2007 Part C of the AACTE Annual Report

Section 1 - Institutional Information

NCATE ID:	11445	**AACTE SID:**	1590
Institution:	Indiana State University		
Unit:	College of Education	**Deadline to Submit Final Version of Part C:**	01/15/2008
Next Accreditation Visit:	S08	**Last Accreditation Visit:**	F05

Section 2 - Individual Contact Information

Unit Head Name:	Bradley Balch	**Unit Head Title:**	Dean
Unit Head Email:	bbalch@isugw.indstate.edu	**Unit Head Phone:**	(812) 237-2919
Unit Head Fax:	(812) 237-4348	**Institution Unit Phone:**	(812) 237-2919
1st NCATE Coordinator:	Dr. Susan M. Powers		
1st Coordinator Title:	Associate Dean	**1st Coordinator Email:**	spowers@isugw.indstate.edu
1st Coordinator Phone:	(812) 237-2918	**1st Coordinator Fax:**	(812) 237-4348
2nd NCATE Coordinator:			
2nd Coordinator Title:		**2nd Coordinator Email:**	
2nd Coordinator Phone:		**2nd Coordinator Fax:**	
CEO Name:	Dr. Lloyd W. Benjamin, III		
CEO Title:	President	**CEO Email:**	president@indstate.edu
CEO Phone:	(812) 237-4000	**CEO Fax:**	(812) 237-7948

Section 3 - Completer

The total number of candidates who completed education programs within NCATE's scope (initial & advanced) during the 2006-2007 academic year?

424

Please enter numeric data only. (Include the number of candidates who have completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings in the 2006-2007 academic year. They should include all candidates who completed a program that made them eligible for a teaching license. It also includes licensed teachers who completed a graduate program and candidates who completed a program to work as a school administrator, school psychologist, school library media specialist, school psychologist, reading specialist, and other specialties in schools. These include the candidates who have completed a bachelor's, post-bachelor's, master's, specialist, or doctoral program. The programs are not tied to a state license.)

Section 4. Substantive Changes

Describe any of the following substantive changes that have occurred at your institution or unit during the past year:

1. A change in the name of the unit or institution.
2. The status of the institution (e.g., campuses merged, campuses separated, etc.).
3. Changes in key personnel, particularly the unit head, NCATE coordinator, or university/college president.
4. The addition and/or removal of programs.
5. The addition or removal of a level of preparation (e.g., addition of a master's degree or doctoral program).
6. Changes in program delivery, particularly when traditionally delivered programs become distance learning programs. (NCATE defines distance learning programs as programs in which more than 50 percent of the courses are not delivered face-to-face.)
7. Significant changes in physical facilities.
8. Significant changes resulting from unforeseen conditions such as natural disasters or health calamities.

Fall 2006, the College of Education welcomed a new Dean, Dr. Brad Balch. He was an internal candidate (previously serving as Chair of the Educational Leadership Administration and Foundations Department, and as an associate professor of Educational Adminstration) that was hired out of a national search. With the beginning of his tenure as Dean, he was able to return two permanent Associate Deans to the College of Education - Dr. Susan Powers who had been serving as Acting Associate Dean was fully appointed as Associate Dean for Curriculum and Student Affairs and coordinate NCATE efforts, and Dr. Rebecca Libler returned from temporary work in the Provost's office to serve as Associate Dean for Outreach and coordinate our Professional Development School efforts and our Teacher Quality Grant (Project PRE).

At the end of the 2006-07 academic year, it was announced that President Benjamin's contract would not be renewed after the June 30 2008, thereby initiating a presidential search beginning Fall 2007.

Institutionally, 2006-07 saw the implementation of Program Prioritiziaton. Program Prioritization was a a campus-wide effort to minimize the number of low-enrolled programs across campus and to redirect resources to other programs. Several education programs were recommended for elimination or reconfiguration from the prioritization program, These programs included advanced programs (master's degrees) in various content areas across campus, the initial and advanced early childhood programs, and a non-degree program for Director of Exceptional Needs and Director of Vocational Education. Faculty worked in 2006-07 to reconfigure these programs and consolidate where possible. Program proposals are being submitted Fall 2007 and include a new early childhood education undergraduate minor (elimination of major), a consolidation of three Elementary Education M.Ed. programs into one with concentrations in reading and early childhood, revised and streamlined programs for the Director of Exceptional Needs and Director of Vocational Education, and a revision to the M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction which will allow teachers to add a concentration/focus in content areas.

Section 5. Conceptual Framework(s)

The conceptual framework(s) establishes the shared vision for a unit's efforts in preparing educators to work effectively in P-12 schools. It provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. The conceptual framework(s) is knowledge-based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and/or institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.
Please indicate evaluations of and changes made to the unit's conceptual framework (if any) during this year:

The unit continues to affirm the conceptual framework - Becoming a Complete Professional.

Section 6. Candidate Performance

Standard 1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

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

All candidate assessments are mapped to the state, professional and institutional standards. Each program has also completed a backmapping process whereby the INTASC standards (initial level) or National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (advanced teaching programs) or Professional Standards (other school services) are mapped to the conceptual framework (institutional standards) and the relevant state standards. Faculty ensure that all candidates satisfactorily meet all standards and institute remediation for candidates where appropriate and standards are not met.

All program proposals in educator related programs are required to submit a revised standards matrix to ensure that candidates have sufficient opportunities to meet and be assessed on standards

On an annual basis, educator programs all submit a content standards assessment matrix (as per the Indiana Department of Education Protocol) that demonstrates where each standard is addressed, assessed and how it is assessed. These matrices are peer reviewed and when appropriate, feedback is given to programs about areas of concern or question.

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 1 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

1.	Candidate dispositions are not clearly articulated and assessed across all programs.	(ITP)	(ADV)
2.	Candidates' effect on student learning is not clearly assessed across all programs.	(ITP)	(ADV)

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these Areas for Improvement (Optional).

1 (ADV). For the advanced programs, a new dispositional assessment was created and adopted by the Advanced Programs UAS Subcommittee and approved by the Teacher Education Committee (TEC). It was implemented late Spring 2007 with a few programs, with full implementation for all programs beginning Fall 2007. It is an online assessment which the students complete first as a self-assessment and print out and sign an acknowledgement that they are aware of the disposition on which they are being assessed. Each advanced program has also identified a midpoint course where faculty complete the dispositional assessment on all students, and then students with internship experience are assessed by supervisors in the field. The

dispositional assessment is directly tied to the Conceptual Framework.

I (ITP). In the initial programs, secondary education and elementary education continued their process for dispositional assessment they had used in the past; however a committee was formed to examine the different assessment forms that each program uses to assess candidates to create more common assessments that allow for easy aggregation of data across programs, including dispositional assessment. A final form and process was agreed to out of this committee, although the form was not approved by TEC until Fall 2007. A new process for assessment was also approved whereby students are assessed in the first gateway course by the instructor, assessed by a field supervisor, and assessed a third time by content area faculty. The new process and assessment will be implemented Spring 2008.

2 (ITP). The assessment of impact of student learning had been embedded in teacher work samples at the initial level; however, the data was not able to be aggregated and the work sample was assessed differently between elementary education and secondary education. These programs have met to confer on a common format for assessment of the work sample and to better delineate the process of assessing impact on student learning. Data on this new process will be collected in 2007-08 to determine effectivness.

2 (ADV). With the advanced programs, a seminar meeting was held in Spring 2007 to discuss how best to assess how well our advanced candidates effect student learning and/or create supportive learning environments. The faculty present elected to also use an educator work sample approach simliar to the initial programs. A small group worked on a sample rubric during Summer 2007 and presented the rubric to the Unit on Assessment Day 2007 (Sept. 7, 2007). The rubric was well-received at Assessment Day and went forward to TEC. TEC approved the rubric at it's November meeting and the work sample will be implemented with as many programs as possible in Spring 2008, and all programs beginning Fall 2008.

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.

Please describe the unit's plans for and progress in meeting this standard.

In working to aggregate data and provide an interpretative framework for data analysis, it was determined that colelcted data elements were not congruent enough at the initial level to allow for meaningful aggregration. Therefore a committee was formed to examine the different assessment forms that the secondary and elementary education programs use to assess candidates and createdd more common assessments toallow for easy aggregation of data across programs.

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 2 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

1.	The unit has not fully developed and implemented a system of data collection regarding unit operations.	(ITP)	(ADV)
2.	The unit has not identified a systematic and continuous process for data collection, aggregation, dissemination and analysis of candidate performance at the unit level.	(ITP)	(ADV)
3.	Management and oversight responsibilities related to the unit assessment system are not clearly identified nor implemented.	(ITP)	(ADV)
4.	The unit does not appropriately track formal complaints and their resolution.	(ITP)	(ADV)

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these Areas for Improvement (Optional).

1 & 2. (ITP & ADV). The faculty in TEC and the TEC UAS Subcommittees (see below) have worked to refine the UAS into a system that looks at candidate and unit performance overall. The UAS delineates data collection at transition points for candidates, who holds responsibility for collecting data and reporting out each data element, when data is collected, and what key questions about the unit are answered by the data. The subcommittees worked to develop the fundamental questions of candidate and unit performance in order to provide structure for understanding the data and providing a framework for discussion during Assessment Day. The fundamental questions were an addition after the first Assessment Day when facutly were challenged by organizing the voluminous data that existed and trying to determine what gaps might exist in the data. The focus on the fundamental questions has brought the subcommittees and TEC during Fall 2007 to the development of several new candidate assessments to fill holes in our data collection and our understanding of candidate and unit performance on an aggregated level.

3 (ITP & ADV). In Spring 2006, a set of bylaws and guidelines was developed by the Teacher Education Committee (TEC) to clearly delineate and clarify its role in the management and oversight of the UAS. The bylaws created a more formal structure for electrion of officers and the executive committee to ensure that continuity exists beyond the academic year, it confirms that the TEC provides continuous review of professional education licensure programs and that TEC holds primary responsibility for the UAS. As part of this responsibility, the TEC establshed two Unit Assessment Planning Committee (Initial and Advanced) to review program assessments, provide feedback to programs and provide an annual report to TEC which takes place as part of the newly established Assessment Day (established by the TEC Bylaws). TEC now formally votes on all recommendations that

emerge from data analysis.

4 (ITP & ADV). A formal database was created to track candidate complaints and their resolutions. The prior academic year's information is presented to TEC at the December meeting for discussion (names of the complainants are not revealed). Thirty-three complaints/appeals reached the Dean's office. Several reach the Dean's office by way of information only (i.e. student judicial terminations) and did not involve an appeal or complaint. Education Student Services continues to maintain an appeal database - the database maintained in the Dean's office reflects those issues that rise above the level of an appeal and cover more than appelable matters.

Section 7. Unit capacity

Standard 3. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice.

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school personnel develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn.
Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes and/or improvements related to Standard 3 that occurred in your unit this year:

We are in the final years of a USDOE grant and one of the major outcomes will be more intensive field experiences prior to the student teaching semester. Elementary Education is running a pilot Fall 2007, with an expanded pilot Spring 2008. Faculty are meeting on a weekly basis to plan how a revised program will work and are heavily utilizing input from the host teachers, school principals, and the candidates to refine the pilot and institute the changes.

Secondary education is conducting a simlar pilot with Math Education this Fall 2007. The professional education faculty are working with content faculty to ensure that the extended field work semester will work with all content areas and that class scheduling can be jointly managed.

The goal is to provide a better mechanism to evaluate candidate performance in the field, provide students with a more realistic experience that more closely mimics the average day of the teacher, and to respond to host teachers' concens that brief drop-in field experience are too disruptive to the instructional environment.

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 3 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these Areas for Improvement (Optional).

Standard 4. Diversity

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. These experiences include working with diverse higher education and school faculty, diverse candidates, and diverse students in P-12 schools.
Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes and/or improvements related to Standard 4 that occurred in your unit this year:

The College of Education is in the midst of a cultural audit that began during the summer. The faculty have completed a cultural awareness inventory (IDI), and faculty, staff, and students have completed or are completing a cultural climate survey. The results from this data collection will go to a newly formed committee that will use the data to update and/or create anew a College of Education Diversity Plan.

Out of data results from Assessment Day 2007, TEC recognized that not all faculty and students are operating from a common definition of diversity. The lack of a common definition, clearly delineated and accepted, becomes problematic when multiple parties are assessing our candidates' diversity skills, but don't hold a common definition. TEC has formed a subcommittee that meets fo the first time November 30, 2007 to begin the work of creating a common definition that will accompany newly created diversity assessments for the advanced and initial programs.

A conclusion made from Assessment Day 2007 was that it was difficult to ascertain the degree to which our candidates as a whole were successful at working in diverse learning environments. More expanded assessments were created by the Initial and Advanced UAS subcommittees and approved by TEC in Fall 2007 to be implemented beginning Spring 2008.

Two faculty members from the College of Education are working with state groups to examine state issues with lack of diverse teaching populations in Indiana and the impact on our schools. Dr. Hema Ganapathy-Coleman (faculty for gateway course in teacher preparation) has been invited to work with the Indiana Civil Rights Commission. Dr. Catherine Tucker (faculty in School Counseling) has been invited to work the Indiana NAACP to examine the low numbers of African American teachers in Indiana and how to improve recruitment statewide.

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 4 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

1.	Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with diverse peers.	(ITP)	(ADV)

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these Areas for Improvement (Optional).

1 (ITP). We are attempting to isolate data to help us understand where our attrition of diverse candidates occurs. Indiana State University as an institution is one of the more diverse higher education institutions in the state, and the percentages for educator preparation at the entry level are comparable to the institution's numbers; however, our graduation numbers within diverse populations is extremely low and visual evidence in our teacher education courses confirms little diversity in classes. Anecdotally, blame for the fall in diverse candidates has been blamed on passing scores for Praxis I, but in the last year questions have been raised if the data supports this evidence. For example, there does not appear to be a great deal of diversity in the first gateway course, potentially indicating that diverse candidates have changed their minds about a teaching profession somewhere between completing the admissions application and entering the first gate. The new MIS to be implemented in Spring 2008 will be used to further investigate where and why we are losing our diverse candidates.

The TEC committee is also examining if sufficient effort is being put into the recruitment of all candidates and also diverse candidates. A series of TEC seminars are being held with Admissions staff to determine how best to recruit teacher education candidates and how our web presence can help with high school students who are seeking a teacher education program.

1 (ADV). The advanced teaching programs struggle with providing opportunities to work with diverse peers because the area school corporations from where we draw our advanced teacher candidates have very limited diversity themselves. Expansions to school corporations that have greater diversity usually take place at those school sites. Our other advanced programs where candidates move to campus to complete their studies tend to have greater diversity among candidates. In the process of completing a number of graduate program revisions, programs are working to provide curricular opportunities for candidates in mutiple programs to interact, thereby also increasing contact with diverse peers for advanced teaching candidates.

Standard 5. Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development.

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

Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes and/or improvements related to Standard 5 that occurred in your unit this year:

The pilot programs emanating from the USDOE TQE grant are bringing about continued change and growth in this area. Faculty working wih the pilot programs are incorporating feedback from the field and candidates at unprecedented levels and finding out that they can change the range and depth of what they teach as a result of the extended field experiences.

Faculty are taking greater responsibility for their professional development and have asked to participate in a reading circle on the professoriate facilitated by the Dean of the College of Education and a learning community on teaching effectiveness instituted by a senior faculty member. Voluntary attendance in these groups has been strong.

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 5 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these Areas for Improvement (Optional).

Standard 6. Unit Governance and Resources.

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

Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes and/or improvements related to Standard 6 that occurred in your unit this year.

The University's Chief Information Officer (CIO) has been collaborating with the College of Education to develop or identify a MIS that will help the unit aggregate and analyze data from its many sources (i.e. institutional data, candidate performance data, applications, surveys, etc.). The Office of Information Technology led information gathering sessions and facilitated the eventual purchase of TK20 (to be implemented beginning Spring 2008).

A major development is that construction work has begun on the renovation of University Hall (formerly the lab school) that will become the new home of the College of Education. It is anticipated that we will relocate by May of 2009.

Areas for Improvement related to Standard 6 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

Please indicate how the unit has addressed these Areas for Improvement (Optional).

If you have another comments, use the space below: