree and hold a current professional license in their area. Exhibit 5.3.b.1 illustrates all clinical faculty employed in the four departments of the BCOE. The data show that the average number of years employed in the field of supervision is 23, and 9.4% of the clinical faculty who supervise BCOE field

experiences have a Master's degree or higher. The average number of years supervising clinical experiences is 9.98 years.

Each department has its own procedures for communicating expectations to clinical faculty. The Department of Communication Disorders and Counseling, School, and Educational Psychology uses contracts that detail the expectations of the candidate and supervisor in a clinical placement ([5.3.c.2](#)). The Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Media Technology relies on host teacher contracts ([5.3.c.6](#)), placement request forms ([5.3.c.5](#)), and the student teaching handbook ([3.3.b.1](#)) to communicate expectations of supervision. The Department of Educational Leadership communicates expectations through the faculty liaison as well as a letter detailing expectations ([5.3.c.3](#)) and the principal intern handbook ([5.3.c.1](#)). The Department of Elementary, Early, and Special Education trains clinical supervisors each year in a full-day seminar using a training manual ([5.3.c.4](#)).

In collaboration with school administrators, school-based faculty who are asked to host a candidate are expected to have at least three years of teaching or school personnel experience. Supervisors of student teachers are also expected to hold a master's degree. Furthermore, teacher candidates have multiple placements within Vigo County School Corporation, which has a 100% highly qualified teacher ranking.

ISU makes available a standardized form (SIR-II) to collect student evaluations of faculty teaching performance. Faculty are required to have students evaluate at least one course each year ([5.3.f.1-5.3.f.16](#)). Instructor-related questions on the SIR-II average in the "effective" (4) range.

The National Survey for Student Engagement (NSSE) also provides important data for the unit in regard to faculty effectiveness in the classroom as compared to students in other fields on campus ([5.3.f.22](#)). Teacher candidates are exposed to more diverse perspectives in class discussions or writing assignments—more so when they are seniors than when they are freshmen, suggesting that diversity in perspective increases through the teacher education program. Senior teacher candidates report that they use computers and information technology in academic work more than freshman teacher candidates. Analysis of the 2010 administration of the NSSE further points to the unit's effectiveness through overall student satisfaction. Finally, teacher education candidates are more likely than their campus counterparts to ask questions and contribute to class discussions, make a class presentation, work with other students on a class project during class, and use computers in academic work.

All of the above work pays dividends in student retention and graduation rates ([5.3.f.23](#), [5.3.f.24](#)).

- Over the past four years the BCOE has either been the leader on campus in student retention rates or second.
- The same holds true for graduation rates where again the BCOE is either first or second campus-wide. Such evidence speaks to the careful structuring of program experiences and the commitment of our candidates.
- Additionally, for first-time freshmen, the BCOE has led the campus with the lowest dismissal percentages for the past two years. The two-year average for the BCOE is 6.05%.

Three years ago, the university discontinued its annual Faculty Report of Professional Activities for a more appropriate means of appraisal. Since that time, different information management systems have been piloted, but no commitments have been made. As such, the Bayh College of Education uses vitae (found at [5.3.a](#)) and survey reporting ([5.3.f.25](#)) to collect information about the teaching, scholarship and service commitments of education faculty.

In order to fulfill the responsibilities of a robust professoriate, the faculty of the BCOE engage in a broad range of research and scholarly activities that impact P-12 problems in practice and contribute to improved teaching and learning. Exhibit [5.3.f.26](#) demonstrates that faculty are actively engaged in a wide variety of new-knowledge contributions (i.e., questions 13, 14, and 15).

Several faculty are also serving as project evaluation specialists and consultants on externally funded projects ([5.3.d.501-5.3.d.505](#)). Others serve as consultants to professional associations by serving on accreditation committees ([5.3.d.506](#)), while still others have fulfilled editor responsibilities for major journals ([5.3.d.507](#)). It should be noted that a number of presentations and publications include candidates as co-presenters and co-authors ([5.3.d.508](#), [5.3.d.509](#)). Faculty are also active in seeking internal and external funds to support their scholarly agendas. Annual summary activity may be found at the Office of Sponsored Programs [website](#). Since 2008, BCOE faculty have proposed an annual average of \$5,317,567 in sponsored program support and been awarded during that same time period an average of \$2,204,260.

All faculty in the BCOE are expected to participate in service activities at the departmental, college, and university level. The BCOE is well-represented on academic, faculty governance, special purpose committees, and these faculty members are a critical component in the future of the institution by helping formulate institutional review policies, distance education policies, intellectual property policies, information technology strategic direction, sabbatical leave policy, etc. ([5.3.f.26](#); questions 1, 2, 16-18, and 21-25). Recently, a faculty member in the BCOE was recognized with the University Community Service Award ([5.3.d.413](#)) and another with a University Exemplar Teaching Award ([5.3.d.415](#)).

Faculty are also active in service with professional organizations at the state, national, and international level. Faculty have served on conference planning committees, organization boards, and held national office ([5.3.f.26](#); questions 19 and 20).

BCOE faculty also pride themselves on the level of their service and work with P-12 schools. A few examples of how faculty and staff continually work with schools include the following:

- As a leading provider of professional development in the education community, the BCOE hosts an annual day of professional development called Sycamore Educator Day. This year's theme was "Meeting the Needs of All Learners." It is free to ISU alumni and only the cost of lunch is charged to all others. School partners, exemplar teachers from across the state and education faculty all present during concurrent sessions ([5.3.e.501](#)).
- For many years, the Lilly Endowment has funded a summer workshop that builds upon the Endowment's Teacher Creativity Fellowship Program. The summer workshop cultivates a potential network of untapped change agents for Indiana schools and focuses on collaboration, networking, and teacher renewal. Over its lifespan, the summer workshop and related activities have impacted approximately 400 teachers across Indiana ([5.3.e.502](#), [5.3.e.503](#)).
- Faculty serve as consultants and external evaluators for two math-related grants that are federally funded. The Vincennes Math Initiative ([5.3.e.504](#)) and the Rural Algebra Project ([5.3.e.505](#)) create an environment and culture of inquiry and collaboration in mathematics education among faculty from ISU and participating schools to strengthen the mathematics education of all students, particularly in algebra.
- As part of a "Statewide Dropout Prevention" grant from State Farm, faculty and professional staff developed a web site for P-12 schools and districts across the state offering continual updates of new and innovative dropout prevention programs, practices and resources, especially those that have a community-wide focus ([5.3.e.506](#)). Another outcome of this grant was the opportunity to provide regional summits across the state in an effort to provide more personalized support based on regional need ([5.3.e.507](#)).
- Recently, the Indiana Higher Education Commission approved a distance-based Ph.D. program in Educational Leadership in the BCOE. The first-of-its-kind program in Indiana identifies an urban partner district with low-performing schools and builds the curriculum around authentic teaching and learning needs. District partners serve as affiliate faculty, helping contribute to overall programming ([5.3.e.508](#)).

Through its unified clinic, the BCOE is also an active contributor to the quality of life in the community. For example, in 2010-11, the [University Hall Clinic](#) (housing the Counseling Clinic, [Porter Center for](#)

[School Psychology](#), and [Rowe Center for Communicative Disorders](#)) provided over 5,300 hours of candidate-delivered assessment and consultation services to children and their families. Additionally, undergraduate and graduate student clinicians in speech-language pathology, counseling, and school psychology are placed in public schools, hospitals, and nursing homes locally and across the state to provide clinical services to members of the community.

The [Blumberg Center](#) continues to provide excellent outreach services to schools and agencies across the state, involving faculty and candidates in valuable activities to extend learning and affording opportunities to participate in research and service activities. The Blumberg Center this past year received \$2,116,670 from state and federal grants and contracts. These funds promote services to children and youth with special needs as well as provide service to those who teach them and their families. During the time span of July 2010 through December 2011, the Blumberg Center provided 211 professional development opportunities in which 4,460 individuals participated. An additional 99 collaborative meetings or activities were sponsored or co-sponsored by the Center, in which 1,404 individuals participated.

The PDS Partnership continues its tradition of simultaneously enhancing the learning of the children and youth attending the partner schools and impacting the preparation and continued development of those who teach them. The focus of PDS activities is continued professional development and school improvement initiatives of partner schools. For example, the PDS Steering Council elicits a call for action research and school improvement proposals every year that are funded through university and grant funds ([5.3.e.509](#), [5.3.e.510](#)). In 2010, it is noteworthy that contracts were only renewed with schools that were high poverty and/or low performing ([5.3.e.511](#)). These efforts were recognized nationally when the National Association of Professional Development Schools selected the PDS Partnership as a recipient for their prestigious 2010 Award for Exemplary Professional Development School Achievement ([5.3.e.512](#)).

This past year evidenced continued outreach and engagement activities of the faculty in the BCOE through our partnership with AdvancED, formerly the North Central Association–Commission for School Improvement for the state of Indiana. As the home for AdvancED, the BCOE annually co-sponsors a statewide conference on school improvement in Indianapolis drawing over 400 practitioners to join together to learn of research-based approaches for continuous school improvement ([5.3.e.513](#)). Faculty contribute conference presentations and regularly serve on accreditation teams throughout the year.

This robust activity relates to the quality of the teaching provided by the faculty and their efforts to offer candidates authentic experiences. Faculty data tables are maintained in the AIMS site (summary table, [5.3.a.2](#)) and individual vitae are available in [5.3.a](#).

5.2.b Continuous Improvement

In February of 2010, the BCOE Congress approved a new set of policies and procedures for reappointment, promotion, and tenure (RPT; [5.3.f.21](#)). The new policy represented two years of work analyzing the role of the professoriate in a professional school and ensuring alignment with the university's strategic plan ([5.3.f.27](#)), as well as the new university handbook procedures for RPT ([5.3.f.28](#)). Following Congress's approval of the RPT document, it was requested of each of the four departments that revisions be made to their RPT documents, ensuring alignment with the revised BCOE document ([5.3.f.17](#), [5.3.f.18](#), [5.3.f.19](#), [5.3.f.20](#)). The policy revisions build on a commitment to experiential learning, outreach and engagement. As a result, a high value is placed on service to professional communities, and definitions of scholarship and research have been broadened to include creative activity such as authoring legislation, policy, and other contributions that impact the education profession. The new policies also ensure regular and systematic evaluation by multiple means for all pre-tenure faculty. On an annual basis, pre-tenure faculty are given feedback by a departmental committee, the department chair, and the dean, regarding performance on teaching, scholarship, and service. Each pre-tenure faculty member also meets with the department chair and the dean individually to discuss the results of the evaluations and to cooperatively set goals for the next year to continue to ensure satisfactory

performance. A college-level committee also reviews materials during the third and sixth years. This detailed level of feedback and evaluation gives a pre-tenure faculty member strong evidential feedback to assess satisfactory progress. Since the new RPT document has been codified, two faculty members have failed to achieve promotion and tenure.

This year, the university codified a faculty performance evaluation model that includes post-tenure review ([5.3.f.29](#)). This was a pilot of the new policy. Faculty selected weighting among teaching, scholarship, service, and other assignments (e.g., department chairperson, fellowship, leaves), provide supporting documentation of their professional activities, and then are appraised at the department, department chairperson, dean, and college levels. In addition to the new performance evaluation, there are a number of annual opportunities for post-tenure faculty to participate in and receive evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and service performance from administrators and colleagues. Faculty are required to submit a yearly report on professional activities ([5.3.f.30](#)). This report is completed online throughout the year and the data are used to develop departmental, college, and university information about faculty productivity and work. This faculty report also serves as a basis for annual salary increases.

Faculty development is important to the BCOE and is facilitated and encouraged in a number of ways. In addition to new faculty orientations ([5.3.f.31](#)), junior faculty, both tenure-track and multi-year contract, participate in informal semi-annual faculty meetings where all junior faculty members meet together over lunch to discuss issues related to teaching, research, service, and simply how to navigate higher education in general. When necessary, invited guests talk with the junior faculty, or if necessary, the junior faculty are invited to network without administrative intrusion. These opportunities provide important connections for pre-tenure faculty. However, feedback from junior faculty indicated the desire to institute a formal mentor program. As such, the BCOE Congress approved a college-wide mentor program ([5.3.f.32](#)) in April 2010. Feedback received from a satisfaction survey ([5.3.f.33](#)) in January 2012 indicates this is an investment well worth making.

Faculty are also required to provide information about workshops and conferences attended for professional development on the annual report of professional activities mentioned above. Academic Affairs makes available through departmental budgets approximately \$400 per year for each tenure/tenure-track and multi-year contract faculty for professional travel. However, through departmental travel policies ([5.3.g.1](#)), departments have leeway in the distribution of these funds. This flexibility allows departments to focus on areas of need within the department and among the faculty.

The BCOE also provides professional development opportunities for faculty. The Reitzel Faculty Research Award ([5.3.g.2](#)) recognizes past noteworthy research and provides a monetary award as part of its recognition. The Holmstedt Professorship honors established faculty with resources for a research project ([5.3.g.3](#)), and the Coffman Award honors the full career of contribution to the institution ([5.3.g.4](#)). A new professional development award, the Paul A. Kinser Award, recognizes exemplar service among faculty ([5.3.g.5](#)). Technology training is available through the college's Instructional and Information Technology Services ([5.3.g.6](#)), and through the university's Center for Instruction, Research, and Technology (CIRT; [5.3.g.7](#)). The CIRT is also a valuable faculty resource for a myriad of professional development opportunities that range from ongoing orientation for new faculty to distance learning training.

The BCOE also provides special professional development activities related to needs that have arisen through data analysis or policy changes in educator preparation (e.g., the Diversity Summit, [5.3.g.8](#); [5.3.g.9](#)), regular presentation venues such as Assessment Day ([5.3.g.10](#)), the Coffman Colloquium ([5.3.g.11](#)), or invited speakers by departments and programs ([5.3.g.12](#)).

A multi-year effort culminated in a 2010 comprehensive strategic plan ([5.3.g.13](#)) for the BCOE. The plan is rich with professional development continuous improvement implications through six goal statements, a staffing plan, and a 10-year academic plan. Goal teams annually report evidence-based accomplishments ([5.3.g.14](#)), and an updated summary is posted at the college's [website](#). One outcome of

the strategic plan was to convene an Academic Planning Consultation Team to consider department and area responses to four grand-tour questions. As a result of the team's work ([5.3.g.15](#)), faculty were challenged to consider collaboration and communication, the needs of clients, the integration of 21st century skills, continuous improvement and greater accountability, and leadership development. These five professional development imperatives are now a prime consideration for the college's strategic efforts.

Standard 6. The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

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

The BCOE is the official teacher education agency of the university ([6.3.a.1](#), [6.3.a.2](#)). Primary responsibility for educator preparation programs and the administrative responsibility, coordination, and accountability for the programs rests with the TEC in the BCOE ([6.3.a.3](#)). The Dean is advised by the TEC ([6.3.a.4](#)), composed of faculty who are representative of the professional teacher education faculty across campus, the BCOE, alumni of educator preparation programs, and candidates preparing for professional educator careers ([6.3.a.5](#)). Exhibit [6.3.b.1](#) is an organizational chart further describing the unit's governance structure.

Admission requirements and instructions for undergraduates are outlined online in the Undergraduate Catalog ([6.3.a.1](#)). Admission criteria for graduate students are described in the Graduate Catalog ([6.3.a.2](#)). These web sites are available also through the ISU home page, the BCOE home page and departmental home pages ([6.3.d.1](#); [6.3.d.2](#))

Each undergraduate student who declares an interest in an education major is first evaluated and oriented through the Education Student Services Office (ESS; [6.3.c.1](#)). All new students participate in new student orientation or transfer orientation ([6.3.c.2](#)). Advisors discuss educational programs, university resources ([6.3.c.3](#); [6.3.c.4](#); [6.3.c.5](#)) that are available, and provide the students and their parents contact information for any later questions. ESS staff members meet individually with students as needed. Once students are enrolled at ISU, the ESS office continues to provide an advisor until the student is admitted into the BCP Program ([2.3.b.1](#)), which usually occurs during the student's second year. Until undergraduate students are admitted to BCP, they do not have official status in their academic programs for graduation and licensing. Each teacher candidate is evaluated throughout his or her program by program faculty based on academic and professional competencies. Continuation in BCP is dependent on satisfactory progress and assessments.

Grading policies for individual courses are determined by the course instructors and are provided to the candidate as part of the syllabus content at the beginning of each class. Grade appeal requests first go through the instructor who would then direct candidates to additional levels of appeal ([6.3.c.6](#); [6.3.c.7](#)). Information on grade appeals can be found at [6.3.c.8](#) as well as from the candidates' academic advisors and department chairpersons.

All undergraduate teaching major candidates also have access to their own Degree Audit Report System (DARS) through their MyISU Portal accounts ([6.3.d.3](#); [6.3.d.4](#)). Information about Praxis testing requirements and BCP criteria are also included in the DARS. Evaluative feedback from candidates regarding the unit's general performance, including ESS, reinforces the important advising service ESS provides and the positive impact it has in the personal and professional lives of our candidates ([6.3.d.5](#)). Specific information about the unit's performance is also gleaned from the candidate's student teaching experience survey. Equally affirming, feedback was discussed in Standard 1([1.3.i.1](#), [1.3.i.2](#)).

Graduate candidates enter the BCOE as either master's degree seeking students or certification only or renewal only students. Candidates who declare they are seeking a master's degree are advised through the department into which they are accepted. All other candidates are advised through the ESS Office, which provides certification and renewal information through one-on-one advising sessions.

Academic calendars are maintained by the Office of Academic Affairs ([6.3.e.1](#)). Catalogs and publications are reviewed by the associate dean and the ESS Office to ensure alignment with program approval documentation. Catalog copy is reviewed as requested by Academic Affairs for all professional education programs across the university. Additionally, the Dean's Office and the ESS Office advise as requested on advertising of programs related to university publications from the department level to the university-wide level ([6.3.e.2-6.3.e.26](#)).

In the summer of 1991, the College of Education at ISU and four area school districts began a year-long series of conversations focused on developing a plan for a school-university partnership. By the spring of 1992, the discussions had led to the development of a concept paper for a Professional Development Schools (PDS) partnership, created a policies and guidelines document, promoted a signed formal agreement, and recruited ten schools within the four school districts to serve as the initial cadre of PDS sites. Codified with new five-year contracts ([6.3.d.6](#); [6.3.d.7](#)) and a revised set of bylaws ([6.3.d.8](#)), the ISU PDS partnership is shaped by the diversity of the students, schools, and school districts involved ([6.3.d.9](#)). The current configuration of 10 schools across two districts covers all grade levels and includes high percentages of students facing conditions of poverty. Annual grants ([6.3.d.10](#)) support a variety of building-based initiatives directly addressing challenging issues of teaching and learning.

In recent years, the overall budget of the BCOE has been reduced as have all units within the university due to state-wide reversions and internal reallocations, but resources remains sufficient to provide sound support for quality educator preparation programs ([6.3.f.1](#)). Exhibit [6.3.f.2](#) presents monetary data over a three-year period from FY 2009 to FY 2011 for the expenditures in the operating budget across all academic units. Exhibit [6.3.g.1](#) presents student credits hours generated by the BCOE in comparison to the university total from Fall 2006 through Spring 2011. Using FY 2011 as a representative year, the BCOE is 12% of the university's budget expenditure and 8.7% of the student credit hour productivity. Individual departmental budgets, productivity profiles, and number of tenure and tenure-track faculty for the BCOE are compared against the university ([6.3.g.2](#)).

Funds for the payment of supervision of clinical field experiences by school-based clinical faculty and travel of university clinical faculty held constant over the past few years. However, as more emphasis is placed on experiential learning at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, support for fee assessments has enabled greater capacity for clinically-based practices ([6.3.g.3](#)). All costs are covered from the operational budget or fee-based budgets.

Funds for supplies, capital equipment, and professional growth have enabled programs and faculty activities to continue to function at productive levels ([6.3.f.2](#)). In 2009, the BCOE moved from the Statesman Towers to University Hall. This renovation is the largest state funded project in the university's history (\$31 million) and is representative of the institution's ongoing resource commitment to educator preparation. As is the case nationwide, the state economy continues to provide budget challenges, but strong strategic planning at the university and college levels provides thoughtful planning and builds collaboration into difficult and competing decisions.

Section 310.1.1 of the ISU Faculty Handbook states that a normal teaching load will be 12 semester credit hours of course work per semester ([6.3.h.1](#)) for tenure and tenure-track faculty. New faculty are given reduced workloads to participate in new-faculty orientation and help with transition to new positions and new courses. Multi-year contract faculty (i.e., 2-5 year contracts) have a 15-hour teaching load ([6.3.h.2](#)). BCOE policies ([6.3.h.3](#), p. 19) indicate that a reduced teaching load is possible for faculty who apply for a reduced load in order to meet a specific research objective. Graduate programs for the most part practice a nine-credit hour workload and factor supervision and advising into that workload. Distance education

delivery carries the same course load as face-to-face courses. Specific workloads are monitored each semester, and departments are required to submit reports detailing faculty deployment, as well as that of temporary fulltime and adjunct faculty and graduate assistants ([6.3.h.4](#)). The university recently established a student-faculty ratio goal of 20:1. It is hoped this can be achieved by 2014. As can be seen from the reports, no faculty member is given a workload that exceeds the equivalent of 12 semester hours per semester. Further, faculty members are provided reassigned time for research and service assignments such as working in partner schools.

Although some professors are assigned less than 12 hours for supervision, their supervisory loads are equated on the basis of no more than 1.5 student teaching candidates per credit hour. Due to logistical considerations, it is sometimes necessary to increase or decrease the load slightly, but the variation is small and the overall ratio is maintained ([6.3.h.5](#)).

Courses are predominantly taught by tenure-track faculty. Adjunct instructors, temporary full-time faculty, and graduate students are employed as necessary for instruction of courses. When circumstances create the need for utilizing these resources, chairpersons make the appointments after careful review of the person's education and experience. Graduate students and part-time faculty who are assigned to teach must have appropriate course work and, if applicable, experiences that contribute to their effectiveness as instructors. In the instance that adjunct instructors are assigned to a graduate course, they must be eligible for temporary graduate faculty status and approval must be granted by the dean of the College of Graduate and Professional Studies ([6.3.h.6](#)). These individuals play an important role in advancing the work of the professional unit and its commitment to a clinical pedagogy. Strategic employment of these individuals contributes to the integrity and coherence of the unit as a whole, augmenting the expertise of tenure-track faculty who lead the unit.

All offices have adequate support staff to meet their program demands. Additional support staff members are employed with external dollars to meet the demands of external grant and contract activity.

The BCOE strives to provide professional development opportunities to faculty and staff, as well as resources and support for scholarly activities ([6.3.h.7](#)). Resources for faculty professional development are also made available. Further, opportunities to advance technical or pedagogical knowledge are frequently provided across the university.

General purpose classrooms are found on the first and second floors of the BCOE. The basement houses the IITS area as well as instructional computer laboratories, micro-teaching classrooms, the Blumberg Center for Interdisciplinary Studies, and the comprehensive clinic. All classrooms are wireless and technology enhanced, allowing instructors to make use of a wide variety of presentation tools during classroom instruction. All faculty have keys that will access the media cabinets. In addition to the classrooms, the first floor houses the ESS Office and the Dean's suite. The second floor contains department offices, including AdvancED Indiana, and the third floor primarily contains faculty offices. A detailed description of floor plans may be viewed in Exhibit [6.3.i.1](#).

All issues related to the allocation of budget and other resources are taken to the Administrative Council and discussed at that time. On an annual basis, allocation of dollars for new hires are decided cooperatively within Administrative Council, with consultation from program faculty. Additionally, the unit has been supported for assistance to work on unit-specific needs such as the unit assessment system and data analysis. For example, foundation funds support a dedicated BCOE assessment director, and the ISU director of assessment is available to BCOE faculty, administrators, and staff.

The BCOE Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC; [6.3.i.2](#)) is a faculty committee that provides guidelines for faculty competencies, recommendations for student technology standards, and oversees allocation of new technology purchases and requests. ITAC also maintains the college's Technology Plan ([6.3.i.3](#)), working with the IITS director to ensure that all areas have adequate technology resources. Additionally, IITS operates in close cooperation with the ISU Office of Information

Technology (OIT) to coordinate purchases for labs, faculty, and staff. Data on BCOE technology programs, policies, and expenditures are located in Exhibits [6.3.i.15-6.3.i.25](#).

Distance education services are provided through the ISU Offices of Distance Learning ([6.3.j.1](#)) and Extended Learning ([6.3.j.2](#)). Students pay a technology fee that goes to support resources directly related to student needs ([6.3.j.3](#)) and, through the Microsoft campus agreement, the Microsoft family of software is available free to students and at nominal cost to faculty ([6.3.j.4](#)). In addition, the Cunningham Memorial Library provides a wide range of services for distance learning students ([6.3.j.5](#)).

6.2.b Continuous Improvement

The BCOE and the TEC share primary responsibility for educator preparation programs. TEC regularly uses data to support changes in its bylaws and guidelines ([6.3.a.4](#)). TEC has overall responsibility to assist in the development, approval, and coordination of both new policies and programs and changes in existing policies and programs related to educator preparation as per their bylaws and guidelines. All matters in the province of educator preparation regardless of the administrative home of the department and program require approval by the TEC and action by the dean of the BCOE. This structure allows for the shared leadership and authority to plan, deliver, and operate aligned and coherent programs of study at Indiana State University.

Program changes and proposals for new courses or programs are initiated by faculty members in the various departments with programs in educator preparation. The Curriculum Approval Procedures Manual (CAPS Manual; [6.3.a.6](#)) details the process on how to prepare an approved course syllabus for educator licensure courses. Departmental committees or committees-of-the-whole have the responsibility for reviewing and making recommendations concerning new courses, programs, and revisions of programs. The department chairperson and the department faculty members review the proposal and forward it to the appropriate dean's office, whereupon it is reviewed by the college-level curriculum approval committee; in the case of the BCOE that is the BCOE Congress. Once fully approved at the college level, the proposal is shared with the TEC for its review and approval and the dean does the same. If both parties approve, the proposal is forwarded on through the university's review process as stipulated in the CAPS Manual. If a proposal is not approved at the TEC and dean's level, it is returned to the department for revision. This procedure is followed for all program revisions impacting educator preparation programs regardless of the administrative home for the department and is fully described in the CAPS Manual as policy for the university.

The unit and its professional education faculty members, through a number of bodies, discharges its authority for managing, coordinating, and making decisions covering a wide variety of topics and concerns that impact professional education matters and candidate needs. These include curricular issues, organizational concerns, personnel procedures and policies. Examination of the minutes of the TEC ([6.3.a.7](#)) for the 2008-2011 period illustrates representative topics, such as

- GPA and New Grading Requirements
- Foundational Studies Changes
- Educator Licensure Rules Changes in Indiana
- Revisions in Elementary and Secondary Education Programs

Representative topics considered by the BCOE Congress ([6.3.a.8](#)) during the 2008-2011 include

- Strategic Planning Updates
- Student Feedback on Faculty Teaching
- Revision of College's Constitution
- Revision of Reappointment, Promotion, & Tenure Policies

Examination of the minutes of the BCOE Administrative Council ([6.3.a.9-6.3.a.54](#)) shows topics such as the following:

- Program Prioritization
- Staffing for 2009-10
- Faculty Position Request
- Student Success Initiatives

Significant changes to the PDS partnership began in 2008 with a meeting of participating superintendents (6.3.d.11). During the meeting, superintendents from four of the five partner schools (6.3.d.12) indicated that partner schools should be high-need schools that better represent real conditions of practice for first-year teaching experiences. The university expressed a desire for a more meaningful partnership in which participation was truly collaborative and occurred more frequently. One superintendent shared concerns about the expense of the partnership. What came from the meeting was change from 19 to 10 partner schools across two districts instead of five. New contracts (6.3.d.6; 6.3.d.7) and a revised set of bylaws (6.3.d.8) were developed.

As part of the President's strategic emphasis (ISU Strategic Plan), ISU recently established an overall student-faculty ratio goal of 20:1. Faculty workload is defined in the *University Handbook*, but student credit hour generation is not addressed. The BCOE's student-faculty ratio goal is 17:1. It is hoped this can be achieved by 2014. Faculty workload data suggest annual productivity gains will be necessary to meet the 2014 goal (6.3.h.4).

An outcome of Project PRE (a five-year federally funded grant) was sustainable support, an improved clinical pedagogy, and a desire for a new resource commitment; a clinical faculty associate (CFA) (6.3.h.8). CFAs are exemplar teachers who receive a one-year sabbatical from their P-12 teaching assignment for the purpose of supervising candidates, teaching courses, and advising faculty on program-related issues. Support for continuing the CFA position has been strong.

The College of Education was located in the Statesman Towers from 1977 until 2009. It proved to be a functional home for the faculty, staff, and students. However, after years of intense planning, the Indiana General Assembly authorized the renovation of [University Hall](#) as the new home of the Bayh College of Education. The \$30M renovation was designed to enhance interactions between faculty and students, students and students, and faculty and faculty. The building is wireless with cutting-edge technology that permits distance delivery of courses and programs, as well as internal and external video conferencing. A comprehensive clinic provides full-service to children, youth and their families and provides exceptional learning environments for future educators. In October 2009, the Indiana State University trustees approved the naming of the university's College of Education in honor of the family of U.S. Senator Evan Bayh and his father, former Senator Birch Bayh. An official dedication occurred in April, 2010 (6.3.e.27).

To support our high level of technology integration, technology resources are made readily available to our faculty and candidates. The BCOE has a director of Instructional and Informational Technology Services (IITS; 6.3.i.26; 6.3.i.27). The Director and IITS have the specific mission to facilitate the utilization of technology for faculty, staff, and students within the BCOE (6.3.i.28). Monthly reports from the Director help drive decision-making for faculty, staff, and student needs (6.3.i.4-6.3.i.14). IITS operates an Instructional Resource Center (6.3.i.29) that is also available for occasional class use. It additionally functions as a drop-in lab where candidates can obtain Tk20, video editing, digital image, and other software assistance. IITS offers training opportunities on the media-friendly classrooms as well as the technology that is made available to all faculty (e.g., social media, laptop and iPad carts). Through IITS, candidates and faculty can check out wireless laptops, digital video and still cameras, Tablet PCs, projectors, and various media devices for use in the classroom and field.

Annually, the university's Office of Information Technology (OIT) provides budgetary dollars for the purchases of faculty computers. The college's Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) works with staff of OIT and Instructional and Informational Technology Services (IITS) to maximize these dollars to meet needs and ensure continual renewal of computing resources on desks and within

classrooms. The data-driven budget informs expenditures ([6.3.i.18-6.3.i.23](#)). The college's computing inventory ([6.3.i.30](#)) shows that no faculty member has a computer older than three years old (unless they have requested to keep it), and there are no computers over five years old in the building that are still actively used.

Since 2004, the [Cunningham Memorial Library](#) (CML) has supported an Education Reference Librarian who is dedicated to help manage library resources directly related to needs of the unit. To assist the CML, the BCOE has a faculty member who serves on a campus-wide committee that works to review and recommended resources for the CML. One outcome of our committee participation has been the improvement of the Teaching Materials Area to better serve our candidates' needs. Overall, the CML maintains an extensive array of online resources that are available to users both on and off-campus. Data regarding resource usage campus-wide have allowed the BCOE to receive additional resource allocations ([6.3.i.31](#)). They continue to expand their e-journal offerings, and find ways to effectively use technology to expand services.