

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction	4
II. Conceptual Framework	6
III. Findings for Each Standard	
Standard 2	8
Summary of Stengths	14
Areas for Improvement	15
Corrections to the <i>Institutional Report</i>	18
IV. Sources of Evidence	
Documents Reviewed	19
Persons Interviewed	21

SUMMARY FOR PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT
National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

Institution: Indiana State University

Standards		Team Findings	
		Initial	Advanced
2	Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	M	M

M = Standard Met
NM = Standard Not Met

I. INTRODUCTION

The Institution

Indiana State University (ISU) is located in Terre Haute, Indiana, approximately one hour west of Indianapolis on Interstate 70 close to the Illinois border. Terre Haute is a small city of approximately 60,000 persons. Mirroring the demography of the state, approximately 85 percent of its population is white; 10 percent of its minority population is African American.

The university was established by the Indiana legislature in 1865 as Indiana State Normal School with a primary mission of preparing “teachers for teaching in the common schools of Indiana.” The institution’s first bachelor’s degrees were awarded in 1908, its first master’s degrees in 1928, and its first doctoral degrees in 1965, when the institution achieved “university” status and its name was changed to Indiana State University.

ISU is today a comprehensive, doctoral-granting institution with a Carnegie Doctoral 2 classification and a special focus on community engagement. It offers a full array of academic programs in a College of Arts and Sciences; in professional schools in Education, Business, Technology, and Nursing, Health, and Human Performance; and in a School of Graduate Studies. Following two years of campus-wide deliberations, the university very recently adopted in February 2008 a revised mission statement and a revised set of guiding values. The institutional mission statement now reads:

Indiana State University, a doctoral research 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.

The university’s revised values emphasize high standards, a well-rounded education, integrity, diversity, personal growth, responsibility as a university citizen, and stewardship of a global community. In the past two years, the university has begun a program to identify and increase funding for particularly “promising programs.” The College of Education is a recent recipient of this designation and additional funding.

The university’s current enrollment totals approximately 11,000 students, 9,500 at the undergraduate level and 1,500 at the graduate level. Nearly 20 percent of all students in the university, including 40 percent at the graduate level, are enrolled in programs for teachers and other school professionals. With an enrollment of more than 700 students, the Department of Elementary, Early, and Special Education in the College of Education is the largest undergraduate department in the university.

The Professional Education Unit

The professional education unit at ISU is housed in the College of Education and in selected departments in the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Business, Technology, and Nursing, Health,

and Human Performance. The dean of the College of Education is the head of the unit, and the university's Teacher Education Committee is the principal governance committee for the unit. This committee is charged with overall responsibility for planning, approving, and coordinating programs that prepare licensed educators.

The unit offers 18 initial teacher education programs, 15 advanced programs for teachers, and a small number of advanced programs for other school professionals in speech communication, counseling, school psychology, educational administration, library media, and reading. The number of advanced programs for teachers will soon be reduced to six programs as a result of a university-wide "program prioritizing process" and subsequent mergers and reorganization. Four programs for P-12 educators are offered through distance learning modalities, three in part and one entirely. The curriculum in each of these distance learning programs is exactly the same as the curriculum in their on-campus counterparts, and the assessment data collected in them are the same as the assessment data collected on campus.

The College of Education has four departments: Elementary, Early, and Special Education; Curriculum, Instruction, and Media Technology; Educational Leadership, Administration, and Foundations; and Communication Disorders and Counseling, School, and Educational Psychology. It also has a dozen administrative, research, and service centers that cut across early childhood education, mathematics education, professional development schools, counseling, interdisciplinary studies in special education, and other professional areas.

In 2007-08, the unit enrolled approximately 1,300 candidates in initial programs and 300 candidates in advanced programs. In 2006-07, 200 candidates in initial undergraduate teacher education programs and 249 candidates in advanced programs completed their programs. In fall 2007, the unit had 73 tenured or tenure-track faculty, most in the College of Education, and 47 nontenure-track faculty, most of whom supervised candidates in field experiences.

The Visit

The NCATE/Indiana protocol guided this Focused Visit focused on Standard 2. It was, therefore, a joint visit that involved a single team of three persons appointed by NCATE and two persons appointed by the Indiana Department of Education. Throughout the visit, the team was very ably assisted by the Assistant Director of Educator Preparation in the Indiana Department of Education. The visit began on Sunday, March 2, 2008, at 9:00 a.m. and concluded at 12:00 noon on Tuesday, March 4. No unusual circumstances affected the visit.

II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The conceptual framework for the professional education unit is derived from the mission and values of the university and from the mission, vision, and values of the unit. The new, revised mission and values of the university are cited above. The current mission of the unit, which will soon be reviewed and possibly refined in light of the revised university mission, is “to prepare, promote, and advance educational and human service professionals for a diverse and ever-changing world.” The vision of the unit addresses the priorities of the unit as a learning community, its physical space, its expanding “sphere of influence,” and its attention to consistent leadership, clear objectives, adequate resources, diversity and social justice, coherence, and collegiality.

The essence of the unit’s conceptual framework is three “components” related to the theme “Becoming a Complete Professional” and seven undergirding “values.” The three components are:

- Educator as Expert or Mediator of Learning: This first component “deals with an educator’s professional skill as a mediator of students’ learning and/or of the progress individuals make in achieving their potential.”
- Educator as Person: This second component “represents the traits and dispositions that make a successful educator justifiably respected and emulated by students.”
- Educator as Member of Communities: This third component “reflects the necessity of contributing to the various communities of which educators, as professionals, are members.”

The seven values that undergird the conceptual framework are:

- Honesty: We have integrity and are trustworthy, ethical, and fair.
- Collegiality: We enjoy being a collaborative team in a positive environment that communicates well and works together for the greater good of all.
- Caring for Others: We are compassionate and supportive of others.
- Responsibility: We are dedicated, dependable, and hard working.
- Student Success: We bring to bear scholarship, professionalism, respect, and high expectations for all students.
- Openness to Change: We prize creativity and support continual improvement.
- Social Justice and Diversity: We work to create environments that support and enable all members of our community to thrive.

The knowledge base that supports these three components and seven values in the conceptual framework is based on the ten INTASC principles for beginning teachers, and it is described in detail in a 100-page, stand-alone document entitled, *Becoming a Complete Professional: A Knowledge-Base Statement in Support of the INTASC Principles with Suggested Learning Activities and Performance Assessments*.

Aligned to the three components in the conceptual framework are the program and content standards defined for each licensure area by the Indiana Department of Education, the 10 INTASC principles for beginning teachers, the five NBPTS core propositions for experienced teachers, and the standards of specialized professional associations (SPAs) or accrediting agencies for teachers and/or other school professionals. In addition, the unit's key assessments in initial and advanced programs are aligned with the three components of the conceptual framework. This alignment of key assessments with conceptual framework components is described in the IR appendix entitled, "Alignment of Key UAS Performance Assessments to Standards."

- principles for beginning teachers and NBPTS core propositions for experienced teachers.
2. The UAS design identifies five transition points for data collection and use in initial programs (admission, entry to professional experience, completion of professional experience, exit from program, and post-graduation) and four transition points for data collection and use in advanced programs (admission, entry to professional experience, exit from program, and post-graduation).
 3. The UAS design includes multiple assessments selected from both internal and external sources, including faculty, applicants, candidates, recent graduates, and principals at the initial level and faculty, candidates, and employers at the advanced level.
 4. The UAS design identifies data elements that relate to applicant qualifications, candidate proficiencies, the competence of graduates, and program quality. More specifically, the UAS design identifies 17 data elements relevant to candidate performance in initial programs, 12 data elements relevant to candidate performance in advanced programs, and eight data elements relevant to unit operations at both levels of programs.
 5. Candidates must meet assessments at an acceptable level at each stage in their programs before going on to the next stage, and the level of proficiency expected becomes more comprehensive and requires greater skill at each successive stage.
 6. Predictors of success in the UAS design include academic advisement, the use of clear rubrics, and Praxis I and II scores.
 7. The UAS design was originally dependent on multiple information technologies for collecting, storing, aggregating, and reporting data. The design is now moving away from dependence on these multiple technologies to implementation of Tk20 as its comprehensive data management system.
 8. The UAS design requires programs to prepare annual reports that are based on aggregated assessment data regarding both candidate performance and program operations. These reports are presented to the unit's stakeholders during annual Unit Assessment Days.
 9. The UAS design includes a database for maintaining records of formal candidate complaints and their resolution.
 10. Responsibility for implementing and revising the UAS design rests with the unit's TEC and its two assessment sub-committees, one at the initial level and the other at the advanced level. The sub-committees make recommendations to the TEC, but the TEC has ultimate responsibility for managing the UAS and making final decisions about it.
 11. Finally, a critical characteristic of the UAS design is its development of a common assessment language that can be used by faculty and others in all programs.

2b. Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
2b. Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation Advanced Preparation		X	

Summary of Findings

Descriptive material in the IR, electronic links to specific documents and tables of data, hard copy files in the Exhibit Room, and conversations with faculty, candidates and others during the on-site visit indicate that the UAS design approved in December 2006 and its revisions approved in April 2007 have been implemented and made operational in the following ways:

1. To varying degrees within specific programs, candidate performance data are now being collected from the desired internal and external sources: faculty, applicants, candidates, recent graduates, and principals at the initial level, and faculty, candidates, and employers at the advanced level.
2. The unit is collecting the data specified at different transition points in the UAS design, although it is having more success relative to collecting data about applicant qualifications, candidate proficiencies, and the competence of graduates than it is collecting data on program quality and unit operations. More specifically, data have now been collected and compiled for 14 of the 17 data elements identified for initial programs, partially collected and compiled for one element, and not yet collected for two other elements. In advanced programs, data have now been collected and compiled for four of the 12 identified data elements, partially collected and compiled for three elements, and not yet collected for two other elements. In terms of the eight data elements relevant to unit operations across initial and advanced programs, data have now been collected and compiled for six of the eight elements at the initial level, but for only two of the eight elements at the advanced level. At this point, therefore, data have not yet been collected and compiled for all identified data elements, particularly those related to unit operations.
3. At this point, only 12 of the unit's 20 programs have submitted program reports in which faculty present, analyze, and reflect on candidate performance data and develop recommendations for program improvement based on those data.
4. The unit has held two successful Unit Assessment Days since the last NCATE visit, one in January 2007 and the other in September 2007. The first assessment day led to substantial revision of the UAS design. Data were subsequently submitted by programs in May to the two assessment sub-committees of the TEC, one at the initial level and the other at the advanced level. These two sub-committees compiled and summarized the data for presentation at the second Unit Assessment Day in September 2007. Six guiding questions on candidate performance and seven guiding questions on unit operations were developed to guide analysis of the data. For reports on candidate performance in initial programs, data were compiled, summarized, and analyzed for five guiding questions. For reports on candidate performance in advanced programs, data were compiled, summarized, and

analyzed for three of six guiding questions. For the reports on unit operations, data relative to initial programs were compiled, summarized, and analyzed for all seven guiding questions, but data relative to advanced programs were compiled, summarized, and analyzed for only four of the seven questions.

5. As evidenced in the minutes of the TEC, recommendations from these two Unit Assessment Days were subsequently presented to the committee for review and decision. For instance, recommendations relevant to candidate performance in initial programs dealt with the need to develop a common dispositions assessment, develop a common diversity assessment, develop an operational definition of diversity, better communicate and share program reports and data needs, and decide how to deal with programs that did not complete program reports. Recommendations relevant to candidate performance in advanced programs dealt with the need to use surveys on advising and faculty effectiveness, develop assessments on technology and diversity, adopt an educator work sample, modify the rating scale for dispositions, articulate data submission needs from programs, and decide how to deal with programs that did not complete program reports. Some of the results of these recommendations are reported in Element 2c.
6. Interviews with members of the TEC indicate that the work of the committee now has clearer purpose in terms of using assessment data, improving data collection, processing recommendations, and monitoring candidate grievances and petitions.
7. The unit has an operational database for maintaining records of formal candidate complaints and their resolution. This database is maintained in the Dean's Office.
8. Finally, during the past two years, a variety of information technologies have been used to support the UAS: Excel, Access, BANNER, LiveText, and PowerPoint. For instance, most of the data shared with faculty during the two Unit Assessment Days were presented by means of PowerPoint presentation that included bulleted summaries of data results, charts, and graphs. The unit is now beginning a transition to Tk20, which in the future will be its comprehensive data management system for collecting, storing, aggregating, summarizing, and reporting both candidate performance data and data about program and unit operations.

2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement Initial Teacher Preparation		X	
2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement Advanced Preparation		X	

Summary of Findings

Since the NCATE visit in fall 2005, the unit has sponsored two Unit Assessment Days, the first in January 2007 in the middle of the 2006-07 academic year and the second in September 2007 at the beginning of the 2007-08 academic year. Two assessment sub-committees of the Teacher Education Committee (TEC), one focused on initial programs and the other focused on advanced programs, set the agenda for each assessment day and conducted each day's activities. The ultimate goal of each assessment day was to use assessment data at program and unit levels to improve candidate performance, the Unit Assessment System, and program and unit operations. Presented below are examples of how the unit has used assessment data since the last NCATE visit to achieve these goals:

1. Data Used to Improve Candidate Performance
 - a. In response to their performance on Praxis I, applicants are now advised to take the test as early as possible while their high school math and writing skills are still relatively fresh. In addition, initial programs now offer applicants a 1-credit course focused on pre-professional knowledge and skills and designed to help them pass Praxis I.
 - b. In response to data collected about candidate dispositions in initial programs, the one-semester professional seminar prior to student teaching has been redesigned to emphasize dispositions.
 - c. In response to 2005-06 data, faculty in the initial program in Family and Consumer Science have changed the timing of the program's microteaching assignment and have developed new rubrics for the assignment.
 - d. In response to assessment data collected during student teaching regarding candidates' ability to deal with diverse students, initial programs now use more low income schools for student teaching.
 - e. In response to candidates' performance on Praxis II, initial programs now have a faculty member who offers a remedial course on the test, conducts workshops, and provides individual tutoring.
 - f. In response to candidates' performance on Praxis II, the initial program in reading now uses a new textbook that is better oriented to the content of the test.
 - g. In response to teachers needed in P-12 education, the initial program in elementary education is being re-designed to provide candidates with licensure additions in special education, reading, English as a Second Language, middle school math, and early childhood.
 - h. Given a lack of data on candidates' impact on P-12 student learners and learning environments, candidates in both initial and advanced programs are now required to

- complete work samples that have common elements across all programs.
- i. Given a lack of good data on candidates' professional dispositions, these are now more purposively presented to candidates, included in handbooks, and assessed during programs. Specifically, disposition assessments have been incorporated in field experiences in advanced programs.
 - j. In response to data collected on the SRI2 teaching effectiveness survey, faculty in the advanced program in educational leadership have made changes in textbooks and in how they use distance education. In addition, a consultant facilitated a workshop on continuous improvement, a template has been created for course syllabi, the language on diversity has been clarified, and syllabi have been sharpened.
 - k. Data generated by the ETS School Leadership Licensure Assessment (SLLA) indicated a relative weakness in problem solving, so curriculum in the advanced program in educational leadership were changed to incorporate problem solving in every class through the use of case studies and other methods. Subsequent data on the SLLA indicated a slight increase in ISU scores, while scores in other universities remained static.
 - l. Based on disposition data collected and analyzed in spring 2007, faculty in the advanced program in educational leadership have revised the program's handbook to place greater emphasis on dispositions, and, in September 2007, they conducted a seminar for administrative interns that stimulated them to reflect on dispositions and their importance.
 - m. Based on data that showed that candidates were knowledgeable about diversity, but not sure how to apply their knowledge to counseling situations, candidates in the advanced program in counseling are now required to complete a multicultural course.
2. Data Used to Improve the Unit Assessment System
- a. To increase the usefulness of data for individual program areas and their faculty, those responsible for the UAS are working to disaggregate Praxis I and Praxis II test scores, diversity data, and information about advising and technology by program area.
 - b. A common dispositional assessment has been created for use in all programs.
 - c. To provide better data about candidates' impact on P-12 student learning and learning environments, all programs will now use an educator work sample that will be assessed with a common rubric.
 - d. A common diversity assessment based on a common operational definition of diversity is now being created, along with recommendations for the kinds of diverse experiences that should be included in all programs. By June of each year, programs are expected to submit a faculty and field experience report focused on diversity.
 - e. A common technology assessment has been proposed.
 - f. Based on experiences during the unit's two assessment days, especially with respect to interpreting data generated on student teaching and internship evaluation instruments, the unit has now adopted a 3-point scale for all key assessments and common terminology for the three points on the scale: "Exceeds Expectations," "Meets Expectations," and "Does Not Meet Expectations" (EMD).
 - g. To increase inter-rater reliability, cooperating teachers in initial programs are being trained to use the unit's student teaching evaluation instrument so that they correctly and consistently interpret its items and rubrics.
 - h. To improve program reports and better identify data needs, two meetings involving 21

faculty members were held in October 2007.

- i. To increase the number of program reports submitted, better follow-up procedures have been implemented.
 - j. To collect, aggregate, and report data at the unit level, as well as at candidate and program levels, the unit is replacing its LiveText database with a Tk20 database at both initial and advanced levels.
3. Data Used to Improve Program and Unit Operations
- a. To deal more effectively with the number of petitions received from secondary education candidates, faculty have requested policy changes that will admit candidates earlier into these initial teacher education programs.
 - b. To increase sharing among candidates in the advanced program in special education, the unit now enable them to share online the activities and products they create in classes.
 - c. In response to diversity data presented during the second Unit Assessment Day, the unit is conducting “a culture/diversity audit.”
 - d. In response to data that indicate the need for more faculty scholarship, the unit has increased funding for those faculty who make presentations at professional conferences.
 - e. To increase the quality of data about candidate advisement and faculty effectiveness, the unit plans to develop a common survey that will be completed by candidates online.

Summary of Strengths

1. Among faculty and administrators, there appears to be *a significant and genuine shift in the culture of the unit that now places increased value on and commitment to assessment*—from assessing the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of candidates and the effectiveness of programs and the unit to using assessment data to increase candidate performance, refine the Unit Assessment System, and improve program and unit operations.
2. There has clearly been *a shift from program considerations to unit considerations*—from viewing individual programs and departments as the important units of analysis to viewing the unit as the primary unit of analysis. This is clearly evident in the responsibilities and activities of the associate dean who serves as the unit’s assessment coordinator, in the responsibilities and activities of the Teacher Education Committee and its sub-committees responsible for unit assessment issues in initial and advanced programs, and the organization of Unit Assessment Days in January and September 2007.
3. Faculty members speak openly and enthusiastically about *new levels of collaboration*, not only across programs in the same department, but also across programs throughout the unit—all in the interest of benefiting the unit.

Areas for Improvement

Corrected Areas for Improvement from the Last Visit:

1. *The unit has not identified a systematic and continuous process for data collection, aggregation, dissemination, and analysis of candidate performance at the unit level.*

Rationale: The 2005 BOE Report noted that the unit's assessment system did not really function at the unit level. Since 2005, the unit has made significant progress in efforts to move from program assessment to unit assessment.

This shift is clearly seen in the content of its first two Unit Assessment Days. For instance, the first assessment day in January 2007 focused on programs, and faculty had a chance to hear from and learn about individual programs in the unit. During the second assessment day in September 2007, the focus of conversation shifted from sharing information about individual programs to sharing and analyzing data across the unit and to identifying common key assessments, common transition points, common scales, and common terminology for the points on that scale. Moreover, during the second assessment day, the two assessment sub-committees of the Teacher Education Committee (one for all initial programs in the unit and the other for all advanced programs in the unit) jointly prepared for and presented the data to those who attended and subsequently provided recommendations based on the assessment day discussions to the TEC. After the full committee discussed and acted on the recommendations, the recommended modifications and revisions were communicated by the unit's Assessment Coordinator to all faculty, and when necessary, follow-up meetings and workshops were held to discuss the changes.

A second example of the shift from program to unit focus is the unit's shift from LiveText, which facilitates candidate assessment in individual courses, to Tk20, which is a comprehensive data management system that cuts across courses and programs and facilitates unit-wide data collection, analysis, and reporting. While LiveText is most useful for candidate assessment in individual courses, Tk20 is most useful at the unit level, and faculty who are just now beginning to use it report that it forces departments and programs across the unit to speak the same language. In addition, Tk20 extends data collection about a unit's candidates beyond graduation.

In interviews throughout the visit, unit personnel indicated that data had been collected in the past, but not systematically shared. Increasingly today, the flow of communication is much more circular from programs to the unit, then across programs, and ultimately from the unit back to programs.

2. *Management and oversight responsibilities related to the Unit Assessment System are not clearly identified and implemented.*

Rationale: The 2005 BOE Report noted that, although the Teacher Education Committee (TEC) had oversight responsibility for managing program changes, no specific individual or office had responsibility for coordinating these functions across all programs. Since 2005,

the unit has taken several major steps to assign management and oversight responsibilities for its Unit Assessment System.

First, the TEC developed a set of by-laws and guidelines in 2006 clearly delineating that it will “maintain primary responsibility for the College of Education’s Unit Assessment System.” To make this responsibility operational, the TEC also established two assessment sub-committees, one to manage and review assessment data for initial programs and the other to manage and review assessment data for advanced programs. It also charged these two sub-committees with responsibility for presenting data and recommendations during future annual Unit Assessment Days.

Second, the job description of the unit’s associate dean for academic and student affairs was revised to include responsibility for coordinating all functions of the Unit Assessment System. The current job description specifies that this individual is expected to periodically review academic policies and procedures, coordinate periodic review of programs, coordinate periodic self-studies and on-site reviews, and serve as the unit’s principal contact with external accrediting agencies.

Third, the unit appointed a faculty consultant for assessment to assist the TEC and its two assessment sub-committees as they manage, review, analyze, and report assessment data.

3. *The unit does not appropriately track formal complaints and their resolution.*

Rationale: The 2005 BOE Report noted that the unit needed to create a more effective system for tracking complaints and their resolution. In 2006-07, a formal database was created to track both complaints and petitions brought to the unit. This database, which is maintained in the dean’s office in the College of Education, tracks each student’s name and major, the date when a complaint or petition was received, its content, its resolution, and the date of its resolution. The current database includes 32 entries between April 2006 and December 2007. The database is organized by academic year, and, once a year, with candidates’ names removed, the database is shared with the Teacher Education Committee (TEC).

In addition to this database of complaints and petitions, the staff in the college’s Education Student Services Office maintain a regular petition database of student appeals and petitions. These too are shared annually with the TEC.

Periodically sharing the databases with the TEC has increased consistency in how candidate complaints, petitions, and appeals are handled, and it has also enabled the committee to identify patterns that may suggest the need for policy changes.

Areas for Improvement Continued from the Last Visit (slightly revised):

1. *The unit has not fully implemented a system for regularly compiling, summarizing, analyzing, and using data from the assessment system to improve unit operations.*

Rationale: First, although the Unit Assessment System identifies eight data elements relevant to unit operations that affect both initial and advanced programs, data have thus far been collected, aggregated and reported for only six of these eight data elements at the initial level and only two of them at the advanced level. Second, only 12 of the unit's 20 programs have submitted program reports that include sections of data and data analysis relevant to program and unit operations. And third, whereas initial programs have summarized and analyzed data in their program reports on all seven guiding questions relevant to unit operations, advanced programs have summarized and analyzed data on only four of the seven questions. Given this relative lack of aggregated data about program and unit operations at both initial and advanced levels, only a few limited examples of the use of assessment data to improve unit operations have been cited in the "Summary of Findings" for Element 2c.

The most significant use of data to improve unit operations during the past year or two has been the institution's "program prioritizing process," which has occurred largely outside the unit, been used to identify and eliminate programs with low enrollments, and led to substantial merger and reorganization of the unit's advanced programs for teachers.

New Areas for Improvement:

1. *The unit does not have regular and systematic procedures for ensuring that its assessment measures and assessment procedures are fair, accurate, consistent, free of bias, and good predictors of candidate success.*

Rationale: As indicated in the "Summary of Findings" for Elements 2a, 2b, and 2c, the unit has made some beginning efforts to ensure the psychometric integrity of its assessment instruments and procedures. For instance, it has trained cooperating teachers in their use of the student teaching evaluation instrument in order to increase inter-rater reliability; it has developed rubrics and a common 3-point scale in order to increase fairness, consistency, and comparability on its key assessment instruments; and it has identified a few measures that may be good predictors of candidate success. What the unit has not yet developed, however, is a comprehensive plan for and detailed schedule of systematic procedures for regularly assessing the validity, reliability, fairness, accuracy, consistency, and lack of bias in all its key measures and key assessment procedures, and for then revising these key measures and procedures on the basis of empirical data. Similarly, the unit has not yet systematically conducted empirical studies on which of its key assessment measures are particularly good predictors of candidate success.

Recommendation: Standard 2 is Met.

Corrections to the Institutional Report

The following is not a correction in the IR, but rather a point of clarification:

The Unit Assessment System (UAS) design described on pages 19-23 of the IR is not the same UAS design used by the unit to prepare documents and other exhibits for this Focused Visit. The version of the UAS design used to prepare documents for the visit was the version approved in April 2007. The UAS design described in the IR is the version approved in December 2007. Documents describing both versions of the UAS design were available during the on-site visit.

IV. SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

Documents Reviewed

Hard Copy Documents Reviewed in the Exhibit Room

General Institutional and Unit Documents:

Institutional mission
Working draft of the revised university mission
A list of distance learning programs
The university's Program Prioritization Report presented to trustees
College of Education *Fast Facts*
The unit's conceptual framework

Standard 2 Documents:

The Unit Assessment System document
TEC Bylaws and Guidelines
Members of the TEC
An email soliciting membership for UAS committees
UAS activities approved by TEC
Notes from meetings of the "forms committee"
Notes from the second meeting of the "forms committee"
TEC minutes
ITP diversity assessment
ITP disposition rubric
ADV work sample rubric
ADV Faculty Effectiveness Survey
ADV Technology and Diversity Assessments
ADV Advising Survey
Student Teaching Evaluation Form
Student Teaching Survey
Principal Survey
Unit Assessment Day 2007 Presentation Notes
Unit Assessment Day 2007 Presentation
Unit Assessment Day 2007 Data (weblink only)
Unit Assessment Day 2006 Data and Presentations (weblink only)
Tk20 memo
2006-07 student complaint database shared with TEC
Full database of student complaints with names removed
Notes of meetings of the Advanced Assessment Committee
Notes of meetings of the Initial Assessment Committee
Email invitation to a working lunch of advanced program faculty members
An email communication to university stakeholders
Unit Assessment Day 2006 participants
Unit Assessment Day 2007 participants
Expanded Table 2 of programs in the unit

The units response to the 2005 AFIs
Handbooks
A synopsis of key assessments in the Unit Assessment System
Initial rubrics for key assessments
Advanced rubrics for key assessments
Syllabi of initial program courses in which key assessments occur
Syllabi of advanced program courses in which key assessments occur

Hard Copy Documents Requested and Reviewed During the Visit

The 2005 *BOE Team Report*
The ISU Rejoinder to the 2005 *BOE Team Report*
A description of the Unit Assessment System (UAS) approved September 9, 2006
A description of the Unit Assessment System (UAS) approved April 17, 2007
A notebook of materials that document the use of data to impact unit operations
A memorandum dated March 2, 2008, from a faculty member: “How I’ve used data to make changes in the graduate SPED program”
A memorandum dated March 3, 2008, that lists examples taken from University Curriculum Forms that illustrate the use of data to justify curriculum changes between 2006 and 2008
Professor Steve Gruenert’s notes on TEC agendas
A notebook from Assessment Coordinator Susan Powers that documents changes in the elementary education program based on assessment data
The university’s course proposal form that includes a section in which faculty justify a course or course change with assessment data
The unit’s standards matrix
The Elementary Education Program Report for the Unit Assessment Day in September 2007

Documents on a Flash Drive Reviewed Prior to and During the Visit

The Accreditation Action Report from the last visit
The Institutional Report for this visit
Specific responses to Areas for Improvement from the last visit
The revised DPS Protocol (November 2007)
An expanded list of initial and advanced programs in the unit
A revised list of hard copy exhibits
A list of acronyms
Key Assessments in the Unit Assessment System
Six handbooks
13 sets of rubrics and assessments for initial programs
24 sets of rubrics and assessments for advanced programs
Syllabi for 21 Key Assessment Courses in initial and advanced programs
The Master Schedule for the visit

Persons Interviewed

University Administrators

C. Jack Maynard, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Karen Schmid, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs

Elliot Robins, Assessment and Accreditation Coordinator, Office of Academic Affairs

Jay Gatrell, Acting Associate Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

Unit Administrators

Bradley Balch, Dean, College of Education

Susan Powers, Associate Dean for Academic and Student Affairs, College of Education

Rebecca Libler, Associate Dean for Educational Research and Outreach Programs, College of Education

Michele Boyer, Chair of the Department of Communication Disorders and Counseling, School, and Educational Psychology

Sue Kiger, Interim Chair of the Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Media Technology

Joshua Powers, Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership, Administration, and Foundations

Diana Quatroche, Chair of the Department of Elementary, Early, and Special Education

Staff in the Office of Education Student Services in the College of Education

Judy Sheese, Director, Educational Student Services

Brian Coldren, Assistant Director, Educational Student Services

Ken Coleman, Advisor, Educational Student Services

Program Coordinators and Department Chairs

Programs for Teachers

Kathryn Bauserman, Elementary, Early and Special Education

Michele Boyer, Communication Disorders and Counseling, School, and Educational Psychology

Dan Clark, Social Studies Education

Vicki Hammen, Communication Disorders and Counseling, School, and Educational Psychology

Sue Kiger, Curriculum, Instruction, and Media Technology

Karen Liu, Elementary, Early, and Special Education

Yasenska Peterson, Health, Safety, and Environmental Health Science

Brad Venable, Art Education

Pat Wheeler, Elementary, Early, and Special Education

Programs for Other School Professionals

Tonya Balch, Communication Disorders and Counseling, School, and Educational Psychology

Michele Boyer, Communication Disorders and Counseling, School, and Educational Psychology

Steve Gruenert, Educational Leadership, Administration, and Foundations

Damon Krug, Communication Disorders and Counseling, School, and Educational Psychology

Terry McDaniel, Educational Leadership, Administration, and Foundations

Josh Powers, Educational Leadership, Administration, and Foundations

Teacher Education Committee (TEC)

Dan Clark, Social Studies Education

Hema Ganapathy-Coleman, Communication Disorders and Counseling, School, and Educational Psychology

Steve Gruenert, Educational Leadership, Administration, and Foundations

Eric Hampton, Communication Disorders and Counseling, School, and Educational Psychology

Debra Knaebel, Elementary, Early, and Special Education

Susan Kiger, Curriculum, Instruction, and Media Technology

Feng-Qi Lai, Curriculum, Instruction, and Media Technology

Susan Latta, English Education

Myung-Ah Lee, Physical Education

Maury Miller, Elementary, Early, and Special Education

Diana Quatroche, Elementary, Early, and Special Education

Judy Sheese, Director, Educational Student Services

Initial Programs Assessment Committee (a sub-committee of the TEC)

Kathy Bauserman, Elementary, Early, and Special Education

Eric Hampton, Communication Disorders and Counseling, School, and Educational Psychology

Susan Kiger, Curriculum, Instruction, and Media Technology

Maurice Miller, Elementary, Early, and Special Education

Della Thacker, Curriculum, Instruction, and Media Technology

Beth Whitaker, Elementary, Early, and Special Education

Advanced Programs Assessment Committee (a sub-committee of the TEC)

Tonya Balch, Communication Disorders and Counseling, School, and Educational Psychology

Noble Corey, Curriculum, Instruction, and Media Technology

Steve Gruenert, Educational Leadership, Administration, and Foundations

Vicki Hammen, Communication Disorders and Counseling, School, and Educational Psychology

Eric Hampton, Communication Disorders and Counseling, School, and Educational Psychology

Damon Krug, Communication Disorders and Counseling, School, and Educational Psychology

Karen Liu, Elementary, Early, and Special Education

Participants in Unit Assessment Day 2 in September 2007

Participants in Initial Program Sessions

Robin Burden, Elementary, Early, and Special Education

Chia-An Chao, Business Education

Dan Clark, Social Studies Education

Hema Ganapathy-Coleman, Communication Disorders and Counseling, School, and Educational Psychology

Rebecca Hinshaw, Elementary, Early, and Special Education

Marylin Leinenbach, Elementary, Early, and Special Education

Rebecca Libler, Associate Dean for Educational Research and Outreach Programs,
College of Education
Karen Liu, Elementary, Early, and Special Education
Larry Tinnerman, Curriculum, Instruction, and Media Technology
Brad Venable, Art Education
Sharon Watkins, Elementary, Early, and Special Education
Diana Quatroche, Elementary, Early, and Special Education
Brian Coldren, Assistant Director, Educational Student Services
Ken Coleman, Advisor, Educational Student Services

Participants in Advanced Program Sessions

Michele Boyer, Communication Disorders and Counseling, School, and Educational
Psychology
Angie Nellis Bright, Graduate Student, Curriculum, Instruction, and Media Technology
Robin Burden, Elementary, Early, and Special Education
Matt Draper, Communication Disorders and Counseling, School, and Educational
Psychology
Hema Ganapathy-Coleman, Communication Disorders and Counseling, School, and
Educational Psychology
Rebecca Hinshaw, Elementary, Early, and Special Education
Susan Kiger, Curriculum, Instruction, and Media Technology
Feng-Qi Lai, Curriculum, Instruction, and Media Technology
Rebecca Libler, Associate Dean for Educational Research and Outreach Programs,
College of Education
Diana Quatroche, Elementary, Early, and Special Education
Elliot Robins, Assessment and Accreditation Coordinator, Office of Academic Affairs
Judy Sheese, Director, Educational Student Services
Larry Tinnerman, Curriculum, Instruction, and Media Technology
Catherine Tucker, Communication Disorders and Counseling, School, and Educational
Psychology

Faculty Consultant on Assessment

Eric Hampton, Communication Disorders and Counseling, School, and Educational Psychology

Faculty Participants in Development and Refinement of Instruments and Forms (The “Forms Committee”)

Kathryn Bauserman, Elementary, Early, and Special Education
Hema Ganapathy-Coleman, Communication Disorders and Counseling, School, and
Educational Psychology
Susan Kiger, Curriculum, Instruction, and Media Technology
Diana Quatroche, Elementary, Early, and Special Education
Della Thacker, Curriculum, Instruction, and Media Technology
Larry Tinnerman, Curriculum, Instruction, and Media Technology
Sharron Watkins, Elementary, Early, and Special Education
Beth Whitaker, Elementary, Early, and Special Education

Teacher Participants in Development and Refinement of Instruments and Forms

Laura Hughes
Julie McLaughlin
Kathryn Spelman

Participants in Implementation of Tk20

The Tk20 Implementation Team

Susan Powers, Associate Dean for Academic and Student Affairs, College of Education
Jim Johnson, Director of Instructional and Information Technology Services
Ryan Hamilton, Educational Student Services
Susan Hagood, Physical Education

Tk20 Faculty Users

Larry Tinnerman, Curriculum, Instruction, and Media Technology
Hema Ganapathy-Coleman, Communication Disorders and Counseling, School, and
Educational Psychology

Candidates Involved in Design and Implementation of Work Samples

Candidates in Secondary and K-12 Programs Currently Working on Work Samples

Kathleen Davis

Recent Graduates of Elementary and Special Education Programs

Linda Biggs
Kim Kelly

Recent Graduates of Secondary and K-12 Programs

Tammy Fish
Eric Graves
Ashley Higham
Shawn Nevill
Michele Puller
Robin Smith