



National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

******Report*

NCATE Board of Examiners Team:

Dr. Julie A. Weisberg
Dr. Judy A. Harrison
Ms. Katherine A. Miller

State Team:

Mr. Kevin Walter
Dr. Geoffrey Schultz
Dr. Karen Venditti

State Consultant:

Dr. Marg A. Mast

NEA or AFT Representative:

N/A

Accreditation Visit to:

INDIANA UNIVERSITY
KOKOMO

2300 South Washington Street
Kokomo, IN 46904-9003
9/19/2009-9/23/2009

Type of Visit:

Continuing visit - Initial Teacher Preparation
First visit - Advanced Preparation

Board of Examiners Report

SUMMARY FOR PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

Institution:

Indiana University-Kokomo

Team Findings:

Standards	Initial	Advanced
1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Standard Met	Standard Met
2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	Standard Met	Standard Met
3. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	Standard Met	Standard Met
4. Diversity	Standard Met	Standard Met
5. Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	Standard Met	Standard Met
6. Unit Governance and Resources	Standard Met	Standard Met

Not Applicable (Programs not offered at this level)

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Provide a brief overview of the institution and the unit.

Indiana University Kokomo is one of eight campuses in the Indiana University system. It is a non-residential regional liberal arts institution, providing a wide range of bachelor's and a limited number of master's and associate's degrees for an 11-county service area in north central Indiana. The University currently enrolls approximately 2800 students. Although IU Kokomo has traditionally served primarily part-time, non-traditional aged students, the 2008-09 freshman cohort included approximately equal numbers of non-traditional and traditional-aged students.

Originally founded as Kokomo Junior College in 1932, the college became a 2-year unit of Indiana University in 1945. Its first 4-year baccalaureate program was elementary education, which first awarded degrees at the June, 1970 commencement. Thus, the university has a long history of preparing teachers for the Indiana public schools.

The professional teacher education unit is the Division of Education, which currently includes eight full-time faculty members, one of whom is serving as the Acting Dean and another of whom is serving as the Acting Assistant Dean. The unit also includes two professional staff members and two administrative assistants. Eight adjunct (part-time) faculty and eight clinical supervisors also teach courses and provide supervision for student teachers. The Division offers baccalaureate degrees in Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education, and Secondary Education. The secondary education and fine arts programs are offered in collaboration with the College of Arts and Sciences. As of fall, 2008, there were 320 students enrolled in initial teacher preparation programs.

2. Describe the type of state partnership that guided this visit (i.e., joint visit, concurrent visit,

or an NCATE-only visit). Were there any deviations from the state protocol?

This was a joint visit conducted according to the state protocol.

3. Indicate the programs offered at a branch campus, at an off-campus site, or via distance learning? Describe how the team collected information about those programs (e.g., visited selected sites, talked to faculty and candidates via two-way video, etc.).

There are no distance learning or off-campus programs.

4. Describe any unusual circumstances (e.g., weather conditions, readiness of the unit for the visit, other extenuating circumstances) that affected the visit.

Since the previous visit, the unit has experienced unusually high turnover in leadership, as well as openings in key leadership positions. As the unit is currently configured, there are unfilled positions for a Dean (12-month, .75FTE), an Associate Dean for Assessment and Accreditation (12-month, .25 FTE), and an Assistant Dean for Program Review and Graduate Studies (10-month, .25 FTE). Since the last Dean stepped down at the end of the 2007-08 academic year to accept a position at another institution, there have been two successive acting deans, and the associate dean's position has been unfilled. The current acting dean has assumed many of the responsibilities of all three administrative positions. It was evident to the team that much of the apparent inconsistency in record keeping over the past two years was the result of this instability in the dean's office, absence of a dedicated assessment/accreditation director, and limited support staff. That the unit has continued to function relatively smoothly and that the quality of the programs and graduates has not been significantly affected is due in large part to the dedication and hard work of the remaining full-time faculty in the unit.

II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.

The conceptual framework 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 is knowledge based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.

1. Provide a brief overview of the unit's conceptual framework and how it is integrated across the unit.

The mission of the Division of Education is to prepare successful teachers for the classroom who must master both a body of content and pedagogical knowledge and effective teaching skills. The bachelor's degree programs prepare teachers for initial licensure in Indiana, while the master's program is designed to enhance the knowledge and skills of experienced classroom teachers. The initial and advanced preparation programs are each guided by a fully developed conceptual framework that establishes learning outcomes for candidates around seven "metastandards" developed by the unit.

The conceptual framework for the initial programs is grounded in the INTASC standards as well as in state content standards for teacher preparation. The seven initial program metastandards describe the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of professional teachers in the following areas: child development and learning; diversity; curriculum and content knowledge; instruction; assessment; professionalism and

learning communities; and family and community involvement. Each metastandard is further described by components, which differ for the early childhood, elementary, and secondary education programs to reflect the appropriate national program content standards. Coursework and assignments are aligned with the metastandards, and rubrics accompanying the metastandards allow developmental assessment of candidates' abilities across six semesters of the program. In accord with the unit's developmental view of teacher preparation, increasing levels of proficiency on the metastandards rubrics are expected as the candidates progress through the programs' benchmarks. The metastandards are the basis of assessment of candidates' knowledge and skills during field experiences and student teaching, candidates' program exit portfolios, and candidates' dispositions.

The conceptual framework for the advanced programs is also expressed in terms of seven metastandards that are based on the standards of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. The seven advanced metastandards are: subject and pedagogic knowledge, managing and monitoring student learning, commitment to diversity, technology and/or the internet; field practice, inquiry and reflective practice, and learning community. Like the initial metastandards, the advanced metastandards are broken down into components that further describe them, and are accompanied by a rubric that allows for developmental assessment of candidates' proficiencies. Course work, required assignments, and exit portfolios are all assessed with rubrics that incorporate the advanced program metastandards.

III. STANDARDS

In its responses to each standard, the team should indicate when differences exist among the main campus, distance learning programs, and off-campus programs.

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

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

1. Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 1 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

Yes

No

jñ

jñ

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Results of Praxis II subject area specialty exams all indicate that initial program completers know the content of the subjects they plan to teach. Data from the required subject area specialty tests for the Praxis II, presented in Table 4 attached to the IR, show pass rates for all content areas at 100 percent. These data were corroborated onsite through examination of candidates' performance in content courses and field and clinical experiences, e-portfolios, and data from surveys of program completers and P-12 administrators.

Candidates' content knowledge is assessed at six benchmarks that determine whether candidates are allowed to continue their progression through the program. One criterion that enables candidates to move from benchmark to benchmark is the passage of identified content courses with a C or better. By the second benchmark (semester IV), candidates must have a 2.50 or better GPA overall and in their education courses. Candidates cannot make below a "C" in their content courses. GPA's are monitored each semester by the data manager, and are reviewed at benchmark meetings. Candidates cannot advance to the next benchmark if they do not meet this criterion.

University supervisors and P-12 host teachers assess content knowledge in field experiences and clinical practice and candidate e-portfolios using metastandard rubrics. Each rubric has seven proficiencies and relevant components that are based upon INTASC principles and standards determined by the Indiana Division of Professional Standards. The seven proficiencies are rated on a 4-point scale, with a rating of 4 being the highest and a minimum rating of 3 (mastery) on all proficiencies required for program completion. Knowledge of content in early childhood education (P-3), elementary education (K-6) and secondary programs (5-12) is assessed by Metastandard 3, which includes components 3.1 Knowledge of Content, 3.2 Representation of Content, and 3.3 Knowledge of Students' Misrepresentations of Content. Mean scores for Metastandard 3 at Benchmark 6 (program completion) ranged from 3.0-3.9 for early childhood candidates (fall 2008-spring 2009), 3.4-3.9 for elementary candidates (fall 2006-spring 2009), and 3.3-3.9 for secondary candidates (fall 2008-spring 2009). These host teacher and university supervisor assessments indicate that candidates' content knowledge at all levels is at the mastery level.

In order to complete Benchmark 6, candidates are also expected to demonstrate mastery of all metastandards by choosing appropriate artifacts for their e-portfolios. Faculty and P-12 teachers assess how well the artifacts selected by candidates represent the standard and the quality of the candidates' reflections on these artifacts using the metastandards rubrics. From fall 2006 through spring 2009, mean portfolio scores for Metastandard 3 for all programs ranged from 2.7-3.5, with the more recent data indicating a lower level of mastery. This data trend has resulted in program changes (see Standard 2C). Live demonstrations of e-portfolios by current candidates and recent program completers indicated their ability to demonstrate appropriate levels on all seven metastandards.

The unit has surveyed candidates at the time of program completion and P-12 school administrators who observed their performance during student teaching since fall, 2006. Question 11 on this survey, "Teach subject matter concepts in ways that help students learn," relates to knowledge of content. Since fall 2006, program completers and P-12 school administrators have rated candidates as well prepared in this area, with mean scores consistently above 3.5 on a 4-point scale. The unit does not survey graduates and their employers.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

At the advanced level, content knowledge for candidates in the MS in Education program is demonstrated through successful completion of courses, overall GPA, assessment of classroom experiences (implementing developed curriculum and action research project) using the metastandards

rubric, and assessment of program experiences (formative assessment of initial candidates' e-portfolios and a mentor experience) using the LEAD standards rubric.

Because the first cohort of MSED candidates graduated in the summer of 2009, assessment data at the time of the visit were limited. Data presented for this cohort of five completers indicated that all had demonstrated the levels of proficiency expected on each of these rubrics. For example, in spring 2009, 100 percent of the cohort scored "excellent" in "Knowledge of Lead Teacher" on the Lead rubric, and in summer 2009 100 percent of the cohort scored "exceeds expectations" on Metastandards 1 and 5 of the metastandards rubric. For the second cohort, admitted fall 2008, no completion data were available, but the preliminary data collected during the first two semesters of the program indicated that this cohort was demonstrating adequate content knowledge as well.

1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates

Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation	Acceptable

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Performance on Praxis II exams, assessments of field experience and clinical practice, e-Portfolio artifacts, and administrator surveys indicate that candidates have pedagogical content knowledge. The Praxis II exams for Early Childhood and Elementary Education are primarily assessments of pedagogical knowledge. Because numbers of test takers were too few, there were no scores available for early childhood education on the last Title II report. However, in 2005-2006, there were 40 test takers for the Elementary Education: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment and Reading Specialist exams. The 100 percent pass rates on these exams indicate that the candidates have adequate levels of pedagogical content knowledge.

Data from Metastandards 3 (Knowledge of Content) and 4 (Instruction, including application of technological advances) at Benchmark 6 (program completion) demonstrate that candidates at the initial level in early childhood, elementary education, and secondary levels have adequate pedagogical content knowledge. Data regarding candidate performance on Metastandard 3 were summarized in section 1a. For Metastandard 4, mean scores for ranged from 3.0-4.0 for Early Childhood candidates (fall 2007-spring 2009), from 3.5-3.9 for Elementary candidates (fall 2006-spring 2009), and 3.4-3.9 for secondary candidates (fall 2006-spring 2009). All data support attainment of adequate pedagogical content knowledge by candidates in all initial programs.

Benchmark 6 summative reviews of e-portfolios corroborated these findings. From fall 2006 to spring 2009, mean e-portfolios scores for Metastandard 4 for all programs combined ranged from 2.5 to 3.1. Program completer and P-12 administrator surveys for this same period indicated that both groups felt that program completers were adequately to well-prepared in areas such as use of technology, teaching subject matter concepts, and choosing appropriate teaching strategies.

Interviews with candidates and host teachers generally confirmed the adequacy of candidates' preparation in the area of pedagogical content knowledge. However, elementary education candidates mentioned in several different interviews that they did not feel prepared in the area of mathematics pedagogy (see Standard 5B, below).

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

At the advanced level, pedagogical content knowledge is assessed through the application of Metastandards 1, 2, 4 and 5 to the assessment of P-12 classroom experiences. For the first cohort of MEd completers, all candidates met or exceeded expectations on all four of these metastandards in spring 2008. Similarly, all candidates in the second cohort met or exceeded expectations for these metastandards in spring 2009. On the assessment of their performance as lead teachers, all five 2009 program completers were rated as satisfactory (1) or excellent (4).

1c. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation	Acceptable

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Key assessments that measure initial candidates' professional knowledge and skills include individual course performance and grades, field experience/clinical practice metastandards rubrics, and e-Portfolios.

Candidates must earn a "C+" or higher in all education courses and maintain a GPA of 2.50 or higher in order to progress through the six program benchmarks. Courses are aligned with INTASC performance standards and the Indiana DPS standards. Program completers demonstrate that they have the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills to be successful in course completion.

Metastandards 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 are indicators of professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills in child/adolescent development, diversity, curriculum, instruction, assessment, professionalism/learning communities, and family and community involvement. The metastandard rubrics are used to rate candidate performance during student teaching and also to rate their e-portfolios. Candidates must score at least a 3 on a 4-point scale on all Metastandards as rated by both host teachers and university supervisors during student teaching in order to pass Benchmark 6 (program completion). In addition, they must achieve ratings at the level of mastery from two raters on their summative e-portfolios at that stage. Data for initial program completers from fall 2006-spring 2008 indicate that all candidates who reach Benchmark 6 meet these criteria for program completion.

Results of program completer and employer surveys also support the conclusion that initial candidates have the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills expected of them. Responses by both program completers and employers in 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 indicate that both groups generally perceive graduates to be adequately to well prepared in all areas. In 2008-2009, program completers indicated that they believed that they were less than adequately prepared to work with parents and families to better understand students and support their learning; however, P-12 administrators indicated that they believed graduates were adequately or well prepared in all categories.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

Advanced candidates demonstrate their professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills through their

performance on Metastandards 2, 3, 6, and 7, and through the action research projects they complete. During summer 2009, all five program completers exceeded expectations on all of these standards, as demonstrated by their p-12 classroom performance. The two candidates for whom action research project data were reported exceeded expectations on the relevant metastandards. Assessment data from the second cohort, which has just started its second year in the program, indicates that these candidates are developing the expected professional and pedagogical knowledge as well.

1d. Student Learning for Teacher Candidates

Student Learning for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Student Learning for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation	Acceptable

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

For initial candidates, direct assessment of their impact on P-12 student learning occurs in the Effective Teaching Project completed during the student teaching semester. All candidates conduct a limited action research project that impacts student learning. Candidates identify where student learning could be improved, engage in a review of related literature, apply an action or strategy, and analyze the results. Candidates present their findings on the effect of their efforts to impact student learning. Candidates cannot complete Benchmark 6 without having successfully completed the Effective Teaching Project. Candidates who presented their projects to team members demonstrated an impressive command of action research methodology. The projects demonstrated that these candidates were well prepared to assess the effectiveness of learning experiences they implement in P-12 schools.

Evaluations of student teaching performance by host teachers support the findings related to the Effective Teaching Project. For Metastandard 5, Component 2–Assessment of Student Learning, ratings by host teachers were 3.0 or above on a 4-point scale for all programs.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

Metastandard 2, “Managing and monitoring student learning,” addresses advanced candidates’ ability to assess their impact on student learning. On this indicator, all five current program completers were rated as meeting or exceeding expectations in their P-12 classrooms. Advanced candidates also design, conduct, and present an action research project within the context of a P-12 setting that is assessed by graduate faculty and mentors. The two program completers for whom action research project data were reported both exceeded expectations on Metastandard 3 on this assignment.

1e. Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals

Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals	Not Applicable
---	----------------

Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Not Applicable

1f. Student Learning for Other School Professionals

Student Learning for Other School Professionals	Not Applicable ▼
---	------------------

Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Not Applicable

1g. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates

Professional Dispositions for All Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Professional Dispositions for All Candidates – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable ▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

<p>Candidates are assessed on core and professional dispositions during field experiences and clinical practice by host teachers and university supervisors. Candidates also self-assess during student teaching. At induction into the teacher education programs (benchmark 2), candidates must demonstrate acceptable scores in both core and professional dispositions. In order to complete Benchmarks 4, 5, and 6 successfully, candidates must maintain a minimum disposition score of 3 (mastery) on a 4-point scale. Data for Benchmark 6 for initial candidates from fall 2006 through spring 2009 showed mean scores exceeding 3.3 for all dispositions for candidates in all programs, indicating mastery of all core and professional dispositions for all program completers.</p>

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

<p>With limited data available, it appears that advanced candidates demonstrate appropriate dispositions for a lead teacher. During their summer 2008 diversity experience, no candidates in the first cohort were rated as displaying unsatisfactory dispositions. All candidates were rated as excellent in displaying the dispositions of a lead teacher, both in their classroom performance and in their e-portfolios.</p>

Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Not applicable

Overall Assessment of Standard

<p>Through a variety of assessment data collected over time, initial program completers demonstrate they have the knowledge of subject matter, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and dispositions expected of effective teachers. Assessment procedures are in place for candidates in the advanced program, and data have been collected from the first cohort that indicate that these candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills and dispositions expected of advanced candidates.</p>
--

Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed “target” or “acceptable.” However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

--

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
none	

AFIs from last visit: Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
none	

New AFIs

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
none	

Recommendation for Standard 1

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met <input type="button" value="v"/>
Advanced Preparation	Met <input type="button" value="v"/>

Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]

--

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

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

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 2 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

Yes

No

jñ

jñ

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

2a. Assessment System

Assessment System – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Assessment System – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Seven metastandards make up the structure of the unit's initial program conceptual framework, and form the basis of the assessment system. All initial courses are linked to the metastandards. A metastandards rubric has been developed for each of the initial programs (Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary) and is used to assess candidate performance during field experiences and student teaching, as well as to assess candidates' e-portfolios. Data on all metastandards are collected and aggregated for the purposes of evaluating candidates and programs.

Initial teacher candidates are reviewed at six developmental levels, called benchmarks. The evaluation measures used at each of the six benchmarks include: (1) grade-point average, (2) Praxis I & II scores, (3) field assessment data, (4) dispositional data, and (5) e-portfolio evaluations. Candidates must meet established performance levels in each of the areas assessed, and are regularly and systematically screened on these criteria on a semester basis. Individual candidate data are reviewed at each benchmark by an initial program committee made up of the departmental faculty, the data manager, and an academic advisor. Candidates are notified via email by the data manager of their status (i.e., good standing, good standing with concerns, and not in good standing) as they are evaluated at each benchmark. Candidates who do not make satisfactory progress are identified and screened for remediation or removal from the program. These benchmark reviews happen at the end of each semester.

Benchmark data are aggregated each semester to provide program-level information to be used for program improvement. Review of these data is conducted by the Program Improvement Committee (PIC) led by the Associate Dean for Assessment and Accreditation or the Dean of Education. While aggregated data were present for each semester of the past three years, regular meetings of the PIC were not consistently documented. Although the unit maintains a Unit Advisory Board that included P-12 and Arts and Sciences colleagues for the purpose of reviewing candidate and program data, the team was not able to document regular meetings of this group. The unit maintains a record of the history of program changes that have occurred as a result of data analysis.

The reliability and validity of the conclusions drawn from the data are ensured through a triangulation process using multiple reviewers. Each e-portfolio is assessed by two reviewers, and by a third if there is significant disagreement about the ratings. Metastandard rubrics are completed by classroom host teachers as well as university supervisors. Training is provided to candidates through e-Portfolio training sessions and to candidates, faculty, adjuncts and clinical faculty via online manuals.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

The conceptual framework for the unit's advanced programs is based on NBPTS propositions and the Indiana mentor standards. Seven metastandards comprise the structure of this program as well as provide grounding for the assessment of candidates entering and exiting programs. All candidate

knowledge, skills, and dispositions are analyzed using the metastandards. Alignment matrices document where and how candidate performance is assessed relative to the program standards.

Advanced program candidates are evaluated at five benchmarks: program admission, program completion, and three times during the program. The evaluation measures used at each of the five benchmarks are the following: (1) grade-point averages, (2) metastandards assessments, (3) leadership assessments, and (4) dispositional assessments. Data indicate that candidates are regularly and systematically screened on these criteria on a semester basis. This screening process involves full-time faculty working in the advanced program and the students' mentors.

Individual candidate performance data are reviewed by a faculty committee made up of the departmental faculty, select P-12 teachers, and the Assistant to the Dean for Program Review and Graduate Studies. Candidates are notified by email of their status as they are evaluated at each of the five benchmarks. Advanced program candidates not making satisfactory progress are identified and screened for remediation or removed from the program.

A plan exists for the aggregation of data for the purpose of program change. P-12 colleagues who have worked as mentors with advanced candidates in various field placements will participate in this assessment. The unit has not yet completed this process, since the first cohort of five candidates just graduated in August 2009.

Like the initial program, the reliability and validity of the conclusions drawn from the data are ensured through a triangulation process using multiple reviewers to generate e-portfolio and metastandard scores.

2b. Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Multiple sources are used to collect data for the assessment of knowledge, skills, and dispositions of initial program candidates. A data manager organizes and inputs the various kinds of assessment data into Excel and Access databases. Initial program metastandard and dispositional assessment data are collected through an online system. The data manager retrieves the data from this online system for screening of initial candidates (early childhood, elementary, and secondary), placing it in Excel files for end-of-semester reviews done by the faculty. During the past year, some data aggregation has also been done by the data manager.

Metastandard data and dispositional assessments are collected from full-time faculty, school-based faculty, and clinical faculty. Initial candidate data are then summarized each semester for use for benchmark evaluations and program improvement. The Associate Dean for Assessment and Accreditation is responsible for compiling data for analysis purposes. This duty is currently being performed by the Dean of Education, since the Associate Dean position is vacant.

The unit has collected data from candidates at the time of program completion and from administrators who observed them during student teaching since 2006. However, the unit does not collect data from alumni or their employers about the effectiveness of its graduates or programs.

Formal candidate complaints follow an administrative review process outlined in the unit policy manual. All documentation generated by this process is kept in an archive in the Division Dean's office. During the past two years, four complaints were recorded and resolved.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Data are collected from multiple sources for the assessment of knowledge, skills, and dispositions of advanced program candidates in the MSED program. The MSED advisor organizes and inputs various kinds of assessment data including grade-point averages, GRE scores, dispositional data, metastandard results, and mentor observation evaluations. These primary indicators are to be used by the Program Improvement Committee to initiate changes in the advanced program.

Metastandard data and disposition assessments are collected from full-time faculty and P-12 mentors working with advanced candidates in the schools where they are employed. The data manager enters the data into the ACCESS database for screening of advanced candidates. Queries and reports are generated for review by the faculty. Advanced candidate data are summarized each semester for use in benchmark evaluations and program improvement. Data compilation is done by the MSED advisor and distributed through the Assistant Dean of Program Review and Graduate Studies, usually via email to faculty actually working in the advanced program.

2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement

Use of Data for Program Improvement – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Use of Data for Program Improvement – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The chief mechanism for the use of candidate performance data for evaluating program effectiveness and initiating change is the Program Improvement Committee (PIC). The PIC meets at least once per semester and is currently chaired by the Dean of Education. All unit faculty and professional staff attend these meetings, during which candidate performance data are presented and reviewed, and specific trends and issues are identified. The Unit Advisory Board, the initial program stakeholder group, reviews relevant data in aggregate form. Members of the Unit Advisory Board reported that the group has met once in the past two years rather than each semester as planned.

Faculty have access to all candidate data generated within the courses they teach. Aggregated data used for program improvement purposes is available to the Program Improvement Committee. Faculty can also request data reports from the data manager as needed.

Candidates reported that they have access to data on a course by course basis. Many instructors include end--of-semester, one-on-one conferences with candidates for the purpose of reviewing course performance, including field performance and dispositions. Candidates are informed in writing each semester by the data manager of their status in the program with any performance-based issues identified by faculty, as well as any remedial experiences that may be necessary to return to "good standing." In the past three years aggregated data analysis has led to some documented changes in the initial program, including the following:

1. Due to relatively low candidate scores on Metastandard 2 during field and clinical experience, the unit

decided to reinstitute a diversity-related course. Faculty were also directed to infuse diversity content into course instruction at all levels of the initial program. Candidate performance in the area of diversity has improved as reflected in the metastandards scores from field and clinical experience since the implementation of the diversity course.

2. The unit's initial program e-portfolio development and training process were revised to stimulate greater candidate success. Additional workshops were created to offer candidates more guidance in artifact selection and writing rationales. Pass rates on portfolio benchmark assessments have improved since the implementation of these workshops.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

In the advanced program, the Program Improvement Committee (PIC) reviews aggregate candidate program data and makes recommendations for program improvement. The PIC meets at least once per year and is currently chaired by the Dean of Education. Unit faculty who teach in the advanced program are part of this evaluative process. Data presentation is usually done via email.

Faculty have access to all candidate data generated within the courses they teach. Faculty can also request data reports from the data manager as needed.

Five advanced candidates finished the MS degree program in the summer of 2009. Interviews with advanced candidates in this cohort indicated that benchmark evaluations had occurred and that feedback at these developmental points had been received. Data from this cohort have not yet been aggregated and reviewed by the PIC.

Starting in 2007, the advanced program data suggested that MS candidates needed a more opportunities for performances related to “teacher leader” functions. As a result, advanced candidates now serve as initial program e-portfolio evaluators and mentors. They also complete lead teacher activities such as: (1) hosting a student teacher, (2) hosting a practicum student, or (3) team-teaching an education course. Finally the metastandard rubric was revised to give more specific feedback aligned to program standards.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit has an assessment system in place that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs. For both the initial and advanced programs, assessment instruments and procedures aligned with program outcomes are used to collect formative and summative candidate assessment data at key transition points. A process has been delineated for the aggregation and review of these data for program and unit improvement. However, the team was not able to document that regular meetings of either the faculty or of stakeholder groups have occurred over the past year. The unit does not collect assessment data from graduates or their employers at either the initial or advanced levels.

Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed “target” or “acceptable.” However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
The unit has not implemented procedures to use data for program improvement.	This AFI has been revised and replaced with new AFI #1 below.

AFIs from last visit: Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

New AFIs

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
1. (Initial and Advanced) Aggregated candidate performance and disposition data are not regularly and systematically reviewed and used for program improvement.	Although policies and procedures for reviewing aggregated candidate performance data exist, the team was unable to document that faculty reviewed these data on a regular basis for the purpose of program improvement.
2. (Initial and Advanced) Follow-up surveys of graduates and employers are not conducted (initial) or planned (advanced).	There were no survey data available from initial program graduates or their employers, and no plan to collect these data for graduates of the advanced program.
3. (Initial and Advanced) Stakeholder advisory groups do not meet regularly to evaluate the effectiveness of the assessment system.	The team was able to document only one stakeholder meeting in the past two years.

Recommendation for Standard 2

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met <input type="button" value="v"/>
Advanced Preparation	Met <input type="button" value="v"/>

Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]

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 professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 3 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

Yes

No

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

--

3a. Collaboration between Unit and School Partners

Collaboration between Unit and School Partners – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Collaboration between Unit and School Partners – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

University faculty, local school partners, and other professionals assist initial candidates in developing knowledge, skills, and dispositions to positively impact student learning. University faculty members work with local school personnel to integrate resources and expertise in order to support candidates’ learning in multiple field experiences and clinical practice. Examples include special research projects, reflective pieces, and classroom lessons as part of course requirements.

Candidates are involved in numerous field and clinical experiences during their programs. The unit collaborates with four partner school districts and others in an 11-county area within the Indiana University Kokomo Region. Field experiences associated with individual courses are coordinated by the course instructors, in collaboration with individual schools.

In the student teaching program, the internship is the culminating experience. Candidates are assigned to host teachers in the field of the candidate’s placement who have at least three years of experience. Student teaching placements are coordinated by the Director of Student Teaching, who works directly with school districts on the recommendation and selection of qualified host teachers and administrators. Faculty and host teachers collaboratively evaluate candidates using the metastandard rubrics.

Collaboration with P-12 schools in the form of partnerships with Sycamore Elementary and Head Start Center have proven to be extremely beneficial to faculty and students at all levels. Professional education courses are taught onsite at Sycamore by both resident teachers and university faculty.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Advanced program candidates, who are already licensed teachers, complete their field experiences in their home schools. As part of the application process for the program, prospective candidates must document the approval of their school corporation to conduct field-based assignments in their schools. Candidates are assisted by a mentor selected from among their colleagues at the school who meet requisite criteria. These mentors complete metastandard rubrics on the candidates as well as evaluating their lead teacher projects.

3b. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Field experiences include observation and participation in a variety of settings involving different age groups, learning needs, socioeconomic levels, and ethnic backgrounds as part of course requirements. Field experiences are coordinated with course content by each course instructor. There is no system at the unit level for tracking the diversity of candidates’ field experiences, although informal efforts are made to ensure that each candidate experiences an appropriate variety of placements.

Student teaching culminates with clinical practice totaling 180 hours of supervised direct teaching. Admission to student teaching requires successful completion of Benchmark 5, which includes a GPA of 2.5 or higher, passing scores for field work on the metastandards rubric and dispositions instrument, and passing PRAXIS II. Candidates must also achieve an acceptable score on the e-portfolio prior to beginning student teaching.

During student teaching, candidates plan and implement lessons and participate in school activities and daily classroom routines. In addition, they are involved in school projects, attend parent-teacher conferences, and work with teachers and others at the school site outside of the classroom. They are supervised by a host teacher and a university supervisor, who complete the metastandards rubric and dispositional assessment twice, formatively at mid-term and summatively at the end of the experience. Although candidates and host teachers reported that metastandards assessments are routinely shared with candidates, there is no formal structure in place to assure that this feedback occurs.

Criteria for school-based clinical faculty include three years of teaching experience, state certification, and the principal’s recommendation. University supervisors, host teachers, and candidates are invited to attend a two-hour training/orientation workshop each academic semester addressing the assessment instruments and review of forms. Candidates do not formally evaluate their host teachers.

Required courses, as well as field experiences and clinical practice, provide candidates with skills and knowledge necessary to effectively infuse technology into the classroom. All candidates complete an e-portfolio that documents their achievement of the metastandards. E-posters describing action research projects based on P-12 student outcomes demonstrated the students' exemplary technology skills.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Multiple and varied assessments ensure that candidates develop necessary knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Interviews with candidates document that mentor teachers provide regular and genuine support throughout the program. The MEd program requires evaluating initial candidate e-portfolios, implementing twelve lesson plans, completing lead teacher activities, and doing an action research project. Advanced candidates complete an e-portfolio that documents their achievement of the metastandards. These candidates also conduct action research projects that require integrating theory and practice in thoughtful and meaningful ways.

3c. Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn

Candidates’ Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Candidates’ Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional	Acceptable

Dispositions to Help All Students Learn – Advanced Preparation

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Benchmark assessments conducted throughout a candidate's program document growth in the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn. Each benchmark includes assessment with the metastandards rubric and dispositions instrument, both of which reflect candidates' professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

Field experiences provide opportunities for candidates to work with and reflect upon experiences with students from diverse populations and developmental levels, and students with exceptionalities. Candidates reflect on various course projects and also receive feedback from peers and faculty. Reflections must be included as artifacts in the e-portfolio to document development of the metastandards, and are assessed as part of the e-portfolio evaluation process.

Each initial candidate completes an action research project during student teaching. These projects include data collection, analysis of data, and development of strategies to support student learning. The projects are presented in the form of an e-poster.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Advanced candidates participate in field experiences that allow them to develop and demonstrate the metastandards for the advanced program, which are linked to the NBPTS and Indiana mentor standards. In the classroom, candidates are expected to implement new curriculum, instructional strategies, technologies, etc. into their classroom. The rubrics for Metastandards 2, 3, 5, and 7 speak to candidates' abilities in this area. Faculty and initial candidates use the LEAD rubric to assess advanced candidate's leadership skills in the context of a required mentoring experience.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit and school partners work together to design and implement field and clinical experiences, and to assess candidate performance. Field experiences allow initial candidates to work with students in a variety of settings; however, there is no method of systematically tracking candidate placements to ensure that all candidates experience an acceptable variety of placements. Advanced candidates are able to apply coursework in their classrooms and in a field setting, as well as analyze data and use research. Opportunities and requirements exist for reflections and feedback related to candidate performance and student learning, but there is no formal process in place for providing written feedback to candidates from host teachers and faculty supervisors following onsite observations. Initial candidates do not formally assess the effectiveness of their host teachers.

Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed “target” or “acceptable.” However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
none	

AFIs from last visit: Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
none	

New AFIs

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
1. (Initial) The unit does not have a system for assigning and tracking field experiences for developmental level and diversity.	Although the unit informally monitors the variety of candidate field placements, there is no formal system in place for assuring that all candidates have an appropriate variety of placements.
2. (Initial) The unit has not designed and implemented procedures for providing written feedback to student teacher following onsite observations.	Although university supervisors generally conference with student teachers after observations, there is not a formal procedure for providing written feedback to the candidates.

Recommendation for Standard 3

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]

none

Standard 4: Diversity

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

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 4 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

Yes

No

jn

jn

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

4a. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences

Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Initial candidate proficiencies related to diversity are defined by Metastandard 2. Components of Metastandard 2 include knowledge of student cultural identities, valuing cultural diversity, the complex nature of diversity, culturally sensitive techniques, multiple perspectives, and understanding exceptionality. Diversity perspectives and experiences are infused in coursework, and addressed particularly in M300, Multiculturalism. The proficiencies related to diversity are assessed using metastandard rubric evaluations conducted during field experiences, disposition assessments, and e-portfolios. These assessments are conducted by host teachers and university faculty; candidates also self-assess their proficiencies and dispositions related to diversity. Candidates are expected to score at least 3 (mastery) on a 4-point scale for this metastandard by the time they reach Benchmark 6.

In fall 2007, the Program Improvement Committee noted low scores for Metastandard 2 for portfolio artifacts and reflections among candidates in all initial programs. As a result, the faculty reinstated M300 and implemented an increased focus on diversity in other courses. For the fall 2008 student teacher cohort (Benchmark 6), metastandard rubric scores ranged from 3-4 in the area of diversity. This means that candidates effectively design and teach lessons that meet the needs of diverse students, adapt and connect instruction appropriately, and create positive learning environments as evidenced by metastandard assessment data. Candidates also self assess proficiencies and dispositions related to diversity. Through interviews and e-portfolio demonstrations, candidates verified their awareness and concern for cultural and gender differences.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

For advanced candidates, proficiencies related to diversity fall under Metastandard 3. Components of Metastandard 3 include understanding how all students develop and learn; creating safe, secure, and tolerant learning environments; respecting the cultural and family differences students bring to the classroom; and treating students equitably and addressing individual differences. This metastandard is assessed using the metastandards rubric to evaluate classroom proficiency. All five program completers in 2009 met or exceeded expectations for Metastandard 3.

4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation

Candidates in the initial program interact with professional education faculty, faculty from other units, and school faculty, both male and female, from at least three ethnic/racial groups. In the initial program the full time professional staff is 71.4 percent White and 28.6 percent Asian. The unit’s faculty are made up of 57 percent males and 43 percent females. The part-time and adjunct faculty is 80 percent White, 10 percent Black, and 10 percent Multiracial. IU-K's faculty is 86.7 percent White, 7.8 percent Asian, 7.8 percent Black, and 2.2 percent Hispanic. Females account for 55.6 and males for 44.4 percent of the institutional faculty.

The unit faculty brings a range of diversity in teaching backgrounds and experiences in urban and rural settings. Faculty create classroom activities and exercises that focus on diversity. Many of the faculty have had professional experiences related to diversity, which includes traveling internationally, studying foreign languages, and/or teaching women’s studies courses. In addition, faculty research includes topics related to gender and ethnic studies.

Interviews confirmed the unit values diversity as demonstrated by good faith efforts to increase and maintain faculty and candidate diversity. Diversity is also part of the institutional strategic plan. The IU-Kokomo Diversity Committee includes a member of the unit with representatives from other departments in the institution. The Diversity Committee, formed in 2007, is responsible for addressing diversity-related issues and topics such as recruiting and retaining a more diverse faculty and student body. Committee members indicate progress toward achieving these goals. The unit advertises in minority journals and periodicals for faculty positions. In addition, the Affirmative Action Officer screens all hiring ads and may add a qualified minority applicant to the final group under consideration for a position.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

At the advanced level candidates interact with a faculty of four white females and one Asian male. They also interact with diverse faculty in their home schools and during assigned exercises and projects. Campus- wide diversity initiatives explained in relation to the initial program also apply to the advanced level.

4c. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The institution and unit continue to make good faith efforts to increase and maintain a diverse student body. Candidates are predominately white in the initial teacher preparation programs (95%). The percentage of White candidates is slightly lower at the institutional level (87.4%). Both are consistent with the geographic area, which is 90.2 percent White. There are more females (72.5% at the initial and 86% at the advanced) enrolled in the unit than males. These ratios exceed the campus-wide percentages of 66.7 percent female and 33.3 percent male, but are not unusual for teacher education programs.

The Chancellor has been charged by the President of Indiana University to promote the recruitment of

diverse candidates and seek additional scholarship and grant funding. As an example, the Office of Financial Aid has contributed to efforts to recruit minority students into teacher education programs by using work-study funds to pay students to tutor in local P-12 schools.

The Office of Campus Climate provides support for students who come from nontraditional backgrounds. This office offers a variety of services including social events, cultural heritage programs, workshops, personal counseling, leadership development and enhancement programs, mentoring, and study tables.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Candidates in the advanced program are predominantly, but not exclusively, White (87.4%).

4d. Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools

Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Candidates are placed in P-12 schools throughout the 11-county area served by IU-Kokomo. Examination of the demographic data from these school districts indicates a wide variety of student diversity among these schools. An informal process is in place to assure a variety of field placements. The Director of Student Teaching and individual faculty members consult with candidates to ensure that they experience an appropriate variety of placements. Individual course instructors select field sites to take advantage of surrounding partner schools that have diverse populations. The Director of Student Teaching considers diversity along with a candidate's geographic location and preferences in making student teaching assignments. The unit does not maintain a systematic record of field placements that insures that all candidates have diverse field experiences.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Most assignments related to the advanced program are connected to the candidate's home school, which may or may not reflect diversity. In addition to required activities completed at their home schools, candidates complete a field placement dealing with exceptionalities.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit maintains good faith efforts to recruit and retain diverse faculty and candidates, and to provide experiences and activities with diverse populations. The unit has clearly defined the competencies related to diversity that it expects of its candidates. Candidates at both the initial and advanced levels have ample opportunity to develop and demonstrate these competencies.

Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed “target” or “acceptable.” However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

--

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
None	

AFIs from last visit: Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
None	

New AFIs

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
None	

Recommendation for Standard 4

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met <input type="button" value="v"/>
Advanced Preparation	Met <input type="button" value="v"/>

Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]

--

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.

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 5 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

Yes	No
jñ	jñ

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

--

5a. Qualified Faculty

Qualified Faculty – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Qualified Faculty – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

As of fall 2009, the Division of Education employs eight full-time faculty members, all of whom hold terminal degrees. Faculty have related teaching experience in their respective fields of expertise. Faculty vitae include experiences both in higher education and p-12 settings that are varied and broad and that are related to their professional areas of focus. Faculty members provide educational leadership through their scholarship and research accomplishments. Faculty continue to seek purposeful professional development opportunities for their own improvement which continues to add to their expertise. All faculty have some prior school experience; most of them have at least four years of full-time p-12 teaching experience in their primary areas of concentration.

The unit also employs eight part-time adjunct faculty members who teach courses in the unit, and eight clinical supervisors who work with candidates in the field. The Division has clear qualifications for these faculty members. Such faculty should have extensive experience in public schools and possess appropriate academic credentials. Clinical faculty, including clinical faculty, university supervisors and host teachers, are licensed educators who have extensive experience in the p-12 setting. All adjunct faculty and all but one university supervisor hold Master's degrees in their licensure areas or school administration. However, university supervisors are often assigned to supervise student teachers in areas that are outside of their areas of expertise.

The Director of Student Teaching and the Interim Dean screen and hire clinical faculty. They are trained for supervisory roles by the Director of Student Teaching who also informally monitors their progress while they are working with teacher candidates.

The affiliation agreements with host school corporations include minimum requirements for host teachers. They must hold an appropriate teaching license and have at least three years of experience. A Master's degree is preferred. The selection of host teachers is made collaboratively with area school principals and superintendents.

5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

With the exception of one full-time faculty member (who is assigned to teach a methods course in an

area not supported by that individual's academic credentials), all division faculty are fully qualified for their teaching assignments by virtue of their academic preparation. As also evidenced through discussion with program candidates, these faculty model a range of effective teaching methods and styles. Faculty teaching assignments are aligned with their specialized p-12 school teaching experiences. Part-time or adjunct faculty have contemporary professional experiences in school settings related to the levels they teach.

Faculty modeling of best professional practices in teaching was evidenced through faculty and candidate interviews, course evaluation data and in syllabi and electronic portfolios. Course activities include guest lecturers, individualized and group-based in-class activities, and field-based experiences. The use of technology as an instructional tool by faculty was shared in interviews of initial and advanced program candidates. Faculty members use Oncourse to enhance their course delivery and as a course management tool. Faculty and candidates reported the use and development of Powerpoint and Internet assignments tied to action research in the capstone course. Technology includes computers, audiovisual equipment, and other more traditional materials.

Education faculty members have been nominated and awarded various excellence in teaching awards through the Division and the campus community.

5c. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

Division faculty are actively involved in academic scholarship in their own specialized areas of interest. Tenure track faculty are provided with a .25 FTE reassignment for research/scholarly activities. Faculty Service Reports as well as the IUK tenure and promotion process places great emphasis on scholarship. Scholarship is one of the three bases for faculty review. Division faculty vitae and publications indicate a wide variety of professional experiences resulting in peer-reviewed publications, presentations and other scholarly activity.

In accordance with the IUK Mission and the shared commitments of the division as evidenced in all program review documents, the campus embraces the values of innovation, assessment and student learning. These concepts are fully supported through the scholarly direction of faculty. All of the unit faculty demonstrate they are professionally active through the process of publication, participation in related professional organizations, presentations, collaboration with unit colleagues and/or grant procurement. For each of the past three years, all tenure track division faculty have been actively involved in scholarly/creative activity. All full-time faculty hired prior to 2008 were funded and attended and/or presented at professional conferences. Examples of their work include not only contributions to professional journals that further the advancement of knowledge in core areas related to pre-service education, but also efforts that further teacher education and contemporary issues related to p-12 stakeholders/settings. All division faculty are members of one or more professional associations related to their teaching and/or research interests.

5d. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

Service is one of the three areas reported to the Dean in each faculty member's annual service report, and is one of the three areas that comprise promotion and tenure dossiers. Service is an integral part of the education faculty agenda. Service-based faculty activities take place throughout the university, Division of Education and local and broader communities. When interviewing the unit faculty, it was apparent that the ideas and issues of scholarship and service are interrelated. According to the Division of Education Annual Faculty Review Guidelines, service activities related to the Division, campus and university are held in greater esteem and carry more weight than those to outside entities.

Unit faculty are also involved in local, state and national organizations and associations. One hundred percent of faculty are engaged in such projects. This involvement includes everything from serving as officers, journal editors, facilitators, conference reviewers and presenters. The development of Partnership Schools in the Kokomo area has enabled professors to collaborate with area educators and provide services to area schools. These range from in-service activities for teachers and on-site teaching with coordinated pre-service teacher engagement in classrooms, to parent workshops and Parent Partnership Council participation.

5e. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

The Division of Education's evaluation system includes a means to assess the accomplishments of its professional education faculty's teaching, scholarship, and service. The purpose of the process is to evaluate and improve faculty performance and provide a framework for continuing improvement. The unit does not show evidence of formal evaluation of clinical faculty, but adjunct faculty who teach in the initial and advanced programs are systematically evaluated by program candidates.

The Faculty Service Report (FSR) outline provides an avenue for each faculty member to detail and explain his/her accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarship/creative activities, and service. This process complies with the Division of Education's Guidelines for Annual Review of Faculty Performance. Faculty Service Reports (FSR) contribute to annual reviews completed by the Dean of Education. Three different levels of success are possible in each of the three areas under review. Reviewers assign the following ratings: excellent, satisfactory or unsatisfactory. Faculty and administrators discuss the reports and agree on the achievement levels. If a disagreement arises, the faculty member is permitted to write a rejoinder for inclusion with the report. The annual report process conforms to the promotion and tenure guidelines established for the entire campus. These reports are the

foundation for the promotion and tenure process.

Course evaluations from students are also kept on file, reviewed by the unit head, with results provided to individual faculty. In one section of the FSR, faculty must provide reflective statements related to the results. They may base course improvements and syllabi changes on the findings presented in the course evaluation data. Adjustments to course development and syllabi and the rationale behind those changes would also be included in the FSR. If problems are discovered at any time during the year, an improvement plan may be instituted. This process is then followed through by the Division Dean.

5f. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

Unit Facilitation of Professional Development – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Unit Facilitation of Professional Development – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

The Division of Education is committed to faculty development to encourage personal growth and build upon both content and pedagogical knowledge to inform professional practice. All full-time faculty members are provided with equal funding to support travel for the purpose of attending or presenting at state, national and/or international professional conferences. Faculty may select their professional development experiences based upon the feedback received in their annual Faculty Service Report reviews which are completed by the Dean of Education.

All campus faculty are eligible to apply for competitive grants-in-aid for research, summer faculty fellowships, university level grants and other funding opportunities. As evidenced through artifacts and faculty interviews, all faculty participate in one or more substantive professional development experience each year. Many more opportunities are available through the IU Kokomo Center for Teaching, Learning and Assessment. On-site offerings, presentations, guest speakers, as well as online workshops are scheduled and available on a variety of topics throughout the academic year. Faculty are encouraged to attend both on-campus and university system activities made available to all Indiana University faculty.

Overall Assessment of Standard

With one exception, Division faculty have the academic backgrounds and professional teaching experiences to support their teaching and supervisory responsibilities. Their varied backgrounds and unique p-12 experiences bring a breadth and depth of practical knowledge to their initial and advanced program candidates. Faculty members have terminal degrees, applicable and appropriate licenses/certifications and complementary public school teaching experiences. They provide service to their campus, division, and area public schools as well as to local, state and national organizations. Adjunct faculty and cooperating teachers are qualified for their assignments. However, clinical faculty frequently supervise student teachers outside of their areas of expertise. Overall, faculty are productive members of the unit in both scholarly and service-related endeavors and collaborate with other members of the educational community as well as with faculty members within their own division.

Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed “target” or “acceptable.” However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

--

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
None	

AFIs from last visit: Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
None	

New AFIs:

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
1. (Initial) Clinical faculty supervise student teachers outside of their areas of expertise.	Clinical faculty currently oversee student teachers who are working in school settings outside of their licensure areas. Information gathered from university supervisor and program completer interviews were confirmed through student teaching records. Assignments appear to be based on geographic constraints and/or supervisor availability. Supervisory roles are not based on matching licensure areas.
2. (Initial) Not all faculty are qualified for their teaching assignments.	One faculty member is assigned to teach a methods course for which that individual does not have academic credentials.

Recommendation for Standard 5

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met <input type="button" value="v"/>
Advanced Preparation	Met <input type="button" value="v"/>

Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]

--

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.

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 6 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

Yes

No

jn

jn

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

--

6a. Unit Leadership and Authority

Unit Leadership and Authority – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Unit Leadership and Authority – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable ▼

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

The Division of Education is the professional education unit of Indiana University Kokomo. The Division functions simultaneously as an academic unit of IU Kokomo and a semi-autonomous unit of the state-wide IU School of Education. The unit plans, delivers and operates initial and advanced programs for the preparation of teachers. The Joint Committee on Indiana Professional Standards is an institutional committee that includes members from both the Division of Education and the School of Arts and Sciences and is charged with development and review of the content curriculum in the initial programs offered by the unit. Examination of documents and minutes corroborate that the faculty has input into the ongoing planning, delivery, and operation of initial and advanced teacher education programs, and since there are so few full-time faculty they are involved extensively in numerous activities related to program planning, recruitment and delivery.

The Division delineates three formal leadership positions: Dean of Education, which is a 12 month .75 FTE assignment; Associate Dean for Assessment and Accreditation, a 12 month .25 FTE assignment; and Assistant Dean for Program Review and Graduate Studies, a 10 month .25 FTE assignment with summer stipend. The Dean of Education reports directly to the IU – Kokomo Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and consults directly with the IU Bloomington Dean of the School of Education through participation in regularly-scheduled meetings of the IU Education Deans’ Council, comprised of the administrative heads of teacher education at IU’s eight campuses.

The unit’s recruiting and admissions policies are described clearly and consistently in publications and catalogues; academic calendars, catalogues, publications, benchmarks and advertising appear to be accurate and current. Further, it was confirmed by interviews that teacher education candidates have access to student services such as advising and counseling.

6b. Unit Budget

Unit Budget – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Unit Budget – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable ▼

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

According to the Institutional Report and NCATE BOE interviews with the Chief Financial Officer/Vice Chancellor for Administration and the Interim Dean of Education, allocations are primarily determined by the IU Bloomington Budget office. Division of Education allocations are determined by the IU Kokomo Administration. Funds currently available are insufficient to adequately support the activities of the unit. For example, through interviews it was apparent that travel to and from field observations/supervision sites by full-time faculty is not reimbursed, but may come out of the \$700 travel/professional development stipend allotted for full time faculty.

6c. Personnel

Personnel – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Personnel – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

There is evidence in documents and BOE interviews that policies are in place that allow full-time faculty to be actively engaged in teaching, assessment, collaboration, scholarship, and service. Class size, teaching loads, supervision, and technology guidelines provide appropriate use of both full- and part-time faculty. Faculty loads do not exceed 12 semester hours, although no distinction is made between undergraduate and graduate teaching. All faculty are provided training in the use of Oncourse to facilitate instruction. The unit endeavors to provide adjunct and part-time faculty with orientation, assistance with syllabi preparation, and training on evaluation instruments. Adjunct and part-time faculty also meet with the Dean or a representative faculty member to discuss the Teacher Education Program, policies, and expectations.

There are ongoing vacant and interim positions which impact the workloads of the remaining full-time faculty. The Dean of Education's position is currently being filled by the second interim in two years, with the Associate Dean of Assessment and Accreditation position going unfilled for the second academic year. The Acting Dean of Education has retained her former duties as Assistant Dean, and assumed the Associate Dean duties as well, with ongoing support from the current Interim Assistant Dean. A national search for a new Dean of Education is currently underway.

The restructuring of the advisory system effective July 1, 2009 has left the unit with one 1.00 FTE professional staff (the Early Childhood Center Director), and one 0.50 FTE Director of Student Teaching and Licensing Advisor. The one 0.50 FTE Coordinator of Education and Student Resources to oversee the day to day operations of the Curriculum Lab is vacant. There is also 1.00 FTE Administrative Assistant to the Dean and one part time secretary to support faculty and staff needs as well as function as the UAS Data Manager.

6d. Unit Facilities

Unit Facilities – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Unit Facilities – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced

Preparation):

Campus and school facilities are adequate to support faculty and candidates. The unit is housed in the Main Building, which was renovated in 1996. In addition to the main office for the Division of Education which houses the office of the Interim Dean, and seven adjacent faculty offices, the unit's facilities include a well-resourced Curriculum Lab (the CuLab) that houses print resources for candidates, work spaces, and networked computers. Classrooms are equipped with instructional technology for faculty and student use. A long range plan is in place at the institutional level for facilities and for replacement of information technology.

6e. Unit Resources including Technology

Unit Resources including Technology – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Unit Resources including Technology – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

Technology is used extensively to support learning by faculty and candidates. Faculty and candidates have access to the exemplary IU state-wide library system which includes curricular and electronic information resources. Students and faculty are each given a university email account and are provided instruction in the use of the online instructional platform Oncourse. A technology fee paid each semester allows candidates access to the IU network through the Onestart portal. Course registration, fee payments, numerous services and information are available online. Computer labs are located throughout the campus for student use. The Curriculum Lab (CuLab) also contains desktop computers for candidate use. Security and confidentiality in the delivery system is ensured through numerous security measures.

The unit assessment system is currently housed in an Excel and Access database. The e-portfolio is managed using a locally designed platform that is cumbersome and does not allow for the easy extraction and aggregation of data.

Overall Assessment of Standard

Overall, the unit has the leadership and authority to manage programs for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards. While turnovers in leadership over the past two years have resulted in some discontinuities in data collection and analysis, a national search for a new full-time Dean is currently underway. The physical resources (facilities, technology) available to the unit are adequate. However, the funds currently allocated to the unit are insufficient to adequately support its activities. The limited number of support personnel and a cumbersome candidate data management system limit the effectiveness of the unit's assessment system. The budget for travel does not include funds to reimburse full-time faculty for their travel to field sites to supervise field and clinical experiences.

Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed “target” or “acceptable.” However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

--

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
None	

AFIs from last visit: Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
1. (Initial and Advanced) The unit lacks the financial resources to fully develop and maintain an assessment system for candidates.	The AFI is continued and reworded. The unit lacks the human and technological resources to fully implement its assessment system.

New AFIs

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
1. (Initial and Advanced) The unit lacks an adequate number of personnel to manage field and clinical experiences.	Currently the unit has only a half-time Director of Student Teaching, and no dedicated staff support for other clinical experiences. Individual faculty members arrange and supervise the field experiences that are associated with their individual courses.
2. (Initial) the university does not provide a budget adequate to support travel to field sites by full-time faculty to supervise field and clinical experiences.	Full-time faculty are reimburse for local travel out of their annual allotment for professional development travel.

Recommendation for Standard 6

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met <input type="text"/>
Advanced Preparation	Met <input type="text"/>

Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]

--

IV. SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

You may either type the sources of evidence and persons interviewed in the text boxes below or upload files using the prompt at the end of the page.

Documents Reviewed

--

Persons Interviewed

--

Please upload sources of evidence and the list of persons interviewed.

	Sources of Evidence
	Persons Interviewed

See **Attachments** panel below.

(Optional) State Addendum:

December 8, 2009

Dear UAB Audit Committee members,

The Division of Education has received the final BOE report from our September 19-23, 2009 joint NCATE/State visit. The Division would like to recognize the accuracy and comprehensiveness of the report and thank the BOE team for their thoroughness. Following will commence our rejoinder of the report:

BOE Report Areas for Improvement (AFI)	IU Kokomo Division of Education Rejoinder
Standard 1	
No AFI or erroneous statements	No rejoinder needed
Standard 2	
<p>(Initial and Advanced) Aggregated candidate performance and disposition data are not regularly and systematically reviewed and used for program improvement.</p>	<p>(Initial) The Division of Education has regularly met for Program Improvement Meetings twice each year beginning in Fall 2007. See Appendix A for minutes from August 2007, January 2008, May 2008, and January 2009 (Document name is Retreat instead of Program Improvement Meeting) and the agenda for May 2009 that were provided to the BOE team. Program Improvement meetings were chaired by the Associate Dean for Accreditation and Assessment. This position was vacant beginning Fall 2008, hence the inconsistencies in documentation. We agree with the BOE statement on page 10 under 2a Assessment System Summary of Findings, “While aggregated data were present for each semester of the past three years, regular meetings of the PIC were not consistently documented” However, we do not agree that the data are not regularly and systematically reviewed and used for program improvement. The BOE report indicates on page 12 under 2c Use of Data for Program Improvement Summary of Findings, “The chief mechanism for the use of candidate performance data for evaluating program effectiveness and initiating change is the Program Improvement Committee (PIC). The PIC meets at least once per semester and is currently chaired by the Dean of Education. All unit faculty and professional staff attend these meetings, during which candidate performance data are presented and reviewed, and specific trends and issues are identified.”</p> <p>(Advanced) The BOE report indicates on page 13 under 2c Use of Data for Program Improvement Summary of Findings, “In the advanced program, the Program Improvement Committee (PIC)</p>

	reviews aggregate candidate program data and makes recommendations for program improvement. The PIC meets at least once per year and is currently chaired by the Dean of Education.” See Appendix B for the minutes from 2008 and 2009 that were provided to the BOE team.
(Initial and Advanced) Follow-up surveys of graduates and employers are not conducted (initial) or planned (advanced).	The Division of Education is in agreement with this AFI.
(Initial and Advanced) Stakeholder advisory groups do not meet regularly to evaluate the effectiveness of the assessment system.	The Division of Education is in agreement with this AFI.
Standard 3	
(Initial) The unit does not have a system for assigning and tracking field experiences for developmental level and diversity.	The Division of Education is in agreement with this AFI.
(Initial) The unit has not designed and implemented procedures for providing written feedback to student teacher following onsite observations.	The Division of Education is in agreement with this AFI.
Standard 4	
No AFI or erroneous statements	No rejoinder needed
Standard 5	
(Initial) Clinical faculty supervise teachers outside of their area of expertise.	The Division of Education is in agreement with this AFI.
(Initial) Not all faculty are qualified for their teaching assignments.	The Division assumes this refers to the full-time faculty member teaching mathematics methods courses, whose academic credentials include a doctorate in Educational Psychology and seven years experience teaching middle school mathematics in a US public school. In AY 2006-2007 the Division conducted a national search for a mathematics educator, but received applications from only two qualified individuals, neither of whom accepted the position. Due to the low number of mathematics educators in the national pool, the Division decided the following year (2007-2008) to search instead for a generalist in Education with P-12 mathematics teaching experience. Eight applications were received, two of which were eventually withdrawn. Of the remaining applicants only one had direct P-12 mathematics teaching experience. That applicant was offered the position, which he accepted. The Division considers this faculty member more qualified to teach mathematics methods courses than master’s-level adjuncts, and thus he has been

	assigned those courses.
Standard 6	
(Initial and Advanced) The unit lacks the financial resources to fully develop and maintain an assessment system for candidates.	The Division of Education is in agreement with this AFI.
(Initial and Advanced) The unit lacks an adequate number of personnel to manage field and clinical experiences.	The Division of Education is in agreement with this AFI.
(Initial) The university does not provide a budget adequate to support travel to field sites by full-time faculty to supervise field and clinical experiences.	The Division of Education is in agreement with this AFI.

Thank you for your careful consideration of this rejoinder,



Julie Saam, Ph.D.
Interim Dean for the Division of Education
Indiana University Kokomo

Appendix A

DIVISION OF EDUCATION

PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT (PI)

AUGUST 27, 2007

MINUTES

1. Portfolio Reviews and Calendars

- a. The meeting began with the reiteration of the requirements for students concerning the formative and summative review of the portfolio. Faculty were presented with both the formative and summative calendars for portfolio review and the guidelines for students.
- b. Faculty discussed the process for reviewing the portfolio. They were presented with a portfolio projection chart which indicated the specifics concerning portfolios to be reviewed by each faculty member and classroom teacher team.

2. Recap Data Collection AY 2007-2008

- a. The data discussed at the Spring 2007 retreat was reviewed at the meeting. Ellen Sigler stated that the two issues discussed were score inflation and numerous "not observed" items.
- b. These stem from a lack of concise teacher training for participating teachers and were linked to the way field and clinical placements were designed and implemented.
- c. Also discussed was the need to further evaluate the field and clinical placements concerning diversity and the range of experiences afforded to each student across each of the programs.

3. Discussion from Spring Retreat cont'd

- a. It was indicated that all issues seem to be overlapping and that it was difficult to discuss one issue without the other. A brief discussion concerning what data was collected ensued, and an overview of the topics were presented.
- b. Also indicated was the addition of partnership data included in the AY 2007 report, which was not in the original version.
- c. It was recommended that all faculty review the report and any questions or concerns can be addressed as needed.

4. Diversity

a. Division Diversity Statement

- i. Dean Cantu tasked Shirley Aamidor and Masato Ogawa to develop the diversity statement and present it at the September 10th faculty meeting. Ellen Sigler indicated that was essential that we develop a policy that can be included as part of the conceptual framework for the division, and one that meets all NCATE expectations.
- ii. It was discussed that this diversity statement will also plan a role in the development of field experiences and clinical practice.

5. Method for Clarifying Metastandard Rubric Expectations

a. Benchmark Sequence Documents

- i. It was discussed that one of the ways to ensure that all involved with the process of evaluating student learning outcomes was to utilize the **Benchmark Sequence Documents** available on the web. This document helps clarify the

expectations that faculty have identified for each student at each point in the program.

ii. It was noted that there were two changes since the previous term. First, all Sequence Documents now contain the Metastandard expectation for each of the field experiences at each program level.

Additionally, the Disposition criteria for each benchmark, that was identified as part of the Disposition Policy was placed in the document according to benchmark point.

iii. It was also discussed that students should be directed to this document to help clarify for them their expectations and when they should be signing up for testing, preparing their ePortfolios, etc. It was indicated that some faculty members do utilize these documents in their classes and that all are presented with these documents during the ePortfolio training sessions.

b. Host Teacher Training

i. The training of host teachers for field and clinical practice was discussed. This was brought together with the idea of altering the way field placements were developed and implemented. It was discussed that if faculty were not in direct contact with host teachers, that these teacher more often than not would be unfamiliar with the metastandards and the expectations of their particular teacher candidate. Additionally, this might create problems when filling out the online rubrics and obtaining the data.

c. Field Experience and Clinical Practice

i. The discussion of teacher training lead to a discussion concerning field and clinical practice.

ii. It was discussed that placements were more variable than should be. Ellen Sigler presented data collected from information given to her by the faculty concerning field placements. The aggregation indicated that many placements were not *prescribed and deliberate* and therefore it was difficult to assess the experiences obtained by those teacher candidates across the programs.

iii. Faculty were show the NCATE standards, and more specifically Standard 3. Ellen Sigler indicated the expectations at the “acceptable” level, which was only “meeting standards” not “exceeding standards”. It was discussed that certain issues needed to be addressed.

iv. Dean Cantu indicated that although it is important to abide by NCATE Standards, it was our duty to ensure teacher candidates receive the best possible training from IU Kokomo. It was discussed that exceeding these standards is a goal but meeting these standards is an absolute requirement.

v. Julie Saam discussed how the 5-12 Faculty met and determined how they would develop their field experiences across the board so that teacher candidates would have a breadth of experiences in both middle school and high school environments. She indicated that this could carry over across all other aspects, such as diversity of placements.

1. Faculty decided to meet as program committees and discuss the requirements of field placements for their individual programs.

2. Amber Reed and Ellen Sigler will meet and bring to the faculty a clear definition of “field experience” that coincides with NCATE but also determines whether such things as *service learning* should be identified as a field placement. This will be presented at the September 10th Faculty Meeting.

6. New Conceptual Framework and Graphic

a. The faculty were presented with a draft of the new conceptual framework and graphic and this was discussed earlier in the meeting in reference to the Diversity statement and policy of the Division.

Program Improvement (PI) Meeting Midyear Report January 7, 2008 1:00 - 3:00

1. Dean Comments
 - a. Discussed RSS feeds, procedures and need for information
 - b. Reminded faculty of faculty service reports requirements and due date

2. Minutes From PI Meeting August 27, 2007
 - a. No approval was required for minutes
 - b. Review of information discussed

3. Approval of Remediation Policy
 - a. Remediation Policy
 - i. Shirley Aamidor made the motion
 - ii. Julie Saam seconded
 - b. Policy identified as a program requirement based on discussion at previous benchmark meetings.
 - i. Fulfilled the need to develop a consistent policy
 - ii. Fulfilled the requirement to inform candidates of consequences of not meeting program standards

4. Portfolio Reviews and Calendars
 - a. Names of Teacher Reviewers to Melissa by February 15th
 - b. Teacher/Faculty Training
 - i. Monday, February 18, 2008 4:00pm – 5:00pm
 - ii. KO 80

- 5. Fall Semester 2007 UAS Data Collection**
 - a. Aggregated Field Experience and Student Teaching Data for Individual Programs
 - i. [Early Childhood](#)
 - ii. [Elementary](#)
 - iii. [Secondary](#)
 1. Data was presented for discussion later in the meeting

 - b. Aggregated Administrator and Program Completer Survey Data
 - i. [Administrator Data](#)
 - ii. [Program Completer Data](#)
 1. Some discussion concerning Diversity may be for a later version of the program completers' survey.

2. No changes will be made as of this semester, to maintain consistency across semesters
3. Discussion concerning the new items on the administrator survey concerning “fairness” and “belief that all students can learn”. Sigler stated that this is only a beginning for the inclusion of such items in the overall evaluation.

c. Formative and Summative e-Portfolio Data

i. [Data from both formative and summative evaluations](#) (all programs combined)

1. Will disaggregate by program in future

6. Procedure/Protocol Updates

a. New Data Capture Form

b. Host Teacher Training

i. Accuracy

ii. Timeliness

iii. Conceptual Framework

7. Program Improvements

a. Diversity

i. Noted disparity between e-Portfolios and Field Evaluations especially in the area of diversity.

ii. Classroom versus Field-Based Artifacts (Authentic Artifacts)

1. Discussion concerning helping candidates reflect on the curriculum and not just on classroom assignments

2. Questions arose concerning the disparity and if the host teachers were seeing something that the candidates themselves were unable to reflect upon. Also, the possibility the host teachers may not be accurately evaluating candidates.

3. Discussed the type of artifacts required within the courses.

4. Discussed the utilization of rubrics and Bloom’s levels of the taxonomy. Discussed ensuring that faculty develop experiences within the curriculum and field that reflect conceptual framework and level expected by the candidate at that time, not simply the standards.

8. Field Experience and Clinical Practice

a. Alignment to Conceptual Framework and Standards (Benchmark Sequence Documents)

i. Discussion continued concerning a better way to ensure all candidates were meeting standards and that they were indeed reaching the level expected by program conceptual framework and benchmark sequence documents.

b. Discussion concerning consistency across all semesters and ensuring all candidates have similar experiences and meet same expectations.

c. Cantu indicated the need for specific data collection and digitization of all placement data, and a more comprehensive system for field placements must be developed. It was agreed that programmatic meetings will take place this semester to ensure development of field experiences progresses in a timely manner.

DIVISION OF EDUCATION **PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT (PI) MEETING MAY 5, 2008**

MEETING MINUTES

1. [Minutes From PI Meeting January 7, 2008](#)

a. Minutes were reviewed and approved from the mid-year data collection and PI meeting.

2. Procedure/Protocol Improvements

Field Experience Rubrics

a. Training and inter-rater scoring

1. Although inter-rater scoring has improved greatly, there were still issues noted concerning the rater agreement, and still there were requirements to bring in a third rater to rectify a discrepancy in scoring. Discussion ensued and it was determined that faculty will implement more individual training with paired teacher rater and ensure that the rubric guidelines, the artifacts and the reflective statement expectations were clearly understood.

b. Verification process within benchmarks

1. Discussion ensued concerning the high failure rate of candidates at both the formative and summative benchmark points. It was understood that the formative may indeed have a higher failure rate due to the nature of a formative evaluation, however, the rates are still higher than expected. The verification process, as identified in the Benchmark Sequence Document, will be looked at more closely and the faculty will take steps to ensure candidates are meeting portfolio requirements. It was also discussed by Julie Saam that interns can be used more in the portfolio process and that she would ensure that they had a clear understanding of that process.

c. Artifact selection

1. Discussion ensued concerning the selection of artifacts for the portfolios. Faculty determined that candidates had a limited understanding of an artifact and felt that it had to be a graded assignment from a specific class, therefore leaving out all material from student teaching. Amber Reed volunteered to create a list of acceptable artifacts so that candidates would have a better idea of what can be included in the portfolio.

3. Spring Semester 2008 UAS Data Collection

a. Aggregated Field Experience and Student Teaching Data for Individual Programs

1. Discussion ensued about the data collected for each of the programs. It was discussed that the “n” indicated the number of rubrics submitted and not the number of candidates in the cohort. As the data presents an aggregated summary of the overall scores for that benchmark, it is the case that candidates may indeed be in the pool more than once. For the sake of aggregation, each individual piece of data would be considered a “subject” and therefore counted in the “n”.

2. There was also discussion concerning the number of data points, particularly in student teaching (Benchmark 6). It was noted that faculty and staff must ensure that candidate data is entered properly and on the proper form.

1. [Early Childhood](#)
2. [Elementary](#)
3. [Secondary](#)

b. Aggregated Administrator and Program Completer Survey Data

1. Discussion ensued concerning the fact that the data demonstrate a continued problem concerning candidates "feelings of preparedness" in the area of diversity. It was noted that the addition of M300 would help the issue, but other things must also be considered.

1. [Program Completers](#)
2. [Administrators](#)

c. Formative and Summative e-Portfolio Data

1. As stated earlier, issues concerning the portfolio were noted. It should also be added that the Diversity standard was one of the lowest scored standards in both the formative and summative portfolio.

1. [Formative](#)
2. [Summative](#)

4. Program Improvements

a. Diversity

1. Inclusion of M300 into the curriculum
2. Inclusion of a diversity "speaker series" for faculty and candidates.

b. Field Experience and Clinical Practice

1. A more aggressive evaluation of field placements is beginning, ensuring that candidates have the variety of placements and diverse placements throughout the program.

2. [Data collection from faculty](#)

DIVISION OF EDUCATION PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT MEETING MINUTES

January 5, 2009

1:00 – 3:00 P.M.

Main Building—Bogle Room

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 P.M. Present were Dr. Patricia Swails, Melissa Grabner-Hagen, Masato Ogawa, Tae Khil Jeong, Julie Saam, Ellen Sigler, Ed Stipp, Michael Tulley, Marilyn Skinner, and Bobbi Johnson.

Dr. Swails welcomed everyone back from the Holiday Break, and turned the meeting over to Ellen Sigler for the data aggregation review. Ellen informed the group that she is moving out of administrative duties and her role as Portfolio program setup, evaluation and remediation, and that she has been working with Rudy Kiser in Computer Services in the process of using IT technology to review and evaluate the e-Portfolios online. Ellen informed the group that she designed the data aggregation procedures under the direction of Dean Cantu, and stated that the program could be changed but would need to be rewritten. She noted that the purpose of the Program Improvement Meeting was to review/discuss the process and decide what has gone well and what has not gone well.

Portfolio Reviews and Calendars

Ellen distributed a handout of the Formative and the Summative e-Portfolio Calendars for spring 2009 see (**Appendix A**). Ellen reviewed the calendars and opened the floor for discussion of the e-Portfolio review process. Michael Tulley commented that at this point in time, there is too much faculty involvement in the process of mentoring, reviewing, evaluating, and remediation of the students' e-portfolios. Michael noted that there is 100% mentoring by faculty in the classrooms and he stated that it was his understanding that the e-portfolio review should be the responsibility of administration. His concern was with time involvement in mentoring students and coordinating classroom teachers for the review. He noted that it is important for an outsider, such as a classroom teacher, to review student's work.

Dr. Swails stated that since she is new to the Division and the process of e-Portfolio review, she has been working with Ellen to understand all that is required for this process, and she will assume additional responsibilities, and will work with Barbara Amos, Faculty Secretary and Student Data Manager, to accomplish some of the administrative tasks. She noted for the record that prior to the Benchmark meeting, she met with students for remediation and also scored the e-Portfolios. Group consensus was that the process for review is working and will be looked at and evaluated again in the future. Dr. Swails noted the possibility of identifying and hiring a group of classroom teachers who would be willing to be trained for e-Portfolio review and hiring them as adjunct faculty for that purpose. She noted the possibility of making changes with a goal of implementing them in the 2009 Academic Year.

Recap Data Collection Fall 2008

Ellen Sigler presented the *Formative and Summative Aggregated Portfolio Scores Fall 2008 Document* (see **Appendix B**). Ellen reviewed the document and explained the data and how the Metastandard scores reflect students' intentions and how they are performing in the field. Ellen explained the evaluation of feedback, and noted that the scores are prior to remediation of e-Portfolios, and emphasized that the Formative scores are good while the Summative scores are lower. Ellen opened the floor for discussion of

the document and the process of data collection. Consensus of the group indicated that this document is a valuable documentation of how our students are performing in the field and will be a great asset for NCATE Accreditation Review in September 2009.

AY 2007-2008 PI Meeting Recap

Ellen presented Charts for the *Early Childhood (P-3) Fall 2008 Benchmark 3, 5 and 6* (see **Appendix C**), Charts for *Elementary (K-6) Fall 2008 Benchmark 3, 4, 5, and 6* (see **Appendix D**), and Charts for *Secondary (5-12) Fall 2008 Benchmark 4, 5, and 6* (see **Appendix E**). Ellen reviewed data collection and how it is reflected in the charts. Topics for discussion are listed below:

- a. Method for Clarifying Metastandard Rubric Expectations
- b. Diversity
- c. Field Experiences
 - i. Diversity
 - ii. Tracking
 - iii. Oversight

Ellen explained the creation of the policy for Benchmark sequence. Ellen reviewed the Benchmark documents and described the n/o documentation listed on the chart, and posed the question of "is this acceptable" and "why is it noted on the evaluations". She noted that evaluations should show that the host teachers and university supervisors understand the evaluations and they should be consistent for each student. Other points of concern were the location of host teachers and university supervisors' evaluations of students noting a defined location for these evaluations would make the process more clear and crisp. Ed Stipp, Director of student Teaching, noted that he distributes the documents to the host teachers and university supervisors at each of their respective meetings and reviews/explains the documents to them.

There was discussion regarding student teacher placements and the importance of diversity in the schools and classrooms for student teacher placements noting that the student teachers should have experiences in diverse environments.

Dr. Swails noted that she will set up a series of short meetings with Barbara, Ellen and Julie regarding the new web site and data collection process for the Metastandard Rubrics regarding candidate performance. Dr. Swails mentioned 21st Century skills should be field experience related and stated that she would audit fall 2008 and spring 2009 course syllabi. Julie Saam noted that State Program Review requires data collected for Standard I. She noted that she will be updating and rejoining programs reviewed and not yet reviewed for NCATE final review. Julie noted that NCATE expects us to take a wholeistic look at what we do and why. She stated that the Unit Assessment System is a huge piece of teaching and looking at trends and development of the teacher education program.

Meeting adjourned: 2:30 P.M.

Division of Education

PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT (PI) MEETING
May 6, 2009
1:00-3:00

Agenda

1. e-Portfolio Reviews
 - A. Formative
 - B. Summative Remediated Scores

2. Student Teaching Evaluations

3. Dispositional Evaluations

4. Recap Data Collection Spring 2009

5. Observations

6. Recommendations

7. New Business

Appendix B

MS in Education

Program Improvement Meeting

October 8, 2008

Attendance: Julie Saam, Ellen Sigler, Pat Swails

Benchmark Letters: Once we send the benchmark letters to all active MS students, we need to send an additional letter to non-active students to recruit their return to the program.

Program Experiences: We have evaluation data from program experiences for both cohorts. Although the database, records completion of the experiences, we still have the raw evaluation. Folders need to be developed to store the evaluations in the MS file in the main Education office.

Database: As we are entering information into the database, we have discovered that Benchmark 4 does not include a place for the program experiences record and we do not have a place to record Content and/or Content Pedagogy course electives.

Initial Candidate Portfolio Evaluations: These evaluations are a part of the MS candidates' program experiences. We realize that since we are organizing the portfolio evaluations that a schedule would need to be developed to ensure that the MS candidates complete these experiences. From now on, each cohort will evaluate a Formative Portfolios in the first Fall semester and Summative Portfolios in the second Spring semester of their program.

Program Experiences: The first cohort is only a year away from finishing and has only accomplished one Lead Teacher Experience that we set up for them. We decided that the Portfolio evaluations we would provide for them; however, they would need to find their own options for the Lead Teacher experiences. Therefore, more options need to be available to them. We brainstormed a list of options:
Lead Teacher Experiences: (a) hosting a student teacher (b) hosting a practicum student (c) serving on a education panel with an undergraduate audience (d) working with an education student organization (e) guest lecturing in an education course (f) Team-teaching an education course.

MS in Education

Program Improvement Meeting

May 6, 2009

Attendance: Julie Saam, Melissa Grabner-Hagen, TK Jeong

Mentor Evaluations:

Each MS candidate has a mentor that evaluates the candidates using the Metastandards rubric. The evaluation is built into the J500 course and evaluates a P-12 experience related to curriculum implementation. We also need to build the mentor evaluation into the Y595 course to evaluate the P-12 action research experience.

More explicit feedback is needed to the candidates regarding the mentor evaluation.

Research Course Sequencing:

Candidates are not prepared for Y520 Educational research. Melissa proposed that we sequence another research introductory course or maybe just use the P507 assessment course to help the candidates think in the assessment/evaluation frame of mind before Y520. Or, sequence the P507 between the two research courses Y520 and Y595 to help bridge the gap.

Research is course-based as well as program-based. More standardized requirements are needed to outline the specifics of each course and in between.

Transfer credits:

Electives are difficult to find for our MS students particularly in their content area, but even the Education classes that we offer are general so to encourage more student enrollment. However this does not assist the MS student in improving their content knowledge and application. We now accept 6 transfer credits and would like to increase that number to 9 credits. The program has 9 credits of electives and all should be available for transfer from other institutions which more than likely includes other IU campuses.

