



Indiana State University

NCATE

Institutional Report

Focused Visit – Standard 2

December 20, 2007

OVERVIEW

A. The institution

1. What is the institution's historical context?

The origins of Indiana State University 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, Indiana State University (ISU) is a comprehensive, research intensive university that includes a College of Arts & Sciences, professional colleges of Business, Education, Technology, Nursing, Health & Human Performance and the School of Graduate Studies. Institutional accreditation has been achieved from 27 accrediting bodies. The current mission of the University is “to educate students to be productive citizens and enhance the quality of life of the citizens of Indiana by making the knowledge and expertise of its faculty available and accessible. These purposes are served when the University disseminates knowledge through instruction and extends and applies knowledge through research, creative and scholarly activities, and public service.”

2. What is the institution's mission?

The current institutional mission is at this time undergoing a significant modification. The present mission is long and cumbersome and holds little that is unique. The revision of the mission statement will be presented to the Board of Trustees at its February meeting. At this time, the campus is engaged in web-based feedback and open community sessions to gather feedback for the final version to be presented. At the time of the BOE visit, the mission statement will have been presented and presumably approved by the Board of Trustees and will be provided to the Examiners. At this time, there is no indication that the mission statement will stray from ISU’s strategic initiatives which are: 1) develop a culture that values, celebrates and delivers experiential learning opportunities for students, 2) achieve a national reputation for engaging in local, state, national, and international communities in ways that improve the communities, enhance student learning, and utilize university resources, 3) develop and invest in selected nationally recognized distinctive programs, 4) attract and retain productive faculty and staff.

3. What are the institution's characteristics?

Indiana State University is a public, doctoral degree-granting institution, with a Carnegie classification of Doctoral 2. Located in west central Indiana, ISU serves the rural student population of west central Indiana and east central Illinois, as well as a population with more urban characteristics within Terre Haute. ISU was recognized in 2006 by the Carnegie Foundation to the new classification of colleges and university

that focuses on community engagement.

B. The unit

1. How many candidates are enrolled in programs preparing them to work in P-12 schools?

From Fall 2007 Official Headcount data – 1,302 ITP and 318 ADV ([see Table 2](#) for Breakdown for program).

2. How large is the faculty, including clinical supervisors, and administrators. How many of them are full-time, and part-time? How many graduate assistants teach education courses?

For Fall 2007, there were 73 tenured and tenure-track faculty working in professional education, one of whom was part-time at the university. Of this number, 4 hold assignments as full-time administrators, but teach part-time in the Unit. The Unit additionally had 9 full-time instructors as part of professional education. An additional 42 part-time adjuncts work as instructors and/or supervisors. Professional education programs utilize 8 graduate teaching assistants as instructors for professional education.

3. What is the academic rank of the professional education faculty?

Table 1
Academic Rank of Professional Education Faculty
For Academic Year: Fall 2007

Academic Rank	# of Faculty with Tenure	Non-tenured Faculty	
		# on Tenure Track	# Not on Tenure Track
Professors	16	0	0
Associate Professors	20	0	0
Assistant Professors	3	34	0
Instructors	0	0	13
Lecturers	0	0	38
Graduate Teaching Assistants	0	0	8
Other			
Total	39	34	55

4. What programs are offered for the preparation of school professionals?

[See Table 2 in Appendix](#)

5. What programs are offered off-campus or via distance learning technologies? What alternate route programs are offered?

O.3 Distance Programs

The Library/Media license as part of the M.S. in Educational Technology is offered via the web. The Secondary T2T is offered via the web (although some content methods require a face-to-face class). The T2T is an alternate route program for initial licensure (18 credit hours for secondary, 24 credit hours for elementary). School

Administration is available at a distance through web and desktop videoconferencing. The Visual Impairment license program is available through the web with selected evening and weekend sessions, it is offered as part of a consortium with Ball State University, Project Vision and the Indiana Department of Education. The non-degree Special Education program is available through DVD, web, with some campus interaction for those teachers who want to add the Special Education teaching license in the area of mild interventions to the school setting of their existing license.

6. (Continuing Visits) What substantive changes have taken place in the unit since the last visit (e.g., added/dropped programs/degrees; significant increase/decrease in enrollment; major reorganization of the unit, etc.)? (These changes could be compiled from those reported in Part C of the AACTE/NCATE annual reports since the last visit.)

O.4 [Program Prioritization](#)

A new dean, Dr. Brad Balch, was appointed in Fall 2006. He previously served one semester as Acting Associate Dean, and for 5 years as Department Chair for Educational Leadership Administration and Foundations, and three years as Assistant Professor in ELAF.

The university has undergone a process of Program Prioritization in order to eliminate low enrolled programs. At the initial level, the bachelor's degree in Early Childhood is being eliminated and a minor in Early Childhood is being added. At the advanced level, all the advanced teaching degrees across campus were pegged for reorganization or elimination. Program revisions for all of these programs are currently in process and under discussion. All action is to be completed by the end of this academic year.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This section provides an overview of the unit's conceptual framework(s). The overview should include a brief description of the framework(s) and its development.

1. Briefly summarize the following elements of the unit's conceptual framework:
 - a. the vision and mission of the unit

CF. 1 [COE Fast Facts](#)

The mission is to "prepare , promote, and advance educational and human service professionals for a diverse and ever-changing world."

The vision is:

Our College is a learning community where teaching and learning are enjoyable. Faculty and staff are constantly researching new methods and modeling the best pedagogical practices. A cooperative, supportive culture exists among the faculty within the College and across campus. Faculty members are chosen carefully and mentored well. We employ continuous improvement tools and philosophies on a daily basis, using data to make decisions and improve our instruction and processes in a timely manner. Students experience the genuine support they are getting from the faculty and staff, as it shows in their retention and achievement.

We have excellent facilities for our work. The layout of our physical space is conducive to effective communication and enhances the work we do. We have appropriate technology to support the teaching, scholarship, and service enterprise.

The sphere of influence of our learning community is growing. Our administrators, teachers, and human service professionals are recognized for their educational contributions, including outreach services to the children, individuals, and families as well as to schools and other agencies, meeting their needs and the needs of those whom they serve. Our faculty works collaboratively with schools and agencies to create rich, supportive, and healthy teaching and learning environments. Support for the mission is clear—the state wishes to increase its investment in what we do, alumni tell us how much they value their education, stakeholders and agencies seek our faculty for their expertise, granting agents seek us out, employers seek our graduates, increasing numbers of capable students desire an education with us, and we receive regional and national recognition for our achievements.

With stable and consistent leadership, our objectives are clear and our work flexible and agile as we organize ways to be most effective, requesting and receiving the resources needed. We are dedicated to promoting social justice, embracing diversity, fostering a spirit of inquiry, and supporting a commitment to excellence for ourselves and our students. As one coherent organization, our collegial team recognizes and achieves the full potential of working together as we take pride in our work and feel fulfilled.

b. philosophy, purposes, goals, and institutional standards of the unit

CF. 2 [Conceptual Framework](#)

The overarching theme of Indiana State University's educator preparation programs is "**Becoming a Complete Professional**." Initially adopted in 1991, the theme has undergone significant modifications over time and 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 outcomes emerged as the conceptual framework. Today our theme encompasses three broad areas that recognize essential areas of the work of an educator:

- Educator as Expert or Mediator of Learning,
- Educator as Person, and
- Educator as Member of Communities.

c. knowledge bases, including theories, research, the wisdom of practice, and educational policies that drive the work of the unit

As a moral imperative, the right to learn is perhaps more important today than ever before in our history. As Darling-Hammond (1997) notes, "Never before has the success, perhaps even the survival, of nations and people been so tightly tied to their ability to learn." But, the moral imperative extends beyond the ability to learn and moves to a vision of a good and just society. A society where education is central and the role of the school is to bring this education equitably to all, ensuring that all children and youth reach high levels of intellectual, practical, and social competence. This is a vision that provides the moral grounding of the educator preparation mission at Indiana State University and gives direction to those responsible for designing coherent programs for the education of educators (Goodlad, 1994).

- d. candidate proficiencies related to expected knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, including proficiencies associated with diversity and technology, that are aligned with the expectations in professional, state, and institutional standards

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 and 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 College of Education is currently engaged in an extensive cultural audit to ensure we create and maintain an environment that encourages and supports diversity. The Unit has also worked hard to create dispositional assessments that are in alignment with the conceptual framework, are legally defensible, reflect the state standards, and are indicative of indicative of the candidates, faculty and staff who represent the institution.

- e. summarized description of the unit's assessment system

S2.1 [UAS Document](#)

The UAS has been designed and supported by the professional community to ensure that it supports and reflects the aspects of the Conceptual Framework. Comprehensive and integrated assessments such as the dispositional assessments have been structured based on Becoming a Complete Professional. BCP has formed the foundation of congruence for the advanced program unit assessments as well.

2. (Continuing visits) What changes have been made to the conceptual framework since the previous visit?

No revisions have been made the Conceptual Framework since the last visit. Instead, the mission and vision statements were both revised by the faculty as a whole and our commitment to "Becoming a Complete Professional" factored into the mission and vision development.

STANDARD 2. ASSESSMENT SYSTEM AND UNIT EVALUATION

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

2a. Assessment system

1. How is the unit assessment system evaluated and refined? Who is involved?

S2.2 [TEC Bylaws & Guidelines](#)

The Teacher Education Committee (TEC) holds ultimate responsibility for the UAS. New Bylaws & Guidelines for TEC, created and approved in Spring 2006 delineate the role TEC plays regarding the UAS. Its most direct role found within

S2.3 [Proposed Amended Bylaws & Guidelines](#)
(to be presented January TEC).

S2.4 [TEC Membership](#)

S2.5 [Invitations for UAS Committee Membership](#)

S2.6 [Summary of UAS Activities Approved by TEC 2007](#)

S2.1 [UAS Documentation](#)

S2.7 [Notes from Forms Congruency Meeting](#)

S2.8 [Notes 2 from Forms](#)

two subcommittees for the UAS – the Initial UAS Subcommittee and the Advanced UAS Subcommittee. These two subcommittees hold representations from the programs that fall in that domain from across the entire unit.

Both subcommittees hold the responsibility to review the UAS annually and determine where the data collection is strong and where there are gaps. As discussions occur in these subcommittees, the members bring feedback from their programs on recommended changes as part of the refinement process. The subcommittees analyze the collected data and prepare the report and presentation for Assessment Day to the Unit. Following Assessment Day, the subcommittees reconvene to synthesize the discussion held and provide formal recommendations for action to TEC.

TEC membership comprises faculty, administrators, students, and a P-12 partner representative. When appropriate and additional feedback is needed for data interpretation, recommended outcomes, or modifications to the UAS, issues may also be referred to the PDS Steering Committee for comment, although TEC holds the final authority for action.

2. How does the unit ensure that the assessment system collects information on candidate proficiencies outlined in the unit's conceptual framework, state standards, and professional standards?

All educator-related programs that make course modifications and program modifications are required to funnel the proposals through TEC as part of the curriculum review process. TEC requires that significant program and course changes include a new program assessment matrix to indicate how all standards are assessed.

The Unit is also working to establish better communication channels to ensure that everyone is aware of modifications made to assessment rubrics, processes, or newly approved rubrics to ensure that the appropriate data is collected.

3. What are the key assessments used to monitor candidate performance on standards and at what points are they administered in programs?

Please see the Initial and Advanced tables in the UAS Document appended.

4. What are the major transition points during programs, what assessments are used, and how are candidates performing on the assessments not reported in national/state program reports or Standard 1 (e.g., performance on admissions assessments)?

[See Table 5 in Appendix](#)

5. What process has the unit adopted to ensure its assessment procedures are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias?

The two assessment committees (initial and advanced) are working to have common assessment items to ensure that all candidates are measured in a consistent manner. With the more common assessments in place, plans are to conduct interrater reliability evaluations. A separate group from ITPs met in Fall

Congruency Meeting

S2.9 TEC Minutes

- [4/17/07](#)

S2.1 [UAS Document](#)

S2.10 [ITP Diversity Assessment](#)

S2.11 [ITP Disposition Rubric](#)

S. 2.12 [ADV Work Sample Rubric](#)

S. 2.13 [ADV Faculty Effectiveness Survey](#)

S. 2.14 [ADV Technology & Diversity Assessments](#)

S2.15 [ADV Advising Survey](#)

S2.16 [Student Teaching Evaluation](#)

S2.17 [Student Teacher Survey](#)

S2.18 [Principal Survey](#)

S2.9 TEC Minutes

- [1/17/06](#)
- [2/21/06](#)
- [3/21/06](#)
- [4/18/06](#)
- [9/19/06](#)
- [11/21/06](#)
- [12/19/06](#)
- [1/16/07](#)
- [2/20/07](#)

2006 to bring ITP assessments to a greater level of consistency.

Programs also take responsibility to provide an orientation to the assessment instruments and the Unit's Conceptual Framework to ensure fair and accurate assessments. A recently approved modification to all assessment rubrics was the language change for the levels in the rubrics. All rubrics were to be 3 level – Proficient, Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory. It was found that field evaluations were almost entirely coming in with Proficient markings. Discussion in the assessment committees focused on the problems within the language the underlying biases in Proficient versus Satisfactory. The recommendation was made and approved by TEC to change the 3-level rubrics to Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, and Does Not Meet Expectations.

6. What assessments and evaluations are used to manage and improve the operations and programs of the unit?

The Unit is moving quickly from a process where every program had its individual student performance assessments and surveys, to a more standardized approach which will allow us to aggregate data across the unit. The Initial programs have met and come to agreement on a standard format for student teaching evaluations, dispositional assessments, and a targeted assessment on diversity skills. The initial group will continue work in Spring 2008 to use a common format and assessment for their work sample. The advanced programs have made significant efforts at collecting more common data for unit-level information. A common disposition form was adopted Spring 2007 and new assessments were created following the September 2007 Assessment Day for Technology and Diversity student assessments, as well as a common rubric for a new educator work sample to be implemented in 2008. Additionally, common survey questions were created for advising and faculty effectiveness for advanced programs to append to existing survey forms.

The attached UAS documents the assessments and evaluations forms that are used to pull together unit level data.

2b. Data collection, analysis, and evaluation

1. What is the unit's timeline for collecting key assessment data related to candidates meeting standards and unit operations.

Following the Fall 2005 BOE visit, the TEC began work immediately to rectify issues with the UAS. Spring 2006, the TEC Bylaws and Guidelines were developed and approved. In Fall 2006, TEC established the two Assessment Committees (Initial and Advanced) and these 2 groups worked with programs to begin collecting data from programs in order to initiate the first Assessment Day in January 2007. Following the January 2007 Assessment Day, the assessment committees were reconstituted as prescribed in the TEC Bylaws and Guidelines (many members continue). The committees began analysis of the results of the first Assessment Day, the lessons learned from this pilot process, what next steps were necessary to ensure continued success, what modifications need to be made immediately, and to begin the process of data collection for the second Assessment Day in Fall 2007.

S2.2 [TEC Bylaws & Guidelines](#)

S2.1 [UAS Documentation](#)

Data for the academic year was submitted as requested by the Associate Dean for Academic and Student Affairs and the assessment committees following the end of the spring semester, the assessment committees met for a day long retreat to organize their data analysis and in turn fine-tuned the UAS document to include the guiding questions for data analysis. During summer 2007, the committees analyzed data and prepared their presentations. Fall 2007 began with the second successful Assessment Day. Following the event, the assessment committee met to provide recommendations to the TEC for changes to the UAS, rubrics, and curriculum and unit operations based upon aggregated results from the first two Assessment Days. The committees worked quickly to ensure that recommended changes could be put in place no later than spring 2008. The assessment committees will be reconstituted again in January 2008 and the cycle established will be continued.

2. What are the process and timeline used by the unit to collect summarize, and analyze data?
 - How are the data collected?
 - Whose responsibility is it to summarize and analyze the data? (Dean, assistant dean, data coordinator, etc.)
 - In what format are the data summarized and analyzed? (Reports, tables, charts, graphs, etc.)
 - How often are the data summarized and analyzed?
 - What information technologies are used to maintain the unit's assessment system?

S2.19 [Assessment Day Presentation \(with notes\)](#)

S2.20 [Assessment Day 2007 Presentation](#)

Web link:

S2.21 [Assessment Day 2007 Data](#)

Web Link:

S2.22 [Assessment Day 2006 Data and Presentations](#)

S2.23 [TK20 Memo](#)

Candidate-level performance data are collected by faculty and field supervisors as a regular part of the curriculum and course instruction. Additional data for unit level performance are collected by different entities as indicated on the UAS document. Wherever possible, the Dean's office attempts to facilitate data collection through central administration of surveys. Data are collected at this point in time in a variety of forms (paper, web-based, LiveText, etc.). The move to TK20 will centralize more of the data collection within that system to facilitate data entry and analysis.

The responsibility to summarize and analyze the data is shared. The two assessment committees for the initial and advanced programs work with the Dean's office to identify specific data analysis that is desired. The Dean's office gathers the data that at this moment (pre-TK20) resides in many different locations and places the raw data in a web-based environment that is available to the committee. The Dean's office has committed resources to assist the two committee on the analysis of data by paying a summer stipend to a faculty member to serve as Assessment Coordinator to consult with the committee as they summarize and analyze data and provide statistical assistance; additionally, a graduate research assistant is provided to the Assessment Coordinator to help with data input and analysis that might be necessary.

Data are summarized and analyzed in a variety of ways with an emphasis on descriptive and statistical analysis. Each assessment committee (initial and advanced) is required to provide an oral report during Assessment Day and to provide a PowerPoint presentation of their report. The Associate Dean for Curriculum and Student Affairs provides the template for the presentation materials and compiles all slides sent to the office. Members of the assessment

committees determine how the data they are summarizing to the stakeholders are best presented for clear understanding. As part of the report, tables, charts, and graphs have all been used.

Data are summarized and analyzed on an annual basis for the unit. The timeframe for specific data collection is a part of the UAS documentation. All data for the academic year is to be made available no later than the end of May so the assessment committees can begin the analysis process in June to prepare for Assessment Day at the beginning of the following academic year.

A variety of technologies are currently being used to maintain data for the UAS – the University Student Information System (Banner), LiveText for some candidate performance data, spreadsheets and databases for other performance data, and a variety of databases for other unit level data. Beginning in Spring 2008, Indiana State University's professional education unit will begin a rapid implementation of TK20. TK20 will interface with Banner to provide analysis and reporting of data against institutional student data. Key surveys, beginning and end student assessments, and a number of other selected databases will be moved to TK20 beginning in January 2008; all data management will be moved to the system by Fall 2008. While it is an aggressive planned adoption cycle, faculty are willing to make this change and several have indicated an interest in transitioning sooner.

3. How does the unit maintain records of formal candidate complaints and their resolutions?

Complaints put in writing by candidates to the institution are maintained in the Office of the Associate Dean for Academic and Student Affairs. A database for each academic year is maintained that tracks student name, date of originating complaint, the matter of issue, and the resolution of the issue. Copies of all documents relating to the complaints are also maintained in paper form (electronically during the academic year). Each fall, the database of complaints and resolutions is shared with TEC as an information item and a point of discussion.

Matters that do not rise to the level of complaint, i.e. petitions to policy, are not maintained in the Associate Dean's office, rather Educational Student Services maintains a database of appeals and decisions for initial programs, and advanced programs maintain records for those matters that are not specific to School of Graduate Studies appeal. If a matter is not successfully resolved to a student's satisfaction at the petition level, students do have the option to appeal up through the Dean's Office, as per the College of Education Congress policies, in which case an appeal is logged in the database as a complaint.

2c. Use of data for program improvement

1. What are assessment data indicating about candidate performance on the main campus, at off-campus sites, and in distance learning programs?

Data presentations conducted during the last two Assessment Days have indicated that our candidates are performing well overall. However, when the Unit has looked at the data in terms of specific questions faculty want to know about candidate performance, the Unit has discovered holes in the aggregatable data that allows us make the conclusions needed to make about our candidates. Specifically,

Weblink only

S2.22 [Assessment Day 2006 Presentation](#)

S2.20 [Assessment Day](#)

2007 Presentation

the Unit can speak in generalities about how our candidates perform at impacting P-12 student learning, but not at enough detail level to be able to consider programmatic implications. The same held true for our assessments of our candidates in diverse learning environments.

2. How are data used by candidates and faculty to improve their performance?

Departmental level or program level data is used regularly for candidate and faculty improved performance. In content areas, faculty use content assessments and content methods assessments to identify strengths and weaknesses in the content delivery. Faculty in professional education courses do the same by using reflections from students and data collected within classes. Faculty also model the use of reflective feedback by collecting periodic informal assessments on their teaching performance. Whenever possible, there is student representation on committees to review programmatic performance.

Pretenure faculty in the College of Education are required to create goals on an annual basis as part of the Promotion and Tenure process. These goals work to form the basis for the next year's review. Goals are jointly developed with department chairs and are based on previous year's information, such as SIRs, informal student feedback, candidate performance, etc.

At the candidate level, all programs have remediation plans to use when candidates do not satisfactorily meet standards. Consultation on remediation extends beyond the one instructor and if necessary will extend beyond one class. Candidates are also encouraged to use the data they have collected on their practice teaching with P-12 students to identify strengths and weaknesses in the candidates' performance for targeted improvement.

3. How are data used to discuss or initiate program or unit changes on a regular basis?

Data are the central core of program and unit changes. At each Assessment Day, UAS performance based on the data is presented to the stakeholders (faculty, students, field representatives, and university administrators). The assessment committees lead and facilitate the discussions but allow for issues to be raised from the participants. The first two Assessment Days have had participation levels at over 30 for every session. The assessment committees use these discussion points to provide a series of recommendations to TEC that are directed to either programmatic changes, or unit changes, and most often at this point, revisions to the UAS (i.e. assessments used, processes, etc.).

At another level, programs that bring forth programmatic changes are challenged by the governing bodies, as part of the program approval process, to describe and justify changes based on data. For example, with current programmatic changes that are being implemented as part of Project PRE, program coordinators and department chairs are being asked how they are considering programmatic and unit level data findings in their revisions. Additionally, when programs make changes, governing bodies are asking how changes to curriculum will in turn impact candidate assessment and the collection of aggregatable data for unit analysis.

When relevant, data that indicate an issue that needs more immediate

S2.26 ADV Assessment Committee Meeting Notes

- [1/10/06](#)
- [1/23/06](#)
- [2/14/06](#)
- [2/28/06](#)
- [4/6/06](#)
- [4/5/07](#)
- [4/10/07](#)
- [4/12/07](#)
- [4/19/07](#)
- [Retreat Notes](#)
- [8/20/07](#)
- [Recommendations](#)

S2.27 ITP Assessment Committee Meeting Notes

- [2/13/06](#)
- [2/28/06](#)
- [3/22/06](#)
- [4/12/06](#)
- [4/24/06](#)
- [3/12/07](#)
- [4/5/07](#)
- [4/10/07](#)
- [4/17/07](#)
- [5/1/07](#)
- [Retreat Notes](#)
- [8/16/07](#)
- [Recommendations](#)

S2.28 [Email invitation to ADV working lunch](#)

attention (rather than wait for Assessment Day) is addressed immediately. For example, when Praxis I results received in the middle of the year indicated an issue related to scores, the Unit discussed ways to help students with Praxis I with the outcomes being an invitation for faculty to take the Praxis I exam (paid for by the College of Education; several faculty did), and the establishment of a course to assist students with Praxis I.

4. What data-driven changes have occurred over the past three years?

S2.29 [Communication to University stakeholders](#)
[Email message](#)

S2.6 [Memo attachment for email](#)

S2.9 TEC Minutes

- [12/19/06](#)
- [1/16/07](#)
- [3/20/07](#)
- [4/17/07](#)
- [9/18/07](#)
- [10/16/07](#)

Date	Modification Made	Based Upon
Spring 2006	TEC Bylaws Approved	NCATE visit and report, reflection by UAS teams
Fall 2006	Forms Committee temporarily created to work on initial program assessments	Aggregation of data for first Assessment Day revealed disparate forms that made aggregation impossible.
Spring 2007	Added three level dispositional assessment in Advanced Programs	Missing data points - Dispositional data for all advanced programs that can be aggregated
Spring 2007	Change of PSU (Proficient, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory) to EMD (Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Does Not Meet Expectations)	Problems in data on internship evaluations, clear definition of PSU among all programs and cooperating teachers. Change effective with Fall 2007

Spring 2007	Identification of guiding UAS questions	Frustration from faculty presenting for first Assessment Day and trying to determine how best to make meaning from data.
Fall 2007	New dispositional assessment for ITP to be placed in TK20, assessed by EPSY 202 instructor, content faculty & field supervisor.	Lack of aggregatable data to make meaningful conclusions, placing dispositional assessments where feedback is most needed. Change effective Spring 2008.
Fall 2007	New diversity assessment for ITP assessed at least twice by faculty and field supervisor.	Current assessments did not provide enough candidate information on working with diverse populations.
Fall 2007	Common student teaching evals, field evals, and work sample rubric evals for ITP.	Difficulty aggregating unit level data. Effective Spring 2008.
Fall 2007	New advising and faculty effectiveness survey items to be added to other surveys for ADV programs.	Lack of data in these areas. Effective Spring 2008.
Fall 2007	New technology and diversity assessments for ADV programs.	Lack of data in these areas across all programs. Effective Spring 2008.
Fall 2007	New Educator Work Sample for ADV programs.	Lack of systematic way for ADV programs to evaluate impact on P-12 student learning and student environments. Effective 2008.
In process	Ongoing changes in ITP to increase intensive field experience prior to student teaching.	Program level data showed a need for additional intensive fieldwork. Feedback from partner schools requested more intensive that would be less disruptive to schools.

5. How are assessment data shared with candidates, faculty, and other stakeholders?

S2.20 [Assessment Day 2007 Presentation](#)

Web link:

S2.22 [Assessment Day 2006](#)

S2.30 [Assessment Day 2006 Participants](#)

S2.32 [Assessment Day](#)

Starting on January 13, 2007, the unit instituted an annual Assessment Day where all the stakeholders gather for a day-long event of presentation on the annual data gathered, comparison to previous data, and discussion of implications. The first Assessment Day was held in January in order to have the process begin, subsequent Assessment Days are held in early September to allow time for recommendations that come out of Assessment Day to be implemented during the current academic year. Students, faculty (T/TT, full-time, part-time, clinical supervisors), and our P-12 partners are all invited to Assessment Day. Furthermore, all analyzed and synthesized data results are posted on a public website for referral by all professional community partners involved in making decisions about educator preparation.

[2007 Participants](#)

S2.28 [Email Invitation to
ADV Working Lunch](#)

Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 2?

The faculty are truly taking ownership of the assessment process. Given the reasons behind this Focused Visit, it is overwhelming and quite impressive the level to which all of our programs have developed an interest in working together to look at how well the candidates perform overall and how well the Unit is performing overall. Conversations are happening in meetings now that go beyond anecdotal data and focuses on the data for continual improvement. The faculty have stopped asking the questions “what do we need to do for NCATE” and are instead asking “what do we need to do better.” This is a tremendous shift in a short time and honestly would not have been possible without the unmet expectations on the last visit on Standard 2.

The faculty have always been highly concerned about candidate performance within their own programs. The degree to which those programs related to the unit as a whole was incidental and not intentional. Assessment of candidates and the Unit is being approached in a positive nature, and in point demonstrated well with the positive reception with which the move to TK20 is being approached. Chairs, program coordinators and faculty are now asking questions and wanting data to answer those questions as it relates to unit and candidate performance, and are asking for new ways to be able to see and look at data. Professional education faculty are asking for help and are asking for meetings to be able to help them progress in their understanding of the data and performance.

2. What research related to Standard 2 is being conducted by the unit?

At the point of writing this Institutional Report, no specific research is being collected as relates to Standard 2; however, it is not unusual to hear discussion about plans and possibilities. In particular, the advanced faculty, who approached their task with due diligence to be able to generate aggregatable data beyond their program specific data, have recently come to realize that the assessments, concessions, and common work sample rubric that they have created and plan to implement is not typical of all advanced programs. There is interest in exploring research related to this new level of collegiality and its impact on program design and revision.

Appendices

Table 2
Programs and their Review Status – Fall 2007

Program Name	Award Level	Program Level (ITP or ADV)	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs (e.g., State or NAEYC)	Program Report Submitted for Review (Yes/No)	State Approval Status (e.g., approved or provisional)	National Recognition Status by NCATE
ELED	Bachelor's	ITP	373	State	No	Approved	NA
Early Child.	Bachelor's	ITP	26	State	No	Approved	NA
Spec. Ed.	Bachelor's	ITP	173	State	No	Approved	NA
ELED	T2T	ITP	0	State	No	Approved	NA
Sec. Ed.	T2T	ITP	11	State	No	Approved	NA
Business Ed.	Bachelor's	ITP	18	AACSB	No	Approved	NA
Visual Arts Ed	Bachelor's	ITP	36	NASAD	No	Approved	NA
English Ed	Bachelor's	ITP	60	State	No	Approved	NA
FCS	Bachelor's	ITP	28	State	No	Approved	NA
Language Ed	Bachelor's	ITP	27	State	No	Approved	NA
Math Ed	Bachelor's	ITP	62	State	No	Approved	NA
Music Ed	Bachelor's	ITP	115	NASM	No	Approved	NA
Science E	Bachelor's	ITP	41	State	No	Approved	NA
Social Studies	Bachelor's	ITP	135	State	No	Approved	NA
Tech. Ed	Bachelor's	ITP	26	ITEA	No	Approved	NA
Health Ed	Bachelor's	ITP	8	State	No	Approved	NA
Physical Ed	Bachelor's	ITP	105	State	No	Approved	NA
SLP	Master's	ITP	29	ASHA	No	Approved	NA
School Couns.	Master's	ADV	38	CACREP	No	Approved	NA
School Couns.	ND	ADV	1	CACREP	No	Approved	NA
School Psych	Ed.S.	ADV	21	NASP	No	Approved	NA
C&I	Master's	ADV	17	State	No	Approved	NA
Library/Media	Master's	ADV	43	State	No	Approved	NA
Dir. Except. Needs	ND	ADV	1	State	No	Approved	NA
Building Admin	Master's	ADV	54	State	No	Approved	NA
Superintendent	Ed.S.	ADV	47	State	No	Approved	NA
Building Admin	ND	ADV	13	State	No	Approved	NA
Ed. Admin.	Ph.D.	ADV	32	State	No	Approved	NA
English Ed	Master's	ADV	1	State	No	Approved	NA
Math Ed	Master's	ADV	1	State	No	Approved	NA
Music Ed	Master's	ADV	0	NASM	No	Approved	NA
Science Ed	Master's	ADV	2	State	No	Approved	NA
Tech Ed	Master's	ADV	0	ITEA	No	Approved	NA
Health Ed	Master's	ADV	1	State	No	Approved	NA
Physical Ed	Master's	ADV	1	State	No	Approved	NA
Driver Ed	ND	ADV	0	State	No	Approved	NA
Special Ed	Master's	ADV	12	State	No	Approved	NA
Visual Impairment	ND	ADV	7	State	No	Approved	NA
Special Ed	ND	ADV	4	State	No	Approved	NA
Early Child.	Master's	ADV	5	State	No	Approved	NA
ELED	Master's	ADV	14	State	No	Approved	NA

Reading	Master's	ADV	3	State	No	Approved	NA
---------	----------	-----	---	-------	----	----------	----

Table 5
Unit Assessment System: Transition Point Assessments

	BCP 1 Admission	BCP 2 Entry to clinical practice	Exit from clinical practice	BCP 3 Program completion	BCP 4 Post- program completion
Initial Teacher Education Programs					
Early Childhood-Bachelor's	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GPA 2.5 • EPSY 342, ELED 110, SPED 226-C or better • Praxis I Passed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.5 GPA • Recommendation from faculty • C or better in all professional education courses • Completion of inclusionary and multicultural courses with C or better • Clear criminal history 	Successful Student Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All standards met • 2.5 GPA • University degree req. met 	Praxis II Criminal history check completed CPR Certification
Elementary-Bachelor's	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GPA 2.5 • EPSY 202, ELED 100, SPED 226-C or better • Praxis I Passed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.5 GPA • Recommendation from faculty • C or better in all professional education courses • Completion of inclusionary and multicultural courses with C or better • Clear criminal history 	Successful Student Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All standards met • 2.5 GPA • University degree req. met 	Praxis II Criminal history check completed CPR Certification
Secondary T2T	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successful content area review • Successful application interview • Candidate Statement • 3 Recs. • Bachelor's with 3.0 or 2.5 and 5 yrs exp. • Praxis I Passed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation from faculty • C or better in all professional education courses • SPED 607 C or better • Passing Praxis II • Clear criminal history 	Successful Student Teaching	All standards satisfactorily met	Criminal history check completed CPR Certification
Secondary-Bachelor's All Grade Programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GPA 2.5 • EPSY 202, ELED 225-C or better • Praxis I Passed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.5 GPA • Recommendation from faculty • C or better in all professional education courses • Completion of inclusionary and multicultural courses with C or better • Clear criminal history 	Successful Student Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All standards met • 2.5 GPA • University degree req. met 	Praxis II Criminal history check completed CPR Certification
Secondary-Bachelor's Jr High/Middle/	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GPA 2.5 • EPSY 202 -C or better • Praxis I Passed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.5 GPA • Recommendation from faculty • C or better in all 	Successful Student Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All standards met • 2.5 GPA 	Praxis II Criminal history check completed CPR Certification

High Programs		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> professional education courses Completion of inclusionary and multicultural courses with C or better Clear criminal history 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> University degree req. met 	
Special Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GPA 2.5 EPSY 202, ELED 100, SPED 102-C or better Praxis I Passed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.5 GPA Recommendation from faculty C or better in all professional education courses Completion of multicultural courses with C or better Clear criminal history 	Successful Student Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All standards met 2.5 GPA University degree req. met 	Praxis II Criminal history check completed CPR Certification
Advanced Programs for Licensed Teachers					
Elementary Ed.	Meet SOGS admission requirements Hold or be eligible for an Indiana teaching license in program area			3.0 Cum GPA Meet all standards University degree req. met	
Special Ed.	Hold or be eligible for an Indiana teaching license in program area			3.0 Cum GPA Meet all standards University degree req. met	
Library/Media	Hold a current teaching license Meet SOGS admission requirements	Student must have successfully completed 21 hours in the certification to enter practicum	Successfully complete practicum	All standards met	Application for license
Curriculum & Instruction	Meet SOGS admission requirements		Successful completion of the research project.	3.0 Cum GPA University Degree req. met.	
Communication Disorders	Bachelor's degree in CD or equivalent Meet two of the following: Undergrad GPA of 2.5 or better Minimum score of 450 on each section of GRE GPA of 3.25 on at least nine hours of Grad Work	Completion of Disposition Assessment	Successful student teaching and completion of hospital practicum Completed Disposition Assessment C or better in all clinical practicum	Meet all standards Passing Score on Praxis II or departmental comprehensive exam All program requirements met	Praxis II Clear Criminal History Check CPR Certification
Early Childhood	Meet SOGS admission requirements Hold or be eligible for an Indiana teaching license in program area			3.0 Cum GPA Meet all standards University degree req. met	

--	--	--	--	--

Advanced Programs for Other School Personnel					
School Administration (M.Ed)	Meet SOGS admission requirements	Satisfactorily complete ELAF 650, 655 & 681. Three letters of recommendation. Two years teaching experience.	Successfully complete long-term project, portfolio, dispositional assessment. Satisfactory mentor assessment	Meet all university requirements for graduation.	Pass SLLA
School Psychology	Hold a master's degree Undergrad GPA of 2.5 Grad GPA of 3.25 Minimum score of 450 on each section of GRE 3 letters of recommendation Personal narrative				
School Counseling	Meet two of the following: Undergrad GPA of 2.5 or better Have scores on the general test of GRE or MAT GPA of 3.25 on at least nine hours of Grad Work	Recommendation from faculty B or better in all counseling related courses Clear criminal history Membership in ASCA & ISCA	Successful internship Minimum of 4 days of professional development	Minimum of 3.0 GPA All standards met	Application for licensure
School Administration (Ed.S.)	Hold a master's degree Undegrad GPA of 2.5 Grad GPA of 3.25 Complete GRE 3 letters of recommendation Be eligible for standard school administration license	All courses must be successfully completed prior to summer internship.	Successfully complete summer project. Satisfactory internship evaluation.	Meet University graduation requirements	Pass SLLA

**Indiana State University
Unit Assessment System**

Educator Preparation

Revised 2007-08

Accepted by TEC December 11, 2007

Guiding Questions of the UAS		
	Initial Data Sources	Advanced Data Sources
How Well Do Our Candidates..		
Support P-12 Student Learning?	CIMT & EESE Work Samples IMAP Survey (TBD) Principal Survey (1, 2, 3, 6-17) Student Teacher Survey (6-8, 10, 11, 13-15, 17-23)	Educator Work Sample
Use technology to support learning?	EESE & CIMT Technology Profiles IMAP Survey (TBD) Principal Survey (12) Student Teacher Survey (10) NSSE	Technology questions on Field Evaluations
Use Appropriate Dispositions?	Dispositional Assessment IMAP Survey (TBD) Principal Survey (4,8,10,18,16) Student Teacher Survey (9,16,18,21,23) Student Teaching Evals (INTASC 9 & 10)	Dispositional Assessment
Work With Diverse Learners?	EPSY 341 & SPED 226 Performance Data Student Teaching Eval (INTASC 3) Diversity Field Assessment	Diversity Assessment Diversity Question from Dispositional Assessment
Perform Overall?	Praxis I & II Data Program Reports	Compressed Standards Eval into BCP Field Evaluations National Exam Results Alumni Surveys Employer Surveys Exit Surveys
Communicate?	NA	Field Evaluations Dispositional Assessment
How Effective Are Our Unit Operations In Terms Of...		
Faculty Effectiveness?	Digital Measures Data PDS Liaisons Faculty/Adjunct K-12 Exp. SIR Student Teacher Survey (24, 26,31) Principal Survey (19)	Digital Measures Data Faculty/Adjunct Exp. SIR Faculty Effectiveness Survey
Diversity of Faculty and Students?	Faculty and Student Demographic Data (Student exit and entry)	Faculty and Student Demographic Data (Student exit and entry)
Field Operations?	Field Survey Field Demographics Average Hours of Field Work	Field Survey Field Demographics Average Hours of Field Work
Advising?	Advising Survey Student Teaching Survey (26,27,28)	Advising Survey Signed program of study %
Placement and Retention of our Graduates?	PRE Database Student Teaching Eval (INTASC 3)	NA
Retention of Our Students?	University Retention Data Appeal Database Demographic Data (entry to end)	Percentage retained from Fall to Spring Demographic Data (entry to end)
Reliability of Assessments?	Interrater reliability	Interrater reliability

Data Elements Collected Transition Points and Candidate Assessment

Initial Programs (Undergraduate and Post-Baccalaureate Initial Licensure)

<i>BCP 1</i> <i>Admission to Program</i>	<i>BCP 2</i> <i>Midpoint Assessments</i> <i>Entry to Professional Experience</i>	<i>Completion of Professional Experience</i>	<i>BCP 3</i> <i>Exit from Program and Graduation</i>	<i>Post Graduation</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Praxis I Analysis • Petitions for Admission to BCP 1 • BCP Acceptance Rates • Matriculating student demographics • NSSE Freshman Data • Dispositional assessment (EPSY 202) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grades/EMD from Exceptionality Class (SPED 226, ARTE 491, MUS 418, PE 497) • Performance evaluations of early field experiences with emphasis on P-12 student learning • Dispositional Assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final evaluation of supervised teaching experience • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student teacher surveys • NSSE Senior Surveys • Praxis II Analysis • Demographic data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IMAP Surveys from State (Internship Completers) • Principal Surveys (Internship Completers) • 5-year alumni survey

Advanced Programs

<i>Admission to Program</i>	<i>Midpoint Assessments</i> <i>Entry to Professional Experience</i>	<i>Exit from Program</i>	<i>Post Completion</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate demographics • Signed program of study by end of first semester • Self-assessment dispositions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classroom-based disposition assessment • EMD on Standards as per program. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work Sample • Evaluations of Field Experience (as applicable) • Field-based dispositional assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employer Surveys • Alumni Surveys (5 years out) • Exit Survey/Self Evaluation • Graduate Demographics

Additional Data Collection and Analysis to Assess Unit Level Performance

- Academic Advising Evaluations (Student Teacher Survey Unit Operations; Advising Survey)
- Field Placement (Placement data, Host teacher evaluation of experience/process and University Supervisor)
- Diversity (Faculty Diversity, Student Diversity, Field Placement/Experiences, Candidate Skills)
- Student Retention (University retention data by program)
- Consistency of performance data (correlation study of performance assessments)
- Program summaries submitted to TEC
- Faculty effectiveness (Digital measures data on service, K-12 experience, scholarship, Adjunct vitas on degrees, K-12 experience, scholarship, SIR, Faculty Effectiveness Survey)

Alignment of Key UAS Performance Assessments to Standards

<i>Performance Assessment</i>	<i>Conceptual Framework Elements Assessed</i>
Initial	
Praxis I	Expert/Mediator of Learning
Praxis II	Expert/Mediator of Learning
Exceptionality Performance	Expert/Mediator of Learning
Performance evaluations of early field experiences with emphasis on P-12 student learning	Expert/Mediator of Learning Person Member of Community
Disposition Assessment	Person
Candidate Skills with Diversity	Expert/Mediator of Learning Person
Final Evaluation of Student Teaching Experience	Expert/Mediator of Learning Person Member of Community
Advanced	
Cumulative GPA	Expert/Mediator of Learning
Course level assessment	Expert/Mediator of Learning
Problems in Practice/Action Research	Expert/Mediator of Learning Person Member of Community
Field Evaluations	Expert/Mediator of Learning Person Member of Community
Disposition Assessment	Person

Responsibility for Data Collection, Analysis, and Action

<i>Data Element</i>	<i>Responsibility for Collection</i>	<i>Responsibility for Analysis and Presentation</i>	<i>Responsibility for Action (Presented at Fall TEC Assessment Day)</i>
Initial			
Praxis I Analysis (Spring)	Dean's Office (Title II)	Dean's Office	Initial Subcomm. to TEC
Petitions for Admission to BCP 1 (Spring)	Dean's Office – ESS	Dean's Office	Initial Subcomm. to TEC
BCP Acceptance Rates (Spring)	Dean's Office – ESS	Dean's Office	Initial Subcomm. to TEC
Matriculating student demographics (high school, GPA, rank, SAT, Gender, Ethnicity, County/State) (Fall)	Dean's Office	Dean's Office	Initial Subcomm. to TEC
NSSE Data (Every other year - Fall)	OSPIRE/Assessment Coordinator	Dean's Office/Assessment Coordinator	Initial Subcomm. to TEC
Grades/EMD from Exceptionality Class (SPED 226, ARTE 491, MUS 418, PE 497) (Summer)	Programs	Dean's Office	Initial Subcomm. to TEC
Performance evaluations of early field experiences with emphasis on P-12 student learning (Fall)	Programs	Programs & Dean's Office	Initial Subcomm. to TEC
Dispositional Assessment (Fall)	Programs	Programs & Dean's Office	Initial Subcomm. to TEC
Student Teacher Survey (Every semester)	Programs (given forms by Dean's Office)	Dean's Office	Initial Subcomm. to TEC
Student Teaching Evaluation (Every semester)	Programs	Programs	Initial Subcomm. to TEC
Praxis II (Spring)	Title II Data (Dean's Office)	Dean's Office	Initial Subcomm. to TEC
IMAP Survey (Spring)	State	Dean's Office	Initial Subcomm. to TEC
Principal Survey (Spring)	Dean's Office	Dean's Office	Initial Subcomm. to TEC
5-year alumni Survey (Spring)	Dean's Office	Dean's Office	Initial Subcomm. to TEC
Advising Survey	Programs	Programs	Initial Subcomm. to TEC
Advanced			
Candidate Demographics (Fall)	Dean's Office	Dean's Office	Adv. Subcomm. To TEC
Signed program of study (Fall)	Programs	Programs	Adv. Subcomm. To TEC
Course Level Assessment (EMD) (Fall)	Programs	Programs	Adv. Subcomm. To TEC
Dispositional Assessment	Programs	Programs/Dean's Office	Adv. Subcomm. To TEC
Problems in Practice/Action Research	Programs	Programs	Adv. Subcomm. To TEC
Field Evaluations	Programs	Programs	Adv. Subcomm. To TEC
Employer Surveys (Spring)	Programs	Programs	Adv. Subcomm. To TEC
Alumni Surveys (Spring)	Dean's Office	Dean's Office	Adv. Subcomm. To TEC
Exit Survey/Self-Evaluation (Spring)	Programs	Programs	Adv. Subcomm. To TEC
Graduate Demographics (Fall)	Dean's Office	Dean's Office	Adv. Subcomm. To TEC

<i>Unit Data</i>			
Academic Advising Evaluations (Spring)	Dean's Office	Dean's Office	Adv. Subcomm. To TEC
Field Placement – Placement Data	Programs	Dean's Office	
Field Placement - PDS Principal Survey (Summer)	PDS Office	PDS Office	PDS Steering to TEC
Field Placement - Host Teacher Survey (Fall)	Dean's Office	Dean's Office	
Faculty Diversity Data (Spring)	Dean's Office	Dean's Office	TEC
Student Diversity Data (Fall)	Dean's Office	Dean's Office	TEC
Field Placement Diversity Data (Spring)	Dean's Office with help from FE Offices	Dean's Office	
Candidate Diversity Skills (Fall)	Programs	Programs & Dean's Office	PDS Steering to TEC
Student Retention Data (Summer)	OSPIRE	Dean's Office	TEC
Consistency of Performance Data (Summer)	Dean's Office	Dean's Office	TEC
Program Summaries Spring	Programs	Programs	Initial & Adv. Subcomm. To TEC
Faculty Qualifications (Summer)	Programs	Dean's Office	TEC