NCATE
The Standard of Excellence
in Teacher Preparation

INSTITUTIONAL REPORT

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

Institutional Report

This section sets the context for the visit. It should clearly state the mission of the institution. It should also describe the characteristics of the unit and identify and describe any branch campuses, off-campus sites, alternate route programs, and distance learning programs for professional school personnel.

A. Institution

A.1. What is the institution's historical context?

Indiana University Kokomo legacy.iuk.edu is one of eight campuses in the Indiana University http://www.iu.edu/ system. The institution originated as an extension center of the main Bloomington campus in 1945. Its primary purpose was to offer lower level general education coursework that could be transferred to the main campus to complete requirements for a baccalaureate degree. By the late 1960s, IU Kokomo had evolved into a regional campus with broader missions and more diverse course offerings. Today, IU Kokomo is a vibrant institution, offering more than 40 programs at the bachelor's and select master's levels. As designated by the Indiana Commission for Higher Education, the IU Kokomo primary service area constitutes the eleven counties immediately surrounding Howard County.

Located 35 miles north of Indianapolis on a 51-acre campus, IU Kokomo employs 90 full-time and 78 part-time faculty to serve 2,690 students in six schools: Arts and Sciences, Business, Public and Environmental Affairs, Continuing Studies, Nursing, and Education. The campus also houses Purdue University College of Technology Kokomo.

A.2. What is the institution's mission?

The mission of IU Kokomo http://legacy.iuk.edu/~kochncl/MissionVision.shtml is to enhance the educational and professional attainment of the residents of North Central Indiana by providing a wide range of bachelor's and a limited range of master's and associate degrees. The IU Kokomo campus is further dedicated to enhancing research, creative work, and other scholarly activity; promoting diversity; and strengthening the economic and cultural vitality of the region and the state through a variety of partnerships and programs.

The vision statement provides a focus for strategic and fiscal planning. It reads, "IU Kokomo aspires to become a regional institution of first choice recognized for providing critical opportunities for student success; acknowledged as a primary and engaged community resource; and valued as a campus where there are faculty, students, and professional staff active in research, creative work, and other scholarly activity."

The institution's mission and vision form the five IU Kokomo Statement of Values http://legacy.iuk.edu/~kochncl/MissionVision.shtml. Commitments to Student Learning, Regional Engagement, Diversity, Innovation, and Assessment define the campus community and its values.

A.3. What are the institution's characteristics [e.g., control (e.g., public or private) and type of institution such as private, land grant, or HBI; location (e.g., urban, rural, or suburban area)]?

IU Kokomo is a public, four-year institution which offers select associate degrees, a variety of

baccalaureate programs, and a limited number of graduate programs. It is one of eight campuses in the Indiana University system. IU Bloomington and IU Indianapolis form the the main, or core campus. The remaining six regional campuses are strategically located across the state. Although the IU Kokomo campus is located in south-central Kokomo, it is shielded from the city by wooded areas and large expanses of grass.

All students are commuters, half of which attend on a part-time basis. The campus has traditionally served non-traditional aged students who attend classes on a part-time basis. For the first time in IU Kokomo history, the 2008-2009 freshmen cohort saw a 50% non-traditional and a 50% traditional distribution of students. (See IU Fact Book http://www.iu.edu/~upira/reports/standard/doc/fact%20book/fact_book_0809.pdf)

A.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the institutional context may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

B. The unit

B.1. What is the professional education unit at your institution and what is its relationship to other units at the institution that are involved in the preparation of professional educators?

The Division of Education http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koeduc/index.shtml is the professional teacher education unit at IU Kokomo. It consists of administrators (dean, assistant dean), faculty, and professional staff (Center for Early Childhood Education director, Director of Student Teaching and Licensing officer, and administrative assistants).

The unit enjoys a collaborative relationship with its Arts and Sciences colleagues in the departments of Humanities, Mathematics, Science, Social Science, and Visual Arts. These content professors and department heads are members of the Joint Committee on Indiana Professional Standards and charged with development and review of the content curriculum in all programs offered by the unit. The unit's dean appoints a chair of the Joint Committee and he/she convenes meetings on a regular basis during each academic year.

B.2. How many professional education faculty members support the professional education unit? Please complete Table 1 or upload your own table at Prompt B.7 below.

Table 1
Professional Education Faculty

Professional Education Faculty	Full-time in the Unit	Full-time in the Institution, but Part-time in the Unit	Part-time at the Institution & the Unit (e.g., adjunct faculty)	Graduate Teaching Assistants Teaching or Supervising Clinical Practice	Total # of Professional Education Faculty
Number of faculty					

B.3. What programs are offered at your institution to prepare candidates for their first license to teach? Please complete Table 2 or upload your own table at Prompt B.7 below.

Table 2
Initial Teacher Preparation Programs and Their Review Status

Program	Award Level (e.g., Bachelor's or Master's)	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs (e.g., State, NAEYC, or Bd. of Regents)	Program Report Submitted for National Review (Yes/No)	State Approval Status (e.g., approved or provisional)	Status of National Recognition of Programs by NCATE

B.4. What programs are offered at your institution to prepare advanced teacher candidates and other school professionals? Please complete Table 3 or upload your own table at Prompt B.7 below.

Table 3
Advanced Preparation Programs and Their Review Status

Program	Award Level (e.g., Master's or Doctorate)	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs (e.g., State, NAEYC, or Bd. of Regents)	Program Report Submitted for National Review (Yes/No)	State Approval Status (e.g., approved or provisional)	Status of National Recognition of Programs by NCATE

B.5. Which of the above initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation programs are offered off-campus or via distance learning technologies? What alternate route programs are offered? [In addition to this response, please review the "Institutional Information" in AIMS and, if updating is needed, contact NCATE with details about these programs.]

IU Kokomo does not offer teacher preparation programs off-campus or via distance learning technologies.

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

2005 – A new Unit Assessment System was developed that addressed the deficiencies reported by the 2005 BOE team, provided data for valid judgments of candidate performance, and provided usable data to inform program, assessment system, and unit improvement.

2006 – Level 2 indicators (components) to the Metastandards rubrics were developed. Rubrics piloted spring 2007. Conceptual framework reviewed and revised. The MS in Elementary Education and the MS in Secondary Education programs were discontinued. The Center for Early Childhood Education http://legacy.iuk.edu/~ecec/ opened. Partnership agreement finalized with Sycamore School (Kokomo Center Schools). Early Childhood program was approved at the Division, Institution, and University level. Early Childhood program enrolled first cohort.

2007 – The position of Division chair was upgraded to a dean's position. D. Antonio Cantu was retained as the first Dean of Education. Associate Professor Ellen Sigler was appointed Associate Dean of Assessment and Accreditation. Associate Professor Julie Saam was appointed Assistant Dean for Program Review and Graduate Studies. Two new programs were approved at the division, institution, university, and state levels. Baccalaureate degrees in Secondary Education (four core content areas with visual arts and Middle School Generalist) were implemented. BS in Early Childhood was approved at the state level. A new MS in Education was approved. New programs enrolled their first cohorts for the fall semester.

2008 – Upon the departure of Chancellor Person and Dean Cantu, a number of personnel decisions were made. Vice-Chancellor Green was promoted to Interim Chancellor, Steve Sarratore (IPFW) was appointed

to a one-year interim appointment as Vice-Chancellor, and Patricia Swails was employed as Interim Dean of Education. As of July 1, Associate Dean for Assessment and Accreditation in the Division was vacant.

As of July 1, 2009, Associate Professor Julie Saam was appointed as Interim Dean for AY 09-10. Associate Dean of Assessment and Accreditation position remains vacant. Assistant Dean for Program Review and Graduate Studies position becomes vacant. Professor Michael Tulley was appointed Interim Assistant Dean for AY 09-10.

B.7. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit context may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

General Background and Conceptual Framework Table 1
General Background and Conceptual Framework Table 2
General Background and Conceptual Framework Table 3

See **Attachments** panel below.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

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

C.1. How does the unit's conceptual framework address the following structural elements? [Please provide a summary here. A more complete description of the conceptual framework should be available as an electronic exhibit.]

- **the vision and mission of the unit**
- **philosophy, purposes, goals, and institutional standards of the unit**
- **knowledge bases, including theories, research, the wisdom of practice, and educational policies that drive the work of the unit**
- **candidate proficiencies related to expected knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, including proficiencies associated with diversity and technology, that are aligned with the expectations in professional, state, and institutional standards**
- **summarized description of the unit's assessment system**

Unit vision & mission

The mission of the Division of Education is to prepare successful teachers for the P-12 classroom who must master both a body of content knowledge and effective teaching skills. As a result, the Division's teacher education programs offer a balance of broad liberal arts education and specialized knowledge in professional education and concentrated areas. The IU Kokomo Teacher Education Programs http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koeduc/index.shtml are based on the Professional Educator Model, a model founded on national, state, and institutional standards, and other current teacher education literature including best practices, in the belief that the teacher education candidate develops over time, from a novice to a skilled educator. This development is accomplished through knowledge gained in coursework, experiences presented in the practicum, and interactions with professionals in the field. Candidates steadily move to understand the interaction of theory and practice.

The Division has developed a Statement of Values that mirrors the five Commitments established by IU

Kokomo. Through its Commitment to Candidate Learning, the Division provides the venue for acquisition of knowledge and skills to measure student learning, the resources to enable candidate learning, the opportunity for inquiry, and by ensuring that P-12 students benefit from their interactions with pre-service and current practitioners. Through its Commitment to Regional Engagement, the Division partners with P-12 school districts, local agencies, and legislators on diverse initiatives. It continues to develop articulation agreements with a wide variety of post-secondary institutions. Through its Commitment to Diversity, the Division provides an inclusive environment to support interaction among unit administration, faculty, staff, and candidates; interaction of the unit with the larger campus community; and interaction of the P-12 community and the region at large. Through its Commitment to Innovation, the Division integrates technology, best practices in teaching and learning, and inquiry throughout curricula to encourage candidate growth. Through its Commitment to Assessment, the Division acknowledges its responsibility to continuous improvement in all its efforts to promote candidate and P-12 student learning.

Philosophy, purposes, goals, institutional standards of the unit
The unit believes the preparation of the effective teacher requires a developmental approach to candidate learning of content, dispositions, and teaching skills. The critical component of this belief is the transfer of theoretical knowledge to application in a succession of field experiences. The purpose of the preparation programs is to prepare candidates to serve as effective members and leaders of the profession; assist candidates in meeting Indiana licensure requirements http://www.doe.in.gov/dps/licensing/ for public school personnel; and to provide program completers with the requisite knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to become highly qualified professionals. The conceptual framework is a shared vision among unit administration, faculty, and staff as well as external constituencies which collaborate with the unit to develop, administer, and assess unit programs.

Knowledge bases: theories, research, the wisdom of practice, and educational policies that drive the work of the unit
Since the unit's inception, the evolution of its conceptual framework has been solidly based on extensive literature reviews conducted by faculty, the study of best practices and other scholarly work, and maturation of the profession through the interaction of practitioners with the wide variety of professional organizations. The framework is founded upon the seminal works of John Dewey. In addition, Lee Shulman's work has also been used to develop programs for teacher preparation. His theoretical categories – Content Knowledge; General Pedagogical Knowledge; Curriculum Knowledge; Pedagogical Content Knowledge; Knowledge of Learners and their Characteristics; Knowledge of Educational Contexts; and Knowledge of Educational Ends, Purposes, Values, and their Philosophical and Historical Grounds – are embedded throughout unit offerings. The writings of Kohlberg, Darling-Hammond, and Danielson have informed conceptual framework development as well. Program structures are also guided by state and national education policies, primarily in the area of content knowledge acquisition.

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

The ten INTASC principles, adopted by the state of Indiana, provide a comprehensive list of knowledge, skills, and dispositions required of beginning teachers – what they should know and be able to do. Content & developmental level standards http://www.doe.in.gov/dps/standards/ from the Indiana Department of Education (Division of Professional Standards) Office of Educator Licensing & Development build upon the INTASC http://www.ccsso.org/content/pdfs/corestrd.pdf principles. Further, standards developed by professional organizations were used by the State of Indiana to develop its teacher and content standards. At the advanced level, the NBPTS core propositions http://www.nbpts.org/the_standards/the_five_core_propositio and IDOE/DPS/OELD mentor standards http://www.doe.in.gov/dps/beginningteachers/mentorprograms.html provide a comprehensive list of performance indicators required of veteran teachers.

At the unit level, three sets of initial Metastandards
http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koeduc/eportfolio/05Elem_Metastandards_Rubric.pdf
http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koeduc/eportfolio/05ECH_Metastandards_Rubric.pdf
http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koeduc/eportfolio/05Sec_Metastandards_Rubric.pdf and one set of advanced
Metastandards http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koeduc/ms/spring08/UAS/MS_Metastandards_Components.pdf were
created to guide curriculum, instruction, and assessment of programs as well as candidate performance.
Rubrics outlining observable and measurable expectations for each indicator in each Metastandards were
written, piloted, and revised. Unit faculty engaged in curriculum mapping activities for each program.
Alignment matrices documenting course content and assessments with all standards levels were then created
to ensure all programs saturated the appropriate standards and unit expectations.

Summarized description of the unit's assessment system
The conceptual frameworks provide the foundation for the monitoring and maintenance of the assessment
system. Seven standards-based Metastandards specific to each level of teacher preparation offered by the
unit are the expectations for candidate performance at the Basic, Proficient, Mastery, and Exemplary levels.
These levels mirror the developmental philosophy of the unit and the framework's organization of
Taxonomy components: Knowledge and Comprehension, Application, Analysis and Synthesis, and
Evaluation. The advanced teacher education program extends the Analysis, Synthesis and Evaluation levels.

Benchmarks (gateways)
http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koeduc/docs/ELEMAllBenchmarks2008Revised14Aug09.pdf
http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koeduc/docs/ECHAllBenchmarks2008Revised19Aug09.pdf
http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koeduc/pdf/SecAllBenchmarks2008.pdf provide the criteria for candidate progression
through the initial preparation programs. Benchmarks 1 and 2 compose the four pre-Professional semesters,
Benchmark 3 occurs at Admission to the Teacher Preparation Program, Benchmarks 4 and 5 compose the
Professional semesters, and Benchmark 6 occurs at Admission to Clinical Practice. The successful
candidate is termed a program completer. At the advanced level,
http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koeduc/docs/MSBenchmark_Document_24Aug09.pdf Benchmark 1 occurs at
admission to the program, Benchmarks 2, 3 and 4 occur during successive semesters of professional
education coursework, and Benchmark 5 occurs at program completion.

Performance data collected at each Benchmark include state-required testing, e-Portfolio evaluation, grade
point average (cumulative and education core), field experience evaluations, dispositions evaluations, and
any key assessments required for the specific Benchmark. At the advanced level, field and program
(mentor) experiences, grade point average, dispositions, and other key assessments required for the specific
Benchmark are evaluated at the point of completion of 10, 20, and 36 credit-hour program hours. These
structures allow the unit to document trend data by cohort as well as compare Benchmark data across
semesters.

Each semester for the initial programs and strategically placed in the advanced program, division faculty
and staff review each candidate's performance at Benchmark Meetings. Decisions are made concerning
whether candidates will progress to the next Benchmark or engage in remediation identified by the faculty.
Each semester for the initial programs and strategically placed in the advanced program, Program
Improvement Meetings are held to review aggregate performance data. When indicated, recommendations
are made for program improvement requiring faculty approval. Annually, the meetings also include a
review of the assessment system and unit operations.

**C.2. (Continuing Visits Only) What changes have been made to the conceptual framework since
the last visit?**

Initial: Although the conceptual framework for the initial programs
http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koeduc/pdf/ConceptualFrameWork.pdf
http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koeduc/pdf/ConceptualFrameWorkGraphic.pdf has maintained its basic structure and

focus (the developmental philosophy of Bloom's Taxonomy), the framework was reviewed and revised based on unit and institutional changes.

In response to former IU President Herbert's mission differentiation initiative, IU Kokomo developed a new mission statement in 2005. The campus then created a strategic master plan http://legacy.iuk.edu/~kochncl/StrategicPlan.shtml, vision, and statements of values (Commitments). The Division revised its mission, strategic plan, and statements of values to mirror those of the institution. The framework has been thoroughly aligned with the new institutional and divisional missions, vision, and Commitments.

Other changes include the integration of technology throughout the Division, especially across the curricula; the intentional focus on diversity in its many forms; and the emphasis on fairness and the belief that all students can learn in the preparation of IU Kokomo pre-service teachers.

C.3. (First Visits Only) How was the conceptual framework developed and who was involved in its development?

Advanced: With the discontinuation of the MS in Elementary Education and MS in Secondary Education programs and the approval of an MS in Education for current practitioners, the conceptual framework for advanced programs http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koeduc/ms/spring08/Conceptual_Framework/Advanced_Conceptual_Framework_%202008.pdf was completely rewritten. Based on the NBPTS core propositions and the Indiana mentor standards for teachers, the advanced program framework is a logical continuation of the initial programs framework.

During the period 2005-2007, extensive discussions were held with P-12 administrators and teachers, local community agencies, and other stakeholders in the region to develop a revised, relevant master's level program focused on curriculum, instruction, and professional development.

C.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the conceptual framework may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

STANDARDS

This section is the focus of the institutional report. A description of how the unit meets each standard element must be presented. Significant differences among programs should be described as the response is written for each element under subheadings of initial teacher preparation, advanced teacher preparation, and other school professionals. Significant differences among programs on the main campus, in off-campus programs, in distance learning programs, and in alternate route programs should be identified. Links to key exhibits to support the descriptions may be attached to the last prompt of each element.

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.

Directions When Programs Have Been Reviewed Nationally or by a Similar State Review

To reduce burden and duplication, units have fewer reporting requirements for Standard1 when programs have been submitted for national review or similar state review. These review processes cover many of the elements in Standard 1. For programs that have been submitted for national review or similar state review, units are asked to report in the IR only the following information:

- **State licensing test data for Element 1a (content knowledge for teacher candidates) and Element 1e (knowledge and skills for other school professionals)**
- **Assessment Data for Element 1c (professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills)**
- **Assessment data for Element 1g (dispositions)**
- **Results of follow-up studies of graduates and employers (all standards elements)**

Because program standards do not generally cover general professional knowledge and skills nor professional dispositions, the unit must respond to all of the prompts in Elements 1c (Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates) and 1g (Professional Dispositions for All Candidates) regardless of whether programs have been submitted for national or state review.

The prompts for each element in the IR include reminders of when data for these programs need not be included. The term "similar state review" refers to state review processes that require institutions to submit assessments and assessment data for evaluation and/or approval. For more information on "similar state review," click on the HELP button at the top right corner of your screen.

1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates. [In this section the unit must address (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and, if the institution offers them, (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.]

1a.1. What are the pass rates of teacher candidates in initial teacher preparation programs on state tests of content knowledge for each program and across all programs (i.e., overall pass rate)? Please complete Table 4 or upload your own table at Prompt 1a.5 below. [This information could be compiled from Title II data submitted to the state or from program reports prepared for national review.]

Table 4
Pass Rates on Content Licensure Tests for Initial Teacher Preparation

For Period: _____

Program	Name of Content Licensure Test	# of Test Takers	% Passing State Licensure Test
Overall Pass Rate for the Unit (across all initial teacher preparation programs)			

1a.2. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from other key assessments indicate that

candidates in initial teacher preparation programs demonstrate the content knowledge delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? [Data for initial teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1a.5 below.]

Initial program candidate content knowledge is assessed through performance in content courses (as expressed in candidate GPA), Praxis II scores, field experience/clinical practice Metastandard rubrics, and the program e-Portfolio. Where the latter two assessments are concerned, components in rubrics pertaining to Metastandard 3 (curriculum and content knowledge) address candidate knowledge and representation of content knowledge of student misconceptions about content, and use of materials and resources to convey content to students.

Since our State Program Review was initiated in 2007, those Initial programs implemented in 2007 were not submitted for state review. These include baccalaureate degrees in Early Childhood Education and Secondary Education programs including Middle School Generalist, and All-Grade Fine Arts: Visual Arts.

Data from these assessments for the three-year period 2005-2008 indicate that candidates are meeting program expectations where content knowledge is concerned, at levels appropriate for particular points (Benchmarks) within programs.

1a.3. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teacher candidates demonstrate an in-depth knowledge of the content knowledge delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? [Data for advanced teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1a.5 below.]

The newly designed M.S. in Education was implemented beginning July 1, 2007, and thus was not submitted for state review. Advanced program candidates are required to meet expectations delineated in Metastandards at various Benchmark points in the program. Two Metastandards are specific to content knowledge: #1 and #5, which pertain to subject and pedagogic knowledge, and field practice, respectively. Specific elements/indicators within these Metastandards pertain to candidate ability to demonstrate breadth and depth of knowledge and understanding of subject area content, knowledge and understanding of pedagogy and content pedagogy, application of knowledge in the context of curriculum planning and classroom instruction, and use of subject, curricular and pedagogic knowledge to plan and deliver effective, developmentally appropriate instruction.

The first cohort of advanced program candidates will complete program requirements in the summer of 2009. Data pertaining to content knowledge collected at various Benchmarks so far indicate that candidates are meeting or exceeding standards and expectations.

1a.4. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation in the content area? If survey data are being reported, what was the response rate? [A table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to content knowledge could be attached at Prompt 1a.5 below. The attached table could include all of the responses to your follow-up survey to which you could refer the reader in responses on follow-up studies in other elements of Standard 1.]

P-12 administrators who have interacted with initial program candidates (both during the program and following program completion) are surveyed by the unit at the completion of each regular semester. Surveys were adapted from similar instruments developed by Darling-Hammond and Silvernail. Survey items that focus on candidate preparedness in content knowledge are directly related to program Metastandards. For example, several items include the prompt "How prepared are IU Kokomo graduates to develop curriculum that builds on students' experiences, interests, and abilities?" "How prepared are IU

Kokomo graduates to teach subject matter concepts, knowledge and skills in ways that enable students to learn?" Survey return rates from administrators are generally in the range of 40 – 50%.

(LINK to data) http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koeduc/assessment/

The first cohort of advanced program candidates will complete the program in the summer of 2009. Follow-up surveys of completers and employing administrators will be conducted in the fall of 2009.

1a.5. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the content knowledge of teacher candidates may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

Standard 1 Table 4

See **Attachments** panel below.

1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates. [In this section the unit must address (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and, if the institution offers them, (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.]

1b.1. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs demonstrate the pedagogical content knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? [Data for initial teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1b.4 below.]

Pedagogical content knowledge and skills are assessed in the same manner as content knowledge, described in 1a.2 above; i.e., Praxis II, field experience and clinical practice evaluation rubrics, e-Portfolio artifacts, and administrator surveys. Candidate performance is viewed from a developmental perspective, with the expectation that pedagogical content knowledge and skills will improve across time and Benchmark reviews, from basic understanding, to application, and then to analysis and synthesis. Program Metastandards are based on INTASC principles and content standards developed by relevant professional organization, and thus are directly aligned to state and national standards. Where initial programs are concerned, two Metastandards are most directly related to candidate pedagogical content knowledge: #3 and #4, which pertain to curriculum/content knowledge and instruction, respectively. Specific elements or indicators in these Metastandards assess candidate ability to represent content, respond to student misconceptions about content, choose developmentally appropriate instructional approaches, support teaching with research, address individual differences in planning and delivering instruction, and vary instructional approaches.

1b.2. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teacher candidates know and apply theories related to pedagogy and learning, are able to use a range of instructional strategies and technologies, and can explain the choices they make in their practice. [Data for advanced teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1b.4 below.]

Advanced program candidate performance is assessed at multiple points. M.S. in Education Metastandards are derived from, and aligned with, NBPTS standards and Indiana Mentor Standards. Where candidate knowledge and application of pedagogy and learning, choice of instructional strategy and use of technology

are concerned, key assessments in the advanced program include candidate GPA, program experience evaluations, field performance, and e-Portfolio artifacts. Where the latter two are concerned, Metastandards 1, 2, 4 and 5 are most useful for assessing candidate ability. These pertain to subject and pedagogic knowledge, managing and monitoring student learning, technology, and field practice, respectively. Specific elements/indicators within these Metastandards address (e.g.,) application of content pedagogy to curriculum and instruction, organization of instruction to meet goals, implementation of developmentally appropriate learning experiences, responses to individual needs of students, identification and use of technology and internet resources to support student learning, demonstration of effective classroom management skills, and incorporation of systematic and varied assessment techniques to monitor student learning.

The first cohort of advanced program candidates will complete the program in the summer of 2009. Data collected at Benchmark checkpoints so far indicate that advanced program candidates are successfully meeting or exceeding expectations.

1b.3. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation in pedagogical content knowledge and skills? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to pedagogical content knowledge and skills could be attached at Prompt 1b.4 below.]

As described in 1a.4, P-12 administrators who have interacted with initial program candidates (both during the program and following program completion) are surveyed by the unit at the completion of each regular semester. Surveys were adapted from similar instruments developed by Darling-Hammond and Silvernail. Survey items that focus on candidate preparedness in content knowledge are directly related to program Metastandards. See data linked in 1a.4.

The first cohort of advanced program candidates will complete the program in the summer of 2009. Follow-up surveys of completers and employing administrators will be conducted in the fall of 2009.

1b.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the pedagogical content knowledge of teacher candidates may be attached here. (Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.)

1c. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates. [In this section the unit must address (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and, if the institution offers them, (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.]

1c.1. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation and advanced teacher preparation programs demonstrate the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards to facilitate learning? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1c.5 below.]

Initial and advanced program candidate performance related to professional and pedagogical knowledge is assessed primarily through individual course performance and grades, field experience/clinical practice Metastandard rubrics, and e-Portfolios. Where the latter two are concerned, in the initial programs, this knowledge is primarily assessed through Metastandards 1, 2, 4 and 5, which address child development, diversity, instruction, and assessment, respectively. In the advanced program this knowledge is primarily assessed through Metastandards 1, 2 and 3, which address subject and pedagogic knowledge, diversity, and field practice, respectively. Note that field evaluation and e-Portfolio rubrics utilize the same seven Metastandards for both field and portfolio evaluations, in both the initial and advanced programs.

(LINK to data) http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koeduc/assessment/

1c.2. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs consider the school, family, and community contexts and the prior experiences of students; reflect on their own practice; know major schools of thought about schooling, teaching, and learning; and can analyze educational research findings? If a licensure test is required in this area, how are candidates performing on it? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1c.5 below.]

Initial program candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions related to school, family, community and prior experiences of students, and reflection on practice are assessed primarily through individual course performance and grades, field experience/clinical practice, and e-Portfolios. Where the latter two are concerned, candidate knowledge is assessed through Metastandards 2, 3, 6 and 7, which address diversity, curriculum/content knowledge, professionalism/ learning communities, and family/community involvement, respectively. Initial program candidates study major schools of thought and theories related to schools, teaching and learning within the context of specific professional education courses, most notably M300 Teaching in a Pluralistic Society, and H340 Education and American Culture (which addresses historical, philosophical, legal, and sociological perspectives of P-12 education). Candidates learn to analyze educational research through specific assignments within various professional education courses (such as article critiques and summaries). Initial program candidates also are required to enroll in a semester-long seminar that parallels the student teaching experience. In the seminar candidates learn about classroom-based action research, and then design and complete a study in their clinical practice classroom which is focused on P-12 student learning. Reflecting on practice is a key element of this research project, which begins with identification of a relevant question related to student learning and/or classroom dynamics and interactions which do not appear effective. As part of their research project, candidates also engage in a small-scale review of related literature, which includes a macro- analysis and synthesis of previous research in their area of interest. The study also must include a rationale grounded in Best Practice philosophy, which candidates also study within the context of the seminar (and also within selected methods courses prior to the clinical experiences).

(LINK to data) http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koeduc/assessment/

1c.3. What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teacher candidates reflect on their practice; engage in professional activities; have a thorough understanding of the school, family, and community contexts in which they work; collaborate with the professional community; are aware of current research and policies related to schooling, teaching, learning, and best practices; and can analyze educational research and policies and explain the implications for their own practice and the profession? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1c.5 below.]

Advanced program candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions related to these areas are assessed primarily through individual course performance and grades, program experiences, field experience, e-Portfolio, and research conducted in the context of a required two-course (6-hour) inquiry strand in the M.S. program. Where field experiences and e-Portfolios are concerned, knowledge, skills and dispositions are assessed through all Metastandards (# 1 through #7), which pertain to subject and pedagogic knowledge, managing student learning, diversity, technology, field practice, inquiry and reflection, and learning communities, respectively. The first of the two inquiry courses in the M.S. program is focused on conducting classroom-based action research; study design; identifying appropriate research questions pertaining to P-12 students, practices, policies, etc.; and reviewing, analyzing and summarizing professional literature related to the research question they identify. In the second course candidates implement the study they have designed, which includes data collection, analyses and reporting.

1c.4. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation

related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills could be attached at Prompt 1c.5 below.]

As described in 1a.4, P-12 administrators who have interacted with initial program candidates (both during the program and following program completion) are surveyed by the unit at the completion of each regular semester. Surveys were adapted from similar instruments developed by Darling-Hammond and Silvernail. Survey items that focus on candidate preparedness in content knowledge are directly related to program Metastandards. See data linked in 1a.4.

The first cohort of advanced program candidates will complete the program in the summer of 2009. Follow-up surveys of completers and employing administrators will be conducted in the fall of 2009.

1c.5. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills of teacher candidates may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

1d. Student Learning for Teacher Candidates. [In this section the unit must address (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and, if the institution offers them, (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.]

1d.1. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs can assess and analyze student learning, make appropriate adjustments to instruction, monitor student learning, and develop and implement meaningful learning experiences to help all students learn? [Data for initial teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1d.4 below.]

P-12 student learning is assessed in multiple ways in the initial program. First it is assessed indirectly as part of the Metastandard rubric. Candidate ability to impact student learning is measured in Metastandard 1.3 Multiple influences on development and behavior and 1.4 Healthy Learning Environments; Metastandard 2.3 Complex Nature of Diversity, 2.4 Culturally Sensitive Techniques, and 2.4 Multiple Perspectives; Metastandard 3.1 Knowledge of Content, 3.2 Representation of Content, 3.3 Knowledge of Students' Misconceptions about Content, 3.4 Materials and Resources, and 3.5 Planning and Supporting Challenging Curricula; Metastandard 4.2 Choice of Instructional Approaches, 4.3 Structure, and 4.5 Approaches for Classroom Management and Addressing Challenging Behavior; Metastandard 5.2 Assessment of Student Learning and 5.3 Using Assessment to Promote Learning; and Metastandard 7.2 Student Learning. Performance expectations progress from Basic to Proficiency, Mastery, and Exemplary.

P-12 student learning is directly assessed as part of the Effective Teaching Project in M440 Teaching Problems & Issues Seminar a project specifically designed to assess student learning. Initial program candidates are required to enroll in a semester-long seminar that parallels the student teaching experience. In the seminar candidates learn about classroom-based action research, and then design and complete a study in their clinical practice classroom which is focused on P-12 student learning. Reflecting on practice is a key element of this research project, which begins with identification of a relevant question related to student learning and/or classroom dynamics and interactions which do not appear effective. As part of their research project, candidates also engage in a small-scale review of related literature, which includes a macro- analysis and synthesis of previous research in their area of interest.

1d.2. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teacher candidates demonstrate a thorough understanding of the major concepts and theories related

to assessing student learning; regularly apply them in their practice; analyze student, classroom, and school performance data; make data-driven decisions about strategies for teaching and learning; and are aware of and utilize school and community resources that support student learning? [Data for advanced teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1d.4 below.]

Advanced program candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions related to these areas are assessed primarily through individual course performance and grades, field experience, and e-Portfolio. Where the latter two are concerned, candidate performance is assessed through Metastandards 2, 5, 6 and 7, which pertain to managing and monitoring student learning, field practice, inquiry and reflective practice, and learning community, respectively. As noted in 1c.3, advanced program candidates also design, conduct and present an action research project within the context of a P-12 setting.

1d.3. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' ability to help all students learn? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to the ability to help all students learn could be attached at Prompt 1d.4 below.]

As described in 1a.4, P-12 administrators who have interacted with initial program candidates (both during the program and following program completion) are surveyed by the unit at the completion of each regular semester. Surveys were adapted from similar instruments developed by Darling-Hammond and Silvernail. Survey items that focus on candidate preparedness in content knowledge are directly related to program Metastandards. See data linked in 1a.4.

The first cohort of advanced program candidates will complete the program in the summer of 2009. Follow-up surveys of completers and employing administrators will be conducted in the fall of 2009.

1d.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to student learning may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

1e. Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals

1e.1. What are the pass rates of other school professionals on licensure tests by program and across all programs (i.e., overall pass rate)? Please complete Table 5 or upload your own table at Prompt 1e.4 below.

Table 5
Pass Rates on Licensure Tests for Other School Professionals

For Period: IU Kokomo does not offer these programs

Program	Name of Licensure Test	# of Test Takers	% Passing State Licensure Test
Overall Pass Rate for the Unit (across all programs for the preparation of other school professionals)	NA	NA	NA

1e.2. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from other key assessments indicate that other school professionals demonstrate the knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? [Data for programs for other school professionals that have been nationally

reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1e.4 below.]

IU Kokomo does not offer programs for other school professionals.

1e.3. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about the knowledge and skills of other school professionals? If survey data are being reported, what was the response rate? [A table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to knowledge and skills could be attached at Prompt 1e.4 below. The attached table could include all of the responses to your follow-up survey to which you could refer the reader in responses on follow-up studies in other elements of Standard 1.]

Not applicable

1e.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the knowledge and skills of other school professionals may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

1f. Student Learning for Other School Professionals

1f.1. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that candidates can create positive environments for student learning, including building on the developmental levels of students; the diversity of students, families, and communities; and the policy contexts within which they work? [Data for programs for other school professionals that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1f.3 below.]

IU Kokomo does not offer programs for other school professionals.

1f.2. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' ability to create positive environments for student learning? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to the ability to create positive environments for student leaning could be attached at Prompt 1f.3 below.]

Not applicable

1f.3. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to other school professionals' creation of positive environments for student learning may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

1g. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates. [Indicate when the responses refer to the preparation of initial teacher candidates, advanced teacher candidates, and other school professionals, noting differences when they occur.]

1g.1. What professional dispositions are candidates expected to demonstrate by completion of programs?

There are two categories of professional dispositions in the initial programs, both based on INTASC principles and Indiana teacher standards. The first is Core Dispositions http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koeduc/forms/dispositions.shtml which all candidates, regardless of level within their program are expected to display. These dispositions pertain to issues such as meeting obligations and

deadlines, accepting procedures and rules, demonstrating effective interpersonal skills, seeking and considering alternative viewpoints, demonstrating tolerance for individuals from diverse backgrounds, submitting work that reflects high standards, taking responsibility for behavior, and demonstrating behaviors in classrooms (both university and P-12) consistent with fairness and the belief that all students can learn. The second category is Professional Dispositions http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koeduc/forms/dispositions.shtml, which are evaluated developmentally, and reviewed at each Benchmark meeting. These dispositions pertain to candidate ability to demonstrate effective problem solving, acceptance of constructive feedback, creating a safe classroom environment and reflecting on their professional behaviors.

Advanced program dispositions http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koeduc/docs/ms_dispositions_rubric.pdf are based on NBPTS core propositions and Indiana Mentor standards. Candidates are expected to display dispositions such as: thinking systematically about practices, learning from experiences, utilizing research to improve practice, sharing within the professional community, displaying a commitment to professionalism and learning, and to students and their learning

1g.2. How do candidates demonstrate that they are developing professional dispositions related to fairness and the belief that all students can learn? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1g.5 below.]

Where initial program candidates are concerned, assessments pertaining to professional dispositions occur within the context of individual course performance, and during field experiences and clinical practice. These assessments are conducted by course instructors, P-12 colleagues, and clinical faculty. In all cases standardized rubrics (related to both core and professional dispositions) are used to guide these assessments. In the initial programs candidate dispositions are viewed developmentally, with candidates expected to meet performance expectations on the basis of their progress within a program. At Benchmark 4 in the elementary education program, for example (i.e., approximately one year prior to student teaching), candidates must achieve a minimum mean score of 2.50 (of 4.00) where core dispositions are concerned, and a minimum mean score of 2.00 (of 4.00) where professional dispositions are concerned. By program completion those minimum mean scores must be 2.50 and 3.00, respectively. Average disposition scores for initial program candidates during the period 2005 – 2008 were 3.67 for core dispositions, and 3.50 for professional dispositions.

(LINK to data) http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koeduc/assessment/

Advanced program candidates are evaluated on dispositions in the following ways: firsthand observations of behaviors, attitudes, etc., during field experiences, by course instructors, host classroom teachers and principals and/or other school professionals; analyses of dispositional elements embedded within portfolio artifacts; formal and informal interactions between students and Division of Education instructors and advisors.

1g.3. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates demonstrate the professional dispositions listed in 1.g.1 as they work with students, families, colleagues, and communities? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1g.5 below.]

Data from key assessments (course performance, Metastandard rubrics, and e-Portfolios) indicate that both initial and advanced program candidates demonstrate appropriate professional dispositions where interactions with students, families, colleagues and communities are concerned. Initial program candidates are expected to demonstrate professional behaviors and expectations, accept suggestions positively and modify behavior appropriately, function effectively in a variety of roles and settings, and recognize and value diversity and cultural differences. Advanced program candidates are expected to demonstrate positive attitudes and emotional maturity, function effectively as a member of a learning community (professional organizations, school-based groups, and/or community agencies), mentor other professionals, treat all students fairly, and demonstrate effective interpersonal skills. (Note that all M.S. program candidates are

also practicing P-12 educators while enrolled in the program.)

(LINK to data) http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koeduc/assessment/

1g.4. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' demonstration of professional dispositions? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to professional dispositions could be attached at Prompt 1g.5 below.]

Survey items ask P-12 administrators to rate initial program completers' dispositional behaviors with specific items related to: 1) the extent to which candidates demonstrate fairness in their approach to teaching and learning and in their interactions with students, 2) whether candidates demonstrate an attitude and belief that all students can learn, 3) candidate understanding of how student family and cultural backgrounds may influence learning, 4) extent to which candidates accept leadership responsibilities at school, and 5) whether candidates work with parents and families to better understand students and support their learning. The survey utilizes a four-point Likert scale; scores on these items typically are in the range of 3.50 to 4.00 (of 4.00).

The first cohort of advanced program candidates will complete the program in the summer of 2009. Follow-up surveys of completers and employing administrators will be conducted in the fall of 2009.

1g.5. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to professional dispositions may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

Optional

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

2. What research related to Standard 1 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?

STANDARD 2. ASSESSMENT SYSTEM AND UNIT EVALUATION

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

[In this section the unit must include (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, noting differences when they exist.]

2a. Assessment System

2a.1. How does the unit ensure that the assessment system collects information on candidate proficiencies outlined in the unit's conceptual framework, state standards, and professional

standards?

The initial programs conceptual framework is based on INTASC principles, Indiana Teacher standards, and standards published by professional organizations. The seven Metastandards which comprise the structure of the unit's initial program conceptual framework are derived from—and encompass—these principles and standards. The initial program Unit Assessment System (UAS) is deeply grounded in these seven Metastandards. Indeed, all professional education courses and experiences are cross-referenced with these Metastandards, and all UAS-related data pertaining to candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions are collected, aggregated and analyzed on the basis of these Metastandards. The unit has developed alignment matrices which document where and how candidate performance is assessed relative to principles and standards.

The unit's advanced program conceptual framework is based on NBPTS propositions, Indiana mentor standards, and standards published by professional organizations. The seven Metastandards which comprise the structure of the unit's advanced program conceptual framework are derived from—and encompass—these propositions and standards. The advanced program UAS is grounded in these seven Metastandards, and all graduate-level professional education courses and experiences are cross-referenced with these Metastandards. All UAS-related data pertaining to candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions are collected, aggregated and analyzed on the basis of these Metastandards. The unit has developed alignment matrices which document where and how candidate performance is assessed relative to principles and standards.

2a.2. What are the key assessments used by the unit and its programs to monitor and make decisions about candidate performance at transition points such as those listed in Table 6? Please complete Table 6 or upload your own table at Prompt 2a.6 below.

Table 6
Unit Assessment System: Transition Point Assessments

Program	Admission	Entry to clinical practice	Exit from clinical practice	Program completion	After program completion

2a.3. How is the unit assessment system evaluated? Who is involved and how?

Data related to initial program candidate performance are systematically reviewed each semester, and every Fall and Summer semesters for the advanced program during Benchmark meetings. Data are then aggregated/disaggregated and used to inform Program Improvement meetings held at least once each regular semester for the initial programs and advanced program. The UAS and candidate performance data are also reviewed during the unit Advisory Board meetings, convened twice each academic year. During these meetings unit faculty, P-12 colleagues and Arts & Science colleagues review candidate performance data, consider whether relevant data are being collected, whether data are collected at appropriate points in programs, and whether data are useful for evaluating program and UAS effectiveness. Included in these reviews and discussions are all Benchmark data, End-of-Year performance reports, and program change records. Criteria used to guide UAS review and improvement decisions are derived from NCATE standard rubrics and BOE review materials.

2a.4. How does the unit ensure that its assessment procedures are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias?

The unit ensures the fairness, accuracy, consistency and neutrality of both the initial and advanced program UAS in several ways. First, school-based and clinical faculty are trained in the use of the Metastandard

rubric by full-time faculty, the UAS coordinator, and/or the Director of Student Teaching. Training focuses not only on the procedures and timelines associated with rubric use, but also the various elements which comprise each Metastandard. Additionally, training manuals http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koeduc/docs/Metastandardonlinerubricguide.pdf have been developed, and are available on the unit's website to offer additional guidance in the proper, effective use of rubrics. Third, all candidates are required to undergo a minimum of two e-Portfolio training sessions at selected points in the program, to ensure that they understand Metastandards and criteria used to evaluate their performance, and to help them identify the most appropriate artifacts and evidence of their knowledge, skills and dispositions. Finally, the validity and reliability of conclusions drawn from UAS-related data are ensured through triangulation. That is, results of administrator surveys, e-Portfolios, Metastandard scores, faculty anecdotal data, etc. are compared each semester by the UAS coordinator and unit faculty.

2a.5. What assessments and evaluation measures are used to manage and improve the operations and programs of the unit?

Key assessments within the initial program UAS include the following:

1. Candidate GPA
2. Candidate Praxis I scores
3. Candidate Praxis II scores
4. Metastandard assessments from the field (multiple assessments)
5. Dispositions assessments from instructors and school-based faculty (multiple assessments)
6. Formative program e-Portfolio assessments
7. Summative program e-Portfolio assessments
8. Administrator survey
9. Candidate program completer survey

Key assessments within the advanced program UAS include the following:

1. Candidate GPA
2. Metastandard assessments from the field (multiple assessments)
3. Dispositions assessments from instructors and school-based faculty (multiple assessments)
4. Formative program e-Portfolio assessments
5. Summative program e-Portfolio assessments

Data are collected and utilized at specific points within each program level, initial and advanced. These data are used to obtain information on individual candidate progress. At the conclusion of each semester, data are aggregated and reviewed at Program Improvement and Advisory Board meetings. A History of Change document lists changes in programs and unit operations based on the data sources above.

2a.6. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit's assessment system may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

Standard 2 Table 6

See **Attachments** panel below.

2b. Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

2b.1. What are the processes and timelines used by the unit to collect, compile, aggregate, summarize, and analyze data on candidate performance, unit operations, and program quality?

- **How are the data collected?**
- **From whom (e.g., applicants, candidates, graduates, faculty) are data collected?**
- **How often are the data summarized and analyzed?**
- **Whose responsibility is it to summarize and analyze the data? (dean, assistant dean, data coordinator, etc.)**
- **In what formats are the data summarized and analyzed? (reports, tables, charts, graphs, etc.)**
- **What information technologies are used to maintain the unit's assessment system?**

Data related to initial and advanced program candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions are collected through multiple sources. Initial program candidate Metastandard, disposition-related, e-Portfolio and Administrator survey assessments are collected using online instruments. Data are transferred to Excel worksheets each semester by the UAS data manager. Other data, such as Praxis I, Praxis II, and GRE scores, are sent directly to the unit and recorded each semester in Access format by the data manager. Program completer surveys are collected by hand and recorded by hand by the Data Manager. Advanced program candidate Metastandard, disposition, and program experience-related assessment data are collected by hand and recorded and manipulated by the MS in Education program advisor.

Initial and Advanced program Metastandards and disposition-related assessments are collected from full-time faculty, school-based faculty, and clinical faculty. Portfolio evaluations are collected from full-time faculty and school-based faculty. Administrator and Program completer surveys are collected by the appropriate stakeholder respectively.

Initial candidate performance data are summarized each semester for use in the Benchmark and Program Improvement meetings. Advanced candidate performance data are summarized at least twice each academic year. All summarized data is used in End-of-Year, Benchmark, and Program Improvement reports in the form of Word documents, with tables, etc. Data related to initial and advanced candidate performance are collected on an ongoing basis throughout the program, with aggregation, disaggregation, and analyses of data occurring at twice each academic year.

Although currently vacant, the position of Associate Dean for Assessment and Accreditation is responsible for management of all initial and advanced candidate performance data, including collection, entry, aggregation, analysis and reporting. The data manager is responsible for all clerical work associated with the UAS and data entry, and reports directly to the Associate Dean and the Dean of Education.

Initial and Advanced program assessment data are reported in tables, charts, and graphs using Word documents. These are generated by the UAS coordinator by utilizing the analysis from Access and Excel worksheets.

Initial program assessment data are collected though an online system that was written and developed by a former faculty member in the Division. These data are generated as text files and stored on a shared server. The Data manager retrieves the text files and utilizes Excel to analyze the data. Additional data is stored and manipulated on an Access database managed by the Division's Data Manager. Advanced program assessment data are collected by hand and managed by the MS in Education advisor. Additional data are stored and manipulated on an Access database managed by the Division's Data Manager.

2b.2. How does the unit disaggregate candidate assessment data for candidates on the main campus, at off-campus sites, in distance learning programs, and in alternate route programs?

The unit does not offer programs at off-campus sites, via distance learning, or via alternate routes. (Where

the latter is concerned, the Indiana-mandated alternate route program—Transition to Teaching—is offered through the Indianapolis campus. Candidates in the IU Kokomo service area who wish to pursue this alternate route are referred to that campus.) All initial and advanced program candidate performance data therefore pertain only to programs offered on the IU Kokomo campus.

2b.3. How does the unit maintain records of formal candidate complaints and their resolutions?

The unit publishes and distributes an initial program and an advanced program Policy Manual http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koeduc/policy_manual_07_08.pdf, http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koeduc/docs/MSinEducationPolicyManual.pdf which describe policies and processes pertaining to all pertinent administrative elements of all programs. Among these are policies and processes related to program completion timelines, course repetition, program dismissal, Benchmark meetings and decisions, candidate dispositions, criminal history checks, and candidate complaints and/or appeals of program-related decisions. The unit also conforms to campus-level policies and processes where course grade appeals are concerned. Documentation of candidate complaints and/or appeals includes a summary of the complaint/appeal, date and manner in which the complaint/appeal was initiated, date and manner in which the complaint/appeal was resolved, and any follow-up actions required of candidates, faculty and/or unit administrators. All documentation is managed by the Dean of Education, who also is responsible for maintaining an up-to-date archive of these events.

2b.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit's data collection, analysis, and evaluation may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement

2c.1. In what ways does the unit regularly and systematically use data to evaluate the efficacy of and initiate changes to its courses, programs, and clinical experiences?

The chief vehicle for the use of candidate performance data for evaluating program efficacy and initiating change is Program Improvement meetings, convened at least once per regular semester in the initial program and in the advanced program by the Dean of Education and/or Associate Dean for Assessment and Accreditation. 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.

2c.2. What data-driven changes have occurred over the past three years?

In the past three years candidate performance data have led directly to substantive program changes in two key areas. The first pertains to diversity. In response to relatively low scores on Metastandard rubrics generated during field experiences and clinical practice, the unit reinstated into the initial program a diversity-related course, M300 Teaching in a Pluralistic Society. Faculty also were directed to examine the design and content of courses they teach, and to incorporate strengthened and/or supplemented diversity-related topics and experiences. Candidate performance in the area of diversity (as reflected in Metastandard scores from field experience) has improved as a result. Secondly, the unit's initial program e-Portfolio development and training processes were revised, to foster higher success rates. A pivotal change in this area was the creation of additional workshops to offer candidate more guidance in artifact selection and writing reflective statements. Portfolio pass rates have improved as a result.

In the past two years, advanced program data suggested that MS candidates needed clearer direction and guidance for program experiences. Program experiences now result in candidates serving as initial program e-Portfolio evaluators and mentors of initial/new teacher candidates as Lead teachers. We realized that since we were 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 initial program

Formative Portfolios in the first Fall semester and Summative Portfolios in the second Spring semester of their program. The unit schedules candidate portfolio experiences, while the candidates develop/schedule their Lead teacher experiences. We decided to offer candidates suggested activities to help in their planning. 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. Advanced program data also suggested that mentor evaluations need to be implemented more explicitly. Each MS candidate has a mentor that evaluates the candidates using the Metastandards rubric. This evaluation is connected to the Field experience element of the MS in Education program. The evaluation is built into the J500 Curriculum and Instruction course and evaluates a P-12 experience related to curriculum implementation. We also need to build the mentor evaluation into the Y595 Application of Educational Research course to evaluate the P-12 action research experience. Additionally, more explicit feedback is needed to the candidates regarding the mentor evaluation.

2c.3. What access do faculty members have to candidate assessment data and/or data systems?

Full-time faculty have immediate access, of course, to all candidate performance generated within the context of courses they teach—course grades, Metastandard assessments submitted by school-based faculty related to course-based field experiences, and formative and/or summative e-Portfolio assessments they themselves have completed.

Individual and aggregate candidate performance is made available to full-time faculty at least twice each academic year during regularly scheduled Benchmark review and Program Improvement meetings. Candidate performance is also discussed at monthly unit faculty/staff meetings, when warranted.

While unit faculty do not have access to UAS databases, they can request data reports or summaries as needed from the Associate Dean and/or data manager.

2c.4. How are assessment data shared with candidates, faculty, and other stakeholders to help them reflect on and improve their performance and programs?

Assessment data are shared with candidates on a course-by-course basis by instructors, many of whom include end-of-semester, one-on-one conferences with candidates for the purpose of reviewing course performance, discussing field evaluations, dispositions, etc. Most instructors also will provide candidates with a copy of all Metastandard rubric assessments submitted by school-based faculty. All candidates receive feedback related to program e-Portfolios immediately after the review process is completed. Any candidate informed of the need to revise artifacts or reflective statements will meet soon after with an advisor or faculty member, and must submit revisions for additional review within a period of two weeks. All candidates also are informed in writing each semester of their program standing following regularly scheduled Benchmark meetings. Letters also describe any performance-based issues identified by faculty, as well as any remedial experiences that may be required to return the candidate to "good standing" status in their program.

Unit faculty have access, of course, to all assessment data directly associated with or generated within the context of the courses they teach. When needed, faculty also can request additional data related to a particular candidate directly from program advisors and administrators. Faculty also have access to all candidate assessment data during Benchmark and Program Improvement meetings.

Other stakeholders have access to relevant assessment data in aggregate form during Advisory Council meetings convened each semester by the Dean of Education and/or Associate Dean.

2c.5. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the use of data

for program improvement may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

Optional

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

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

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.

[In this section the unit must include (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, noting differences when they exist.]

3a. Collaboration between Unit and School Partners

3a.1. Who are the unit's partners in the design, delivery, and evaluation of the unit's field and clinical experiences?

The unit ensures appropriate and diverse field experiences in three ways. First, field placements are made directly with selected P-12 schools by course instructors. Placement sites are selected by instructors on the basis of school demographics, location, and ability of host teachers to provide meaningful experiences and opportunities for candidates. The unit and instructors also coordinate placements to ensure that candidates have exposure to a range of grade levels. For example, in the first of two literacy methods courses in the elementary education program, candidates are placed at primary grade levels; in the second course placements are made at intermediate grade levels. Instructors in the ECE program and the secondary program coordinate in a similar manner.

Second, the unit maintains a University Partnership School (UPS) agreement with Kokomo Center Schools, which allows extensive candidate access to Sycamore Elementary School, located a short distance from campus. Sycamore has been designated by the Indiana Department of Education as a "four-star" school (i.e., it has met state standards of excellence in selected categories, including student performance). Sycamore also houses Head Start programs, gifted and talented programs, an AmeriCorps program, a fatherhood initiative program, and special education classes.

Third, clinical experiences for the capstone student teaching semester are arranged by the Director of Student Teaching, in collaboration with area school district administrators.

At the advanced level, candidate field work is categorized as either Program experiences or P-12 classroom experiences. Program experiences include mentoring, lead teacher activities, and initial program e-Portfolio review. P-12 classroom experiences provide opportunity for advanced candidates to immediately apply

course materials to their own classrooms in the areas of curriculum, instruction, assessment, and action research strategies. The Program experiences involve mentoring initial candidates and/or new teachers in university and P-12 settings.

The unit's Advisory Board, composed of area educators (administrators and teachers), parents, and community agency professionals, provides oversight, evaluation, and recommendations for the ongoing improvement of program field and clinical experiences.

3a.2. In what ways have the unit's partners contributed to the design, delivery, and evaluation of the unit's field and clinical experiences?

P-12 colleagues contribute to field and clinical experiences primarily through informal and formal evaluations of candidate performance. All initial candidates are placed with experienced host teachers who provide ongoing, formative feedback and constructive criticism in "real time" as field experiences are completed. Host and Mentor teachers also complete a formal evaluation of candidates using Metastandard rubrics which include ratings of core and professional dispositions. P-12 colleagues also collaborate with clinical faculty (university supervisors) in the evaluation of candidate performance during the student teaching experience; when necessary, P-12 faculty also assist with remediation of candidate weaknesses (accomplished primarily through extended or repeated field placement with well-defined performance criteria). P-12 host teachers and clinical faculty also participate in orientation and/or debriefing meetings each semester with the Director of Student Teaching.

P-12 colleagues are also the conduit for the advanced program. These colleagues serve as mentors assigned to each MS in Education candidate. These mentors evaluate the on-site field components of the program using the Metastandards and Dispositional rubrics. Additional field experiences are developed within specific courses in coordination with outside agencies and educational centers.

3a.3. What are the roles of the unit and its school partners in determining how and where candidates are placed for field experiences, student teaching, and internships?

Unit faculty who place candidates for field experiences within the context of a particular course do so in collaboration with P-12 building principals and district administrators and/or agency directors, who help to identify appropriate host teachers, classrooms, activities and opportunities. The same occurs with candidate placement for student teaching.

3a.4. How do the unit and its school partners share expertise and resources to support candidates' learning in field experiences and clinical practice?

Throughout the initial preparation programs, candidates are placed in field experiences aligned with the courses in which they are enrolled relative to their Benchmark level. Field experiences are integrated at multiple points throughout the program with the experiences and expectations of candidate performance aligned with program requirements. Host teachers and unit faculty work together to evaluate candidates' abilities to meet the standards expected at each specific Benchmark. For example, in pre-professional courses (five education courses required prior to acceptance into Teacher Education) candidates are evaluated by P-12 faculty solely on the dispositions required for Benchmark 1.

In content and general methods classes, candidates are assessed in relation to the standards and dispositions required by the specific course and the appropriate Benchmark. Course instructors meet regularly and collaborate with host P-12 teachers regarding course assignments and expectations and appropriate and effective use of program Metastandard rubrics.
In the advanced program, each MS in Education candidate chooses a mentor to assist in their growth

throughout the program. Each mentor should have a Masters degree in Education, teach in the same school corporation as the advanced program candidate, teach in a compatible subject area field, be able to schedule time to observe and consult with the candidate, and should not hold a position in which they already serve as a direct evaluator of the advanced program candidate.

3a.5. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to collaboration between unit and school partners may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

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

3b.1. What are the entry and exit requirements for clinical practice?

For the initial program, the clinical practice semester is equivalent to Benchmark 6. Therefore to enter into Benchmark 6, each initial candidate will need to complete Benchmark 5 successfully. Benchmark 5 requirements include a GPA of 2.5 or higher, passing scores for field work in the Metastandards rubric and Dispositions, and passing PRAXIS II scores. Exit requirements for clinical practice are identical to the requirements for any other field experience, which include passing scores in the Metastandards rubric and Dispositions.

3b.2. What field experiences are required for each program or categories of programs (e.g., secondary) at both the initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation levels, including graduate programs for licensed teachers and other school professionals? What clinical practice is required for each program or categories of programs in initial teacher preparation programs and programs for the preparation of other school professionals? Please complete Table 7 or upload your own table at Prompt 3b.9 below.

Table 7
Field Experiences and Clinical Practice by Program

Program	Field Experiences	Clinical Practice (Student Teaching or Internship)	Total Number of Hours

3b.3. How does the unit systematically ensure that candidates develop proficiencies outlined in the unit's conceptual framework, state standards, and professional standards through field and clinical experiences in initial and advanced preparation programs?

All initial program candidates are tracked each semester through Benchmark criteria and meetings at which performance across several measures is reviewed. A primary consideration in all Benchmark discussions and decisions is candidate field performance, as described by Metastandard rubric scores submitted by host P-12 teachers. A mean score is generated by the UAS coordinator for each initial program candidate for each field assignment each semester. This score is compared to the score required as dependent upon the Benchmark criteria. Therefore each candidate is judged against the Benchmark criteria for each field placement, each semester.

Advanced program candidates are also evaluated in the field with use of the Metastandards rubric completed by their mentor. The Metastandards are an extension of the conceptual framework and aligned with state and professional standards. A satisfactory rating on the rubric is calculated by meeting or exceeding each component of each Metastandard.

3b.4. How does the unit systematically ensure that candidates use technology as an instructional

tool during field experiences and clinical practice?

Both the initial and advanced program utilize the respective Metastandards rubric to evaluate field and clinical experiences. The use of technology is directly measured in the initial Metastandards under components in #3 and 4 and in the advanced Metastandards under components in #4. Initial components include such items as: "Candidate demonstrates awareness of the various factors affecting the choice of instructional approach and makes technology a part of the instructional choices. Candidate creates relevant and developmentally appropriate instructional materials and resources that support and engage students cognitively which includes the use of technology whenever possible." Advanced components include such items as: "Teachers can identify, evaluate access and adapt technology- and Internet-based resources to support learning. Teachers are able to integrate technology and the Internet in the design and development of curricular and instructional resources for the classroom."

3b.5. What criteria are used in the selection of school-based clinical faculty? How are the criteria implemented? What evidence suggests that school-based clinical faculty members are accomplished school professionals?

Host P-12 teachers are required to have a minimum of three years relevant teaching experience. They also must hold licensure in the subject and grade they teach, and be recommended/approved for participation with program candidates by their building or district administrators. The unit has formal contracts with every Indiana school corporation in which candidates are placed for student teaching/clinical practice. These contracts originate with the IU Bloomington School of Education, outline the criteria and expectations of the university, and apply to all field experience and clinical practice placements made by all IU campuses. The IU Kokomo Director of Student Teaching approves and monitors all placements made through the unit.

3b.6. What preparation do school-based faculty members receive for their roles as clinical supervisors?

P-12 colleagues who serve as host teachers for candidate field experiences within the context of particular professional education courses are provided training in the use of dispositional and Metastandard rubrics by course instructors who arrange field placements. Course instructors link each P-12 colleague with the evaluation guidelines when providing the directions and expectations of the Metastandard online rubrics. Course instructors also meet with host teachers on-site, both individually and in groups, to describe and discuss course requirements and expectations prior to placement of candidates.

Student teaching host teachers and university supervisors receive training through workshops and small group meetings coordinated by the Director of Student Teaching each semester. The unit has prepared dispositional and Metastandards rubrics to guide school-based faculty in the evaluation of candidate performance. Further, extensive explanations of rubric criteria at Basic, Proficient, Mastery, and Exemplary levels are included in the Host Teacher and University Supervisor handbooks. These matrices are used by field-based faculty and supervisors as they assess candidates during student teaching.

3b.7. What evidence demonstrates that clinical faculty members provide regular and continuous support for student teachers, licensed teachers completing graduate programs, and other school professionals?

The Director of Student Teaching hires and monitors all clinical faculty (university supervisor). Each supervisor is responsible for logging time spent with student teachers and host teachers. These logs are collected and analyzed by the Director. Clinical faculty are expected to attend mandatory training sessions designed to provide training on the conceptual framework and UAS in context of the student teaching component. Clinical faculty are also required to complete both a mid-term and final evaluation on each

student teacher using the Metastandards online rubric.

3b.8. What structured activities involving the analysis of data and current research are required in programs for other school professionals?

Not applicable.

3b.9. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

Standard 3 Table 7

See **Attachments** panel below.

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

3c.1. On average, how many candidates are eligible for clinical practice each semester or year? What percent, on average, complete clinical practice successfully?

Approximately 16-20 candidates are eligible for clinical practice in the Fall semester and approximately 30-40 candidates are eligible for clinical practice in the Spring semester. Within the last three years, only three candidates were not successful, bringing the percentage of candidates completing clinical practice successfully to approximately 99%.

3c.2. What are the roles of candidates, university supervisors, and school-based faculty in assessing candidate performance and reviewing the results during clinical practice?

During the 16-week clinical practice experience (student teaching), candidates complete a mid-term and a final self-evaluation, using the same Metastandard rubric as P-12 host teachers and university supervisors (clinical faculty). Candidates use these self-assessments as a vehicle for comparing perceptions of performance with host teachers and university supervisors, in both a formative and summative manner.

Clinical faculty observe candidates a minimum of eight times during the student teaching experience (i.e., at least once per 10-day instructional period). During on-site visits clinical faculty will conduct focused observations and evaluations of candidate classroom performance, consult with host teachers (and building administrators when appropriate) and candidates, and provide ongoing, formative feedback. Clinical faculty also will complete a mid-term and final evaluation of candidate performance using program Metastandard rubrics.

They also will assist with the development of a transition schedule for returning instructional responsibility to the host teacher at the completion of the clinical practice. Host teachers also observe candidates on a systematic basis and provide ongoing feedback regarding performance, dispositions, etc. Host teachers also will complete a formal mid-term and final evaluation of candidates using program Metastandard rubrics; these evaluations are also used as the basis for discussion about candidate progress throughout the clinical experience.

3c.3. How is time for reflection and feedback from peers and clinical faculty incorporated into field experiences and clinical practice?

Course-based field experiences depend primarily on feedback from course instructors and P-12 host teachers. In these contexts, initial program candidates receive ongoing feedback directly from instructors and host teachers; they also receive copies of all Metastandard rubric evaluations, and then have access to instructors and host teachers for debriefing and follow-up discussion at the completion of the field experience. Candidates also receive written notification of all Benchmark discussions and decisions pertaining to their field performance.

During the clinical experience (student teaching) feedback from P-12 host teachers and clinical faculty is provided in the form of ongoing informal feedback, and also assessments of performance weighed against Metastandard rubrics.

3c.4. What data from multiple assessments provide evidence that candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping all students learn in field experiences and clinical practice?

All seven Metastandards contain components that connect to student learning. When candidates are in field and clinical experiences, host teachers, clinical faculty, full-time faculty and candidates utilize the Metastandards rubric to evaluate candidates' demonstration for helping all students learn. Program Completer and Administrative surveys are also linked to the Metastandards rubric and also evaluate candidates' demonstration for helping all students learn. For example, Metastandard #2 evaluates how candidates understand how different students in the classroom are learning, and Metastandard #7 evaluates how candidates work with parents and families to better understand students and to support their learning.

3c.5. What process is used to ensure that candidates collect and analyze data on student learning, reflect on those data, and improve student learning during clinical practice?

To the extent possible, initial program candidates are expected/encouraged to monitor P-12 student learning during each course-based practicum or field experience. Many initial program courses also will include reflective elements such as journals, online forums, etc., to encourage and provide opportunities for candidates to engage in reflection about all elements of their field experiences, including their efforts to impact student learning.

Candidates are required to enroll in a seminar course during their student teaching experience. The principal expectation of that seminar is that candidates will design a relevant, classroom-based action research project which has P-12 student learning as its focus. This project will involve data collection and analysis, and reporting of study results in the form of an "Effective Teaching Project." This project is also referred to as an "e-Poster", because the final product is a series of Power Point slides which describe all aspects of the study research questions, subjects, methods, data analyses, conclusions, etc., in the form of a poster similar to those encountered at professional conference poster sessions. Candidate e-Posters are archived on a semester-by-semester basis and can be accessed through Oncourse.

3c.6. How does the unit ensure that all candidates have field experiences or clinical practice that includes students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic groups?

All initial program field placements are made by unit faculty and/or the Director of Student Teaching on the basis of available demographic information about P-12 school districts, particular schools, and classrooms, with the intent to place candidates in settings where exposure to a wide range of student diversity is possible. This is sometimes a challenge, given the demographics available in the central Indiana area. This is offset, however, by the fact that candidates will complete multiple field experiences during their programs; where elementary education candidates are concerned, for example, candidates will complete at least eight different field experiences, at varying locations in the IU Kokomo service area. P-12 administrators are asked to assist the unit with identification of classrooms in which exposure to student

diversity can be maximized. And, as noted elsewhere, the unit on occasion also has expanded beyond the traditional campus service area to find appropriate placements for candidates.

Since the advanced candidates utilize their respective P-12 schools/corporations for field work, diversity is a result of the candidates' school demographics only. This is offset by offering advanced candidates additional field work in community agencies under the service-learning model.

3c.7. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the development and demonstration of knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping all students learn may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 3?

2. What research related to Standard 3 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?

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.

[In this section the unit must include (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, noting differences when they exist.]

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

4a.1. What proficiencies related to diversity are candidates expected to develop and demonstrate?

Unit faculty have created programs that emphasize experiences working with diverse higher education and school-based faculty, diverse candidates and other IU Kokomo students, and diverse P-12 students. The Division has made a commitment to diversity that complements and specifies the IU system commitment to diversity as well as President McRobbie's Diversity Initiatives http://www.indiana.edu/~dema/divers_initiative.shtml. As seen in the Division's Statement of Values Commitment to Diversity and measured in Metastandard #2 for initial candidates and Metastandard #3 for advanced candidates, specific competencies have been identified.

Initial candidates are required to demonstrate knowledge of students' cultural identities, value cultural diversity, understand the complex nature of diversity, use culturally sensitive techniques, accommodate multiple perspectives, and understand exceptionality. Early Childhood candidates are also required to

demonstrate knowledge of the multiple influences on children's development and behavior due to cultural, language, economic, disabilities, and health conditions. Advanced program candidates are required to demonstrate an understanding of how all students develop and learn; the ability to create safe, secure, and tolerant learning environments; respect for the cultural and family differences students bring to the classroom; the treatment of students equitably; and the ability to address individual differences in their practice.

4a.2. What required coursework and experiences enable teacher candidates and candidates for other school professional roles to develop:

- **awareness of the importance of diversity in teaching and learning; and**
- **the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to adapt instruction and/or services for diverse populations, including linguistically and culturally diverse students and students with exceptionalities?**

Specific diversity-related instruction is included in all professional teacher education courses. Indeed, at the initial program level, candidates complete at least four courses which focus principally on topics such as diversity awareness, knowledge about the various types of student diversity, and direct field experience with diverse student populations. As part of their pre-professional experience, initial program candidates complete an educational psychology course and an introduction to exceptionality course, which in tandem provide a broad foundation in the area of student diversity. Later in the program, candidates complete two additional foundational courses (H340 Education and American Culture, and M300 Teaching in a Pluralistic Society) which have strong diversity components.

Initial program methods courses include direct instruction on how to modify classroom practice to address student diversity and differing learning needs and styles, and how to connect instruction to students' experiential and cultural backgrounds. Also addressed are methods of communicating with students and families in culturally sensitive ways, incorporating multiple perspectives into classroom content, developing classroom climates that value diversity, and demonstrating behaviors consistent with the ideas of fairness and the belief that all students can learn. Initial program methods courses also require field components that allow candidates to interact with students of diverse backgrounds.

Advanced program candidates are required to complete Life Span Development: Birth to Death (P514), Introduction to Special Education for Graduate Students (K505), and Education & Social Issues (H520) as part of the Foundations component. These courses follow the impetus of the conceptual framework and advance and extend the knowledge, performance and dispositions of the MS candidates. For example, Introduction to Special Education is the advanced version of the initial program's Introduction to Exceptionalities, and Education and Social Issues is the advanced program equivalent version of the initial program's Education and the American Culture. Advanced program candidates are also afforded the opportunity to do field work with students and adults from diverse backgrounds.

4a.3. What key assessments provide evidence about candidates' proficiencies related to diversity? How are candidates performing on these assessments?

The Division gathers candidate performance on Metastandard 2 for initial preparation programs and Metastandard 3 for the advanced program to measure diversity proficiency indicators. Disposition audits, formative e-Portfolio, summative e-Portfolio, field and clinical experience evaluations, and performance on course-specific learning outcomes are used as data sources. Data on candidate dispositions, field experience evaluations, and course-specific learning outcomes are gathered each semester. The formative e-Portfolio,

summative e-Portfolio, and clinical field evaluation data are gathered once in each program. Data for each Metastandard 2/3 indicator are presented to faculty for review each semester.

During the period 2005 – 2007 data from these various sources showed that, while initial candidates were consistently performing at the Proficient level in the area of diversity (i.e., mean scores of roughly 2.0 / 4.0), there was room for improvement. In response to this noted trend, faculty reinstated in the initial program the requirement that all candidates complete M300 Teaching in a Pluralistic Society. This, coupled with a renewed focus on diversity in individual courses, has resulted in an improvement in mean scores across these various measures which now are in the Mastery range (i.e., 3.0 – 4.0).

The Division gathers advanced candidate performance via Metastandard 3. Formative e-Portfolio, Summative e-Portfolio, Field experience evaluations and course specific learning outcomes also are used as data sources. During the period of 2007-2009, advanced candidates have been scored on Metastandard 3 as meeting or exceeding components of field evaluations and as satisfactory or excellent on Formative e-Portfolios. Four of the five program completer candidates were scored on Metastandard 3 as satisfactory or excellent on Summative e-Portfolios.

4a.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to diversity proficiencies and assessments may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

4b.1. What opportunities do candidates (including candidates at off-campus sites and/or in distance learning or alternate route programs) have to interact with higher education and/or school-based faculty from diverse groups?

IU Kokomo initial and advanced teacher education candidates have opportunities to work with diverse faculty both on- and off-campus. Within the unit, faculty diversity has been enhanced in recent years with the addition of two full-time faculty of Asian descent; part-time faculty ranks include an individual of African-American descent. Given the relatively small number of faculty in the unit, all candidates will have opportunities to take courses from all teacher education faculty, both full-time and part-time.

Initial program candidates are now advised by an advising center that includes two full-time and one part-time advisor. One of the full-time advisors is of Hispanic descent; therefore, each education candidate will have the opportunity to be advised and interact with this advisor on a regular basis.

Where coursework and experiences outside of the unit are concerned, initial program candidates have opportunities to work with the entire range of diversity which the faculty ranks of this campus have to offer. (See IU Fact Book http://www.indiana.edu/~upira/reports/standard/factbook/index.shtml)

Initial program candidates also have opportunities to interact with a wide range of school-based faculty through field placements associated with each professional teacher education course. P-12 sites and classroom teachers are selected in part on the basis of the exposure to diversity they offer candidates.

4b.2. What knowledge and experiences do faculty have related to preparing candidates to work with students from diverse groups?

In 2003 the annual Faculty Service Report (FSR) (used to summarize faculty performance each calendar year) was modified to include a section pertaining to diversity. In the FSR unit faculty describe all teaching and curriculum development efforts pertaining to diversity. An analysis of these reports since that time indicates that faculty has enhanced diversity-related topics, issues, and assignments throughout all

professional education courses and experiences.

During the period 2007-2009, for example, full-time faculty in the unit were involved at various times with international travel, language studies, development of an ethnic studies course, teaching women's studies course, research and writing related to women and gender issues, and research related to international issues and racial and ethnic minorities.

A Division of Education faculty member served on the grant writing committee that received funding through Indiana University President's Diversity Initiative. The Summer Diversity Program is a two-year program and is one of 12 university-wide selected to receive funding. The Summer Diversity Program will provide experiential learning activities in the areas of nursing, education, business, and public and environmental affairs. The objective of each program is to support each student and to provide information necessary to be successful at IU Kokomo. Through academic mentoring services and self-exploration, these programs will facilitate student success.

4b.3. How diverse are the faculty members who work with education candidates? [Diversity characteristics in addition to those in Table 8 can also be presented and/or discussed, if data are available, in response to other prompts for this element.] Please complete Table 8 or upload your own table at Prompt 4b.5 below.

**Table 8
Faculty Demographics**

	Prof. Ed. Faculty Who Teach Only in Initial Teacher Preparation Programs n (%)	Prof. Ed. Faculty Who Teach Only in Advanced Programs n (%)	Prof. Ed. Faculty Who Teach in Both Initial Teacher Preparation & Advanced Programs n (%)	All Faculty in the Institution n (%)	School-based faculty n (%)
American Indian or Alaska Native					
Asian					
Black or African American, non-Hispanic					
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander					
Hispanic or Latino					
White, non-Hispanic					
Two or more races					
Other					
Race/ethnicity Unknown					
Total					
Female					
Male					
Total					

4b.4. What efforts does the unit make to recruit and retain a diverse faculty?

The institution and unit are proactive in recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty. Faculty diversity is an issue addressed in campus strategic plans, and faculty searches are required to recruit individuals from diverse backgrounds. All faculty searches at IU Kokomo are monitored by the campus Affirmative Action http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koafac/ officer, an African-American woman. All faculty openings are announced in a variety of print and on-line outlets, including services and publications directly affiliated with minority and diverse cultural organizations. In fall, 2008, as an outgrowth of the campus diversity portfolio review, each IU campus worked to develop a diversity plan

http://www.indiana.edu/~dema/campus_div_plans/divplan_iukokomo.pdf. IU Kokomo's plan outlined goals in four areas: institutional leadership, curriculum transformation, campus climate and representational diversity. A campus Diversity Committee was formed in 2008, and charged by the Chancellor to (among other things) review faculty employment policies, make recommendations to promote and maintain cultural diversity, and collaborate with other IU campuses to partner with Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

4b.5. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to faculty diversity may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

Standard 4 Table 8

See **Attachments** panel below.

4c. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

4c.1. What opportunities do candidates (including candidates at off-campus sites and/or in distance learning or alternate route programs) have to interact with candidates from diverse groups?

Indiana University is proud of its long history of educating a student body that includes women, persons of color, and those of diverse cultural backgrounds. Similarly, IU Kokomo is committed to creating a welcoming environment for all postsecondary students. Through the work of the Diversity Committee, the Chancellor has been charged to "make recommendations to promote the recruitment and retention of minority students, pursue additional scholarship and grant funding for minority students, and facilitate listening forums to ascertain needs and aspirations of diverse communities on campus as well as in the larger north central Indiana region served by the institution."

The Office of Campus Climate http://legacy.iuk.edu/~kocacl/ provides a vital support system for African-American, Hispanic, American Indian, and Asian students as well as other students of color enrolled at IU Kokomo. This office offers a variety of services including social events, cultural heritage programs, workshops, educational support programs, personal counseling, leadership development and enhancement programs, mentoring, and study tables so that unit candidates can meet with other students on campus. The office also assists in the development, administration, and evaluation of student recruitment and retention efforts, sponsors outreach and early access to higher education programs, and provides cultural diversity training for IU Kokomo.

Teacher Education candidates actively participate in unit and campus organizations such as Student Government Association http://legacy.iuk.edu/~kosact/StudentGovernmentAssociation.shtml, content-specific clubs, and service clubs where student body diversity is valued and supported. Within and across the unit, candidates experience diversity in its many forms: racial/ethnic, cultural heritage, religion, gender, exceptionalities, socioeconomic status, language, sexual orientation and age. The unit has traditionally served adults returning to school to begin or complete a degree, however, for the first time, the entering class of 2008 was 50% non-traditional and 50% traditional aged students. Division candidates interact and work with other candidates with diverse characteristics and backgrounds across campus, in their professional education courses, and in the P-12 schools.

4c.2. How diverse are the candidates in initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation programs? [Diversity characteristics in addition to those in Table 9 can also be presented and discussed, if data are available, in other prompts of this element.] Please complete Table 9 or upload your own table at Prompt 4c.4 below.

Table 9
Candidate Demographics

	Candidates in Initial Teacher Preparation Programs n (%)	Candidates in Advanced Preparation Programs n (%)	All Students in the Institution n (%)	Diversity of Geographical Area Served by Institution (%)
American Indian or Alaska Native				
Asian				
Black or African American, non-Hispanic				
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander				
Hispanic or Latino				
White, non-Hispanic				
Two or more races				
Other				
Race/ethnicity unknown				
Total				
Female				
Male				
Total				

4c.3. What efforts does the unit make to recruit and retain candidates from diverse groups?

Unit faculty and staff are active recruiters and regularly collaborate with the campus Office of Admissions http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koadms/. When an individual applies for admission to the university, an advisor is notified, and the advisor then helps to shepherd the student through orientations, meetings with major area faculty, etc. All incoming freshman also participate in the Freshman Learning Community (FLC) which provides support for first-generation, at risk, or overwhelmed students. Faculty also recruit potential candidates through their collaborations with P-12 colleagues, and through work with community agencies and organizations.

Unit faculty also are active participants in campus efforts to develop a diverse population of students, faculty and staff. In 2009 the unit was awarded funding for a two-year summer program designed to bring local minority students to campus to explore biology, chemistry and physics. Also funded was a summer Bridge Program http://newsinfo.iu.edu/news/page/normal/9645.html for talented area high school minority students, during which they are introduced to experiential learning in various majors, including nursing, business and education.

4c.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to candidate diversity may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

Standard 4 Table 9

See **Attachments** panel below.

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

4d.1. How does the unit ensure that candidates develop and practice knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions related to diversity during their field experiences and clinical practice?

The unit attempts to place initial program candidates for field experiences in P-12 settings which allow for maximum exposure to and interaction with students from diverse backgrounds.
This is an ongoing challenge, given the demographics of central Indiana, which includes many school corporations (districts) in which student diversity is relatively limited. Faculty and staff therefore select

candidate field placement sites carefully, and attempt to identify individual schools and classrooms where greater student diversity exists. Despite its relatively small size, the city of Kokomo includes considerable student diversity, and thus candidates are placed in city schools as often as possible.

Fortunately, the population area near the city of Logansport—which is located northeast of campus and within the service area—includes one of the fastest growing Hispanic populations in the state, and placements in this geographic area are made as frequently as possible. In recent years this has led unit faculty and staff to seek placements in locations outside of the usual campus service area, where greater diversity is located, such as the suburban Indianapolis area, to the south.

Advanced program candidates utilize their own P-12 setting for much of their field work, however, these local schools do not necessarily guarantee access to diverse populations. The unit recognizes this limitation, and thus also offers candidates other field work through community agencies that afford opportunities for interactions with students and adults from diverse backgrounds. Both initial and advanced candidates' field experiences are evaluated through Metastandards #2 and #3, respectively, both of which pertain to candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions related to diversity.

4d.2. How diverse are the P-12 students in the settings in which candidates participate in field experiences and clinical practice? Please complete Table 10 or upload your own table at Prompt 4d.4 below. [Although NCATE encourages institutions to report the data available for each school used for clinical practice, units may not have these data available by school. If the unit uses more than 20 schools for clinical practice, school district data may be substituted for school data in the table below. In addition, data may be reported for other schools in which field experiences, but not clinical practice, occur. Please indicate where this is the case.]

Table 10
Demographics on Sites for Clinical Practice in Initial and Advanced Programs

Name of school	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Black or African American, non-Hispanic	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Hispanic or Latino	White, non-Hispanic	Two or more races	Other	Race / ethnicity unknown	Students receiving free / reduced price lunch	English language learners	Students with disabilities

4d.3. How does the unit ensure that candidates use feedback from peers and supervisors to reflect on their skills in working with students from diverse groups?

Initial program candidate performance in the area of diversity/cultural proficiency is assessed on an ongoing basis by both unit and field-based faculty. These assessments principally occur within the context of disposition rubrics completed on a course-by-course basis by instructors and host P-12 teachers candidate reflection papers and journals pertaining to diversity written in connection with specific courses, diversity-related artifacts included in candidate formative and summative e-Portfolios, field evaluations completed by host teachers and supervisors during the student teaching experience, and that action research project conducted during the capstone seminar (which must have a P-12 student learning focus). Data from these various sources are aggregated and analyzed by faculty during Benchmark review meetings which occur each regular semester, and candidates then are informed of their performance in writing. All issues or areas identified as in need of improvement (diversity-related or otherwise), and also specific remedial experiences and performance expectations are included in the Benchmark letters candidates receive. These Benchmark reviews and decisions provide standards and criteria for monitoring candidate development and performance over time.

Advanced program candidate performance in the area of diversity is assessed on an ongoing basis by unit faculty, mentors, and field instructors/directors. These assessments principally occur within the context of disposition and Metastandard rubrics, and formative and summative e-Portfolio evaluations. Data from these various sources are collected, aggregated, analyzed and used in the same manner as initial program data, described above.

4d.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the diversity of P-12 students in schools in which education candidates do their field experiences and clinical practice may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

Standard 4 Table 10 (1)
Standard 4 Table 10 (2)
Standard 4 Table 10 (3)

See **Attachments** panel below.

Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 4?

2. What research related to Standard 4 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?

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.

[In this section the unit must include the professional education faculty in (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, noting differences when they exist.]

5a. Qualified Faculty

5a.1. What are the qualifications of the full- and part-time professional education faculty (e.g., earned degrees, experience, and expertise)? Please complete Table 11 or upload your own table at Prompt 5a.5 below. [Professional Education Faculty information compiled by AIMS from earlier reports submitted for the national review of programs and updated by your institution (see Manage Faculty Information page in your AIMS workspace) can be imported into Table 11. For further guidance on completing this table, see the directions provided below (select link "click here") as well as in the Help document (click on "Help" in the upper right corner of your screen.)]

Table 11

Faculty Qualification Summary

5a.2. What expertise qualifies professional education faculty members who do not hold terminal degrees for their assignments?

All full-time faculty in the unit hold the terminal degree for their discipline.

5a.3. How many of the school-based faculty members are licensed in the areas they teach or are supervising? How does the unit ensure that school-based faculty members are adequately licensed?

All school-based faculty, university supervisors and host teachers are licensed in the areas they are supervising and/or the areas in which they are teaching. All part-time and adjunct faculty retained by the Division to supervise student teachers are senior practitioners who have extensive experience in area public schools, who possess appropriate academic credentials, and who have long-standing ties to and/or firsthand familiarity with the unit's programs. Host teachers who supervise student teachers are screened by the Director of Student Teaching and their principals or district administrative offices to ensure these teachers hold a current teaching license in the area currently being taught. Unit faculty members who place and supervise course-related field experiences screen the teachers hosting these pre-clinical experiences.

Minimum requirements for host teachers are three-years teaching experience, appropriate licensure, relevant credentials (master's degree preferred), recommendation of their building and/or district administrator, and approval of the Director of Student Teaching and/or unit faculty.

5a.4. What contemporary professional experiences do higher education clinical faculty members have in school settings?

The unit's clinical faculty members (University Supervisors) have a solid (and varied) background in education. The vast majority of our University Supervisors hold Masters degrees with majors in elementary education and secondary education (Science, English and Vocational education). A few are certified and experienced in school administration. On average, they represent approximately 23 years in-school experience teaching and leading.

5a.5. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to faculty qualifications may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

Standard 5 Table 11

See **Attachments** panel below.

5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

5b.1. How does instruction by professional education faculty reflect the conceptual framework as well as current research and developments in the fields?

IU Kokomo values a triad of foci for faculty work: teaching, scholarship, and service. Being a regional institution, teaching is the first priority. The university's mission, vision, and strategic plan reflect this emphasis. Similarly, the Division of Education makes classroom performance a priority, and the majority of full-time faculty attained solid P-12 teaching credentials prior to joining IU Kokomo. All full-time unit

faculty members also possess relevant, firsthand experience as teachers/clinicians in the areas they teach. Faculty responsible for language/literacy education methods courses were both classroom language/reading teachers in Indiana schools. Faculty responsible for teaching science and mathematics methods courses were classroom science and mathematics teachers, and those responsible for teaching educational psychology and special education courses worked in a number of relevant clinical and/or classroom settings prior to joining the Division. All full-time faculty maintain professional development agendas which keep them current in their respective fields. Professional development opportunities include attending conferences, reading journals, and interacting with other experts at the university, local, regional, state, national, and international levels.

All unit faculty are fully knowledgeable about, and fully vested in the conceptual framework that guides unit initial and advanced teacher training programs. They unanimously embrace the belief that teacher educators must model the skills, competencies, and dispositions identified in the standards and indicated by best practice. They design and deliver courses which promote candidate learning through multiple instructional approaches and attention to individual learning styles and preferences. All syllabi are aligned to the appropriate Metastandards, which in turn are aligned to the conceptual framework. The developmental focus of the conceptual framework is reflected in course sequencing and learned outcome expectations as well as the instruction modeled by unit faculty.

5b.2. How do unit faculty members encourage the development of reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, and professional dispositions?

Critical thinking and the ability to engage in reflection about classroom practice are common elements and expectations in all initial and advanced professional education courses. The Division's developmental conceptual framework includes moving initial candidates to the analysis, synthesis and eventually evaluative stage of the profession. The advanced candidates also are expected to begin and proceed through the evaluative stage as well. Using the Metastandards as a guide, Division faculty prepare students with activities that will allow progress through these stages that require critical thinking, problem solving, and reflection.

Faculty monitors candidates' core and professional demeanor and dispositions, not only by modeling professionalism in daily responsibilities and activities, but also by providing additional opportunities each semester for candidate interactions with a variety of professionals, guest speakers, and other practitioners who are recognized for their teaching excellence. Dispositions are also evaluated within field experiences by host teachers.

5b.3. What types of instructional strategies and assessments do unit faculty members model?

Unit faculty model a wide range of instructional strategies, which includes the use of lectures, demonstrations, discussions, questioning, text-based assignments, Socratic methods, in-class student presentations, and individual and small-group outside-of-class projects and assignments. All faculty also utilize various forms of technology in the delivery of content, such as OHP, Power Point slides, and videos. Faculty also rely to an increasing extent on online delivery of courses, and in that context make use of the full range of instructional strategies made possible by Oncourse, the IU online course platform. Among these are the use of chat rooms, online forums and discussions, links to relevant internet content sites, electronic project submission, etc. Where assessment is concerned, faculty utilize several methods, most notably rubrics designed to accompany course assignments and projects. Also used often are more traditional methods such as essay and multiple-choice tests, etc. Many courses will include field experience requirements, and in those cases faculty rely upon observations, performance checklists, and rubrics.

Faculty in the Division have excellent records and reputations as strong, effective teachers, as evidenced by

the fact that several have been nominated and selected for IU's Faculty Colloquium on Excellence in Teaching (FACET) and Mack Fellowships, the IU Kokomo Claude Rich Excellence in Teaching Award, and the newly-created Trustee's Teaching Award. These awards are highly prestigious, and of the five given in 2008, three went to Division of Education faculty.

One member of the Division faculty has been a participant in two IU overseas teaching programs in Malaysia and two faculty teaching exchanges with teacher education institutions in Taiwan, selection for which in each case was partly based on teaching record and ability.

5b.4. How do unit faculty members incorporate the use of technology into instruction?

The use of instructional technology to supplement and improve teaching has been a unit priority since the 1990s. All faculty members use the online Oncourse system to complement instruction. Oncourse is a course management system that allows instructors to upload documents, organize discussions, retrieve and deliver electronic messages, announcements and assignments, and record and calculate grades. Additionally, Division faculty routinely use a variety of multi-media teaching tools and strategies in their courses including video, audio, document camera, computer projector, and OHP.

Division faculty also participate in technology training by enrolling in selected technology-related training sessions offered through the campus Center for Teaching, Learning, and Assessment. Many faculty also have incorporated technology-related projects and assignments into course design, to develop candidate skill in the use of technology in P-12 classrooms.

The Division has incorporated an electronic portfolio program requirement for both initial and advanced candidates which requires candidates to upload, hyperlink, change formats, and transfer files.

5b.5. How do unit faculty members systematically engage in self-assessment of their own teaching?

Faculty submit documentation of teaching-related efforts and effectiveness on an annual basis, through their individual Faculty Service Report (FSR), which is submitted to the Dean of Education for review. Narrative sections within the FSR describe the nature of all course-related curriculum development efforts of the previous 12 months, including efforts by faculty to address diversity, improve assessment, and foster service learning, through course design and delivery. Teaching effectiveness is described in the FSR in the form of summaries of student evaluations, peer evaluation, and self-assessments of teaching. The Dean uses the FSR as the basis for each faculty member's annual performance review, and for discussion with individual faculty about areas of teaching strengths and weaknesses.

5b.6. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to faculty teaching may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

5c. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship

5c.1. What types of scholarly work are expected of faculty as part of the institution's and unit's mission?

Faculty members are expected to pursue and maintain a robust, active, and focused scholarship agenda. The agenda includes engaging in original and relevant research; delivering papers and making presentations at professional conferences; and publishing books, book chapters, or articles in refereed professional journals. All full-time faculty is expected to carry the equivalent of a 12-hour teaching load each semester. However, all tenure-track faculty members are given a .25 FTE reassignment each semester (i.e. one course

equivalent) to allow time to engage in scholarship.

Although IU Kokomo prefers not to express its scholarship standard in quantitative terms, it is usually the case that tenure-track faculty is expected to publish one relevant manuscript every 12 to 18 months. Faculty pursuing tenure, therefore, will be expected to have at least three or four relevant publications during their five-year probationary period. Division faculty is held to the IU Kokomo standard and the IU School of Education standard. Thus, where scholarship is concerned, faculty will often maintain a higher level of scholarly productivity by the time of their tenure decision than is minimally expected of faculty in other units at IU Kokomo (the campus-level standard established by the VCAA is a minimum of two relevant, refereed publications by the time of the tenure review).

Post-tenure faculty members are expected to conform to a capacity model http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koacad/handbook/capacity.htm, which requires they maintain active scholarly agendas and publish at least one relevant, refereed manuscript every three years to qualify for the .25 FTE reassignment.

5c.2. In what types of scholarship activities are faculty members engaged? How is their scholarship related to teaching and learning? What percentage of the unit's faculty is engaged in scholarship? (Review the definition of scholarship in the NCATE glossary.) [A table could be attached at Prompt 5c.3 below to show different scholarly activities in which faculty members are involved and the number involved in each activity.]

All full-time faculty in the unit are provided reassigned time for scholarship, and all have been productive scholars. Indeed, the Division historically has had an excellent reputation across campus for the quality and quantity of scholarship produced by its relatively few faculty. Areas of research interest among unit faculty include several studies directly related to the scholarship of teaching and learning, and some unit faculty have published relevant articles in the SoTL area. Other areas of interest include cross-cultural examinations of social studies textbook content, studies of state and local level textbook selection processes, critical literacy approaches in elementary classrooms, rubric perceptions, uses, and development, multiculturalism, social justice, and governance issues.

5c.3. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to faculty scholarship may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

5d. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

5d.1. What types of service are expected of faculty as part of the institution's and the unit's mission?

Full-time faculty generally have the freedom to choose committee assignments or other service-related activities at the unit, campus, School, and/or university levels. Many campus standing committees require representation from each academic unit, however, and thus faculty are occasionally assigned service activities, as well. The unit specifies that all full-time faculty will participate in at least three committees, councils, etc., per academic year. Most faculty will exceed that number, although attempts are made to protect pre-tenured faculty from excessive service entanglements. Overall, unit faculty have compiled an impressive record of service engagement, both within the university and also within professional organizations. The Center for Early Childhood Education is also under the direction of the unit. The Center collaborates with area community agencies and organizations, and provides an additional service outlet for faculty, especially those in the area of early childhood.

5d.2. In what types of service activities are faculty members engaged? Provide examples of faculty

service related to practice in P-12 schools and service to the profession at the local, state, national, and international levels (e.g., through professional associations). What percentage of the faculty is actively involved in these various types of service activities? [A table could be attached at Prompt 5d.3 below to show different service activities in which faculty members are involved and the number involved in each activity.]

All full-time faculty maintains ongoing interactions with select public school colleagues as part of regular teaching responsibilities. Although the majority of these interactions pertain to IU Kokomo's initial teacher preparation programs, these relationships provide Division faculty with opportunities for direct, relevant collaboration with teachers and administrators in the central Indiana area. In addition, the Division's part-time faculty is composed entirely of local practitioners whose presence on campus each semester provides another vehicle for collaboration. Further, the Division's Advisory Board and the MS in Education Graduate Program Council include P-12 professional representation.

One member of the Division's full-time faculty is a participant in the IU Kokomo Center for Economic Education http://www.econed-in.org/center_iuk.asp housed administratively within the School of Business. Lastly, the Division hosts a study council composed of over 20 superintendents in the IU Kokomo service region. The Dean of Education holds a seat on that council; their monthly meetings at IU Kokomo provide another direct vehicle for communication and collaboration with public school colleagues.

The Division also hosts many professional development activities each academic year. The annual Fall Education Conference, co-sponsored with the local chapter of Pi Lambda Theta education honorary society and EdSAC, is now in its 24th consecutive year. This one-day event brings dozens of area educators to IU Kokomo for meetings, guest speakers, and a myriad of informal interactions with Division faculty, staff, and candidates. Unit faculty members also play an active role in the coordination and direction of the local Pi Lambda Theta chapter, and regular meetings of that group provide another vehicle for interactions among Division faculty, candidates, and area practitioners.

Division of Education faculty collaborates with the broader professional community through membership in a variety of professional organizations. Faculty also regularly attend local, state, regional, national, and international meetings of those organizations. Among these are the International Reading Association, American Educational Research Association, National Council for Social Studies, National Council for Teachers of English, Indiana Association of College Teachers of Education, Association of Teacher Educators-Indiana Unit, Phi Delta Kappa, Pi Lambda Theta, National Science Teachers Association, National Council of Economic Education, and the National Council for Teachers of Mathematics. Division faculty has also held office in local- and state-level professional organizations.

5d.3. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to faculty service may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

5e. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

5e.1. How are faculty evaluated? How regular, systematic, and comprehensive are the unit evaluations of adjunct/part-time, tenured, and non-tenured faculty, as well as graduate teaching assistants?

As noted in 5b.5 above, all full-time unit faculty members are evaluated by the Dean at the end of each calendar year. That evaluation primarily occurs within the context of the Faculty Service Report (FSR), completed by the individual faculty member and submitted to the Dean, which describes all teaching, scholarly, and service activities of the previous 12 months. Included in the teaching section will be

summaries of candidate course evaluations and other evidence of classroom performance, narrative descriptions of curriculum development activities, a listing of all advising-related activities and responsibilities, and a synopsis of the manner in which diversity-related issues and topics have been addressed in course content and delivery. Included in the scholarship section will be listings of all grants applied for and/or received and the status of all research projects including manuscripts under development, under editorial review, and accepted for publication. In the service section, faculty will report all campus, university and unit activity for committees, councils, and study groups for the previous year. Service contributions to professional organizations such as state-, regional-, and national-level office; editorial review boards; and peer review activities are included as well.

Upon review of each service report, the Dean prepares a narrative evaluation which rates the individual's performance in each of the three areas weighted against Division and IU Kokomo standards. Each of the three areas is rated as Excellent, Satisfactory, or Not Satisfactory. Those ratings are then synthesized into a global annual performance rating of Not Meeting-, Meeting-, or Exceeding Expectations. Dean evaluations are used as the basis for individual discussions with each faculty member regarding issues such as classroom efficacy, progress toward tenure and/or promotion, making necessary or desired adjustments in load, and other topics identified in the evaluation.

All service reports, complete with Dean evaluations, are forwarded to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs for review. Dean evaluations then are used as the basis for individual salary and merit recommendations, which also are forwarded to the VCAA.

Part-time faculty are evaluated by the Dean, who reviews (or delegates) all syllabi and other course materials developed for use within a particular program, to ensure conformity with unit standards, needs, sequences, etc. The Dean also will review all candidate and peer-review teaching evaluations of course(s) taught by adjuncts.

5e.2. How well do faculty perform on the unit's evaluations? [A table summarizing faculty performance could be attached at Prompt 5e.4 below.)

Division Faculty perform well on the unit's evaluation. Individual faculty performance will be made available during the visit.

5e.3. How are faculty evaluations used to improve teaching, scholarship, and service?

As noted in 5b.5 and 5e.1, faculty annual service/performance reports are reviewed by the Dean and VCAA, and used as the basis for decision making about faculty performance, and also areas which may be in need of improvement. IU and IU Kokomo have developed clear protocols that provide a framework for guiding full-time faculty evaluation processes. At the unit level, annual evaluations for both tenure-track and full-time lecturers are guided by standards and criteria described in the Academic Handbook http://www.indiana.edu/~deanfac/acadhbk/acad_handbk_2008.pdf . For pre-tenure faculty, that framework (i.e., performance standards, benchmarks and criteria) are thoroughly described in university and campus Faculty Handbooks and other tenure-related policies, procedures, etc. Where post-tenure faculty are concerned, policies and procedures for post-tenure review http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koacad/handbook/post-ten.htm ensure that unsatisfactory performance on the part of a senior faculty member is met with a clearly defined administrative response, which includes a well-defined improvement plan (including resources and support available to the individual), and an intensified, systematic review of performance in the areas of concern.

5e.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit's evaluation of professional education faculty may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be

able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

5f. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

5f.1. How is professional development related to needs identified in unit evaluations of faculty? How does this occur?

If a professional development-related issue is identified through the faculty performance evaluation process, remedies can be pursued in two ways. First, if the issue is specific to the Division, the Dean will discuss options during regular Division meetings, and then attempt to secure approval and/or funds from the VCAA and/or VC of Finance. Specific unit requests for professional development assistance—in the form of supplemental funding or additional support for particular initiatives and priorities—are reviewed at bi-monthly Deans Council meetings or through individual meetings with the Dean of Education and campus administrators. Often, the campus CTLA is able to provide the necessary instruction or training to faculty.

Division of Education faculty regularly participates in university- and campus-level conferences and meetings held at IU Kokomo each year. Full-time unit faculty members also have access each academic year to library funds which can be used to acquire books and materials within their areas of specialization. Funds for faculty development and/or to support scholarly work are budgeted each fiscal year through the office of the VCAA. Grants-in-aid of research and summer faculty fellowships are available to all IU Kokomo full-time faculty on a competitive basis. All IU Kokomo faculty are eligible to compete for many university-level grants and funding opportunities as well. Limited funding for international travel is also available.

5f.2. What professional development activities are offered to faculty related to performance assessment, diversity, technology, emerging practices, and/or the unit's conceptual framework?

Professional development activities are offered to faculty through the IU Kokomo Center for Teaching, Learning, and Assessment http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koctla/. Offerings include on-site workshops, online workshops, guest speakers, instructional technology training, etc.

Specific professional development activities for unit faculty also be accessed through the Indiana University School of Education. Those activities will include guest speakers, on-site workshops, and online workshops.

Specific professional development activities for unit faculty take place during regular faculty meetings and retreats. These activities include guest speakers and on-site workshops.

5f.3. How often does faculty participate in professional development activities both on and off campus? [Include adjunct/part-time, tenured, and non-tenured faculty, as well as graduate teaching assistants.]

All full-time faculty in the unit participate in one or more substantive professional development experiences each academic year. Much of this professional development occurs within the context of attendance and/or participation or presenting at state-, national- and/or international education conferences; some faculty attend or present at numerous such conferences each year. All faculty also participate in the wide range of professional development training offered through the IU Kokomo campus, most often through workshops and in-service training sessions on specific topics offered through the campus CTLA. Faculty also will occasionally participate in School- and university-level conferences, symposia, workshops, etc. offered on an ongoing basis throughout IU.

5f.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit's

facilitation of professional development may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 5?

2. What research related to Standard 5 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?

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.

[In this section the unit must include (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, noting differences when they exist.]

6a. Unit Leadership and Authority

6a.1. How does the unit manage or coordinate the planning, delivery, and operation of all programs at the institution for the preparation of educators?

As of July 1, 2007, there are three formal leadership positions in the Division: a) Dean of Education, a 12-month .75 FTE assignment, b) Associate Dean for Assessment and Accreditation, a 12-month .25 FTE assignment, and c) Assistant Dean for Program Review and Graduate Studies, a 10-month .25 FTE assignment with summer stipend. Faculty participation in the governance of academic programs is part of the tradition and culture of Indiana University, IU Kokomo, and the Division of Education. Thus, all Division faculty plays a significant supporting role to these three administrative positions where the ongoing planning, delivery, and operation of initial and advanced teacher preparation programs is concerned. This is accomplished largely through regular meetings of Division faculty and through committee participation. Due to the relatively small number of unit faculty, a majority of full-time faculty participates in the majority of initial and advanced program-related discussions, policy decisions, and implementation strategies. The Associate and Assistant Deans report directly to the Dean of Education, as does all full- and part-time/adjunct faculty in the Division.

The Dean of Education reports directly to the IU Kokomo Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA), and where IU School of Education issues are concerned, consults directly with the University Dean http://education.indiana.edu/Dean/tabid/6212/Default.aspx of the School of Education http://education.indiana.edu/ in Bloomington. This is largely accomplished through regular meetings of the Education Deans Council, composed of the administrative heads of teacher education at each of IU's eight campuses, convened for the purpose of facilitating communication and coordinating the common initial and advanced teacher education programs and policies at each campus. The Division is simultaneously an academic unit of IU Kokomo and a semi-autonomous unit of the statewide IU School of Education. The

latter operates more or less like a federation, in which day-to-day oversight and management of IU Kokomo's teacher education programs are the responsibility of the Division, but curriculum changes within those programs are subject to review and approval of the university-wide School. The Division also holds a seat on the IU School of Education Council http://education.indiana.edu/Default.aspx?alias=education.indiana.edu/ecouncil, which is responsible for reviewing modifications to initial and advanced teacher training programs common to the various IU campuses.

6a.2. What are the unit's recruiting and admissions policies? How does the unit ensure that they are clearly and consistently described in publications and catalogues?

The Office of Admissions http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koadms/ is solely responsible for admitting students to IU Kokomo. Information about admission is readily available on the campus website, and students can apply online as well. While Admissions is chiefly responsible for recruiting students to IU Kokomo, Division faculty and advisors assist in that effort through participation in annual on-campus recruiting events and direct outreach activities such as attending high school visitation events, supporting cadet teaching groups, and, for the MS in Education degree program, scheduling school visitations during which they meet individually with potential candidates. Division advisors also work in cooperation with IU Kokomo's Coordinator of Campus Climate http://legacy.iuk.edu/~kocacl/, whose responsibilities include recruiting minority candidates.

Those applying to the initial teacher education programs, usually as second-semester sophomores, must meet six criteria. These criteria include completion of 60 hours of coursework; minimum overall GPA of 2.50; passing Praxis I scores at state level; completion of W131 (composition), S121 (speech), and M118/M125 (mathematics); completion of pre-professional courses with C+ or higher, and faculty approval at Benchmark 1.

The Assistant Dean for Program Review and Graduate Studies is chiefly responsible for ensuring that all program-related documents are current, accurate, and disseminated to both initial and advanced candidates. All documents and other information are available on the Division's webpage. For the M.S. in Education program, the Assistant Dean is supported by a Graduate Program Council, which reviews admissions applications.

6a.3. How does the unit ensure that its academic calendars, catalogues, publications, grading policies, and advertising are accurate and current?

All campus-level academic calendars and program-related policies are posted on the IU Kokomo website and are linked to the Division website so that TEP candidates can access this information easily. Two campus-level offices most directly involved with these calendars and schedules are the Office of Academic Affairs http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koacad/ and the Office of the Registrar http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koregstr/. The Office of Academic Affairs updates the campus Academic Bulletin every two years. The IU Kokomo Office of Communication and Marketing http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koocm/ is responsible for campus-level event calendars, advertising and dissemination of information, and assisting academic units with the development of marketing materials.

At the unit level, faculty and advisors continually update program planning guides and other relevant documents to reflect both campus- and Division-level changes in curriculum, policies, and processes. All such documents are posted on the Division website by the unit's webmaster. Changes in TEP policies and procedures that occur as a result of the Division's program improvement meetings each semester are immediately conveyed to candidates via email and website postings.

6a.4. How does the unit ensure that candidates have access to student services such as advising and counseling?

IU Kokomo students who indicate an interest in initial teacher education are encouraged to attend orientation sessions conducted by Division advisors who provide them an overview of program requirements, course sequences, and unit policies and processes. These students are immediately assigned an advisor who tracks them to ensure they enroll in the proper prerequisite/pre-TEP courses. Those who eventually become program candidates attend a number of orientations (admission to TEP, admission to student teaching, etc.) and two e-Portfolio development training sessions. Advisors participate in each of these sessions. All advanced program advising is coordinated by the Assistant Dean for Program Review and Graduate Studies.

Each TEP and ATEP candidate receives a letter from the Dean following Benchmark meetings to inform them of their program status. Tracking of candidates allows advisors to identify those who are experiencing academic and/or dispositional difficulties. These candidates must meet with their advisor to resolve the issues before enrollment in any additional TEP or ATEP courses is permitted. The Division also utilizes email as a principal means of communication with candidates about events, deadlines, requirements, and other important unit business. TEP and ATEP candidates are encouraged by advisors and faculty to visit the Division's comprehensive website on a regular basis for additional program-related information. The Division also maintains two bulletin boards in the Main Building which are updated frequently with program-related information and announcements. Finally, faculty and advisors refer candidates to other campus-level services (counseling, financial aid, registrar, student services, etc.) as necessary.

6a.5. Which members of the professional community participate in program design, implementation, and evaluation? In what ways do they participate?

The Division convenes an Advisory Board composed of area P-12 educators. The Board is chaired by the Dean of Education and serves as a pivotal stakeholder sounding board for discussing initial and advanced program developments, proposed modifications, data-informed recommendations, and maintaining currency in unit offerings. The Board also played a substantive role in the redesign of the Division's MS in Education program, including participation in an on-campus program planning conference in spring 2006. The Dean of Education also holds a seat on the North Central Indiana Superintendent Study Council which meets monthly at IU Kokomo. That Council also serves as an ad hoc advisory board in that they are provided regular updates about - and opportunities to comment on – developments, trends, policy changes, and other issues related to unit initial and advanced programs.

Members of the P-12 professional community also actively participate in the implementation and delivery of initial and advanced programs as adjunct faculty, host teachers for field and clinical experiences, occasional members of Division search and screen committees, members of the Graduate Program Council, and members of e-Portfolio evaluation teams. As the Division continually moves in the direction of a Professional Development School approach for its field experiences, close collaborations have developed with selected P-12 schools in the IU Kokomo service area.

6a.6. How does the unit facilitate collaboration with other academic units involved in the preparation of professional educators?

The unit enjoys a collaborative relationship with its Arts and Sciences colleagues in the departments of Humanities, Mathematics, Science, Social Science, and Visual Arts. These content professors and department heads are members of the Joint Committee on Indiana Professional Standards and charged with development and review of the content curriculum in all programs offered by the unit. The unit's assistant dean serves as chair of the Joint Committee and convenes meetings on a regular basis during each academic year.

6a.7. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to unit leadership and authority may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

6b. Unit Budget

6b.1. What is the budget available to support programs preparing candidates to meet standards? How does the unit's budget compare to the budgets of other units with clinical components on campus or similar units at other institutions?

The majority of the Division of Education's annual budget is allocated to full-time faculty and staff salary and fringe benefits. Other main categories in the Division's budget pertain to part-time/adjunct salaries; supplies and expenses such as telephone, postage, and copier; professional travel, including reimbursements for full-time faculty travel to and from field experience sites and professional meetings; and instructional support such as teaching materials and equipment. Funds made available to the Division each fiscal year are minimally adequate to support the basic costs associated with the operation of its initial and advanced teacher education enterprises.

6b.2. How adequately does the budget support all programs for the preparation of educators? What changes to the budget over the past few years have affected the quality of the programs offered?

Unit heads at IU Kokomo exercise only limited control over budget allocations and expenditures. Unit budget requests and projections are solicited during the budget approval process each year by the VCAA, but ultimately each unit's budget is determined by the IU Kokomo campus-level administrative Cabinet. The amount made available to units in each budget category, final approval of all unit expenditures, and any changes in the unit budget which occur during a fiscal year, such as moving funds to a different line item, are approved and/or managed at the campus level. Because of this centralization of budget authority, the Dean of Education makes few substantive budget-related decisions and exercises little autonomy over expenditures, except those pertaining to the purchase of routine office supplies and approval of routine faculty and staff professional travel expenses. Any unused unit funds at the end of the fiscal year are presumed to belong to campus administration.

6b.3. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit's budget may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

6c. Personnel

6c.1. What are the institution's and unit's workload policies? What is included in the workloads of faculty (e.g., hours of teaching, advising of candidates, supervising student teachers, work in P-12 schools, independent study, research, administrative duties, and dissertation advisement)?

All full-time faculty members at IU Kokomo are expected to carry a 12-credit hour, four-course equivalent workload each semester; summer employment is optional. All eligible full-time faculty members are given a one-course equivalent reassignment for scholarship/research each semester. No distinction in teaching load is made between undergraduate- and graduate-level assignments, nor is there any differentiation in workload on the basis of rank. Each full-time faculty member is expected to maintain office hours each week, and most Division faculty teach courses with a P-12 field component, which must be arranged and supervised by the instructor. The Division attempts to limit independent study courses. When a faculty member agrees to an independent study, it is considered an overload and faculty are compensated on a per capita basis. Except for Deans, those faculty at IU Kokomo who engage in administrative work are typically given a one-course reassignment each semester; some administrative assignments receive a

summer stipend.

Scholarly expectations for pre- and post-tenure teacher education faculty are described in 5c.1.

The typical load each semester for a full-time faculty member includes participation in a relatively wide range of service activities related to the ongoing governance of unit programs. These tasks include mentoring candidates; participating in faculty, benchmark review, and program improvement meetings; serving on Education faculty and staff search committees, faculty third year review committees, and teaching award selection committees; assisting with formative and summative e-Portfolio assessment; and collecting data for the UAS and assisting with other accreditation-related tasks. The Division designates one faculty member to serve on the system-level Education Council. Each full-time faculty member is expected to serve on a minimum of three Division-/campus-level committees, task forces, and study groups each academic year. Many of these committees require representation from each academic unit on campus, and several are two-year assignments. Unit faculty members thus are able to limit their service assignments to three committees only rarely given the large number of committees and the small number of full-time faculty. This includes pre-tenure faculty who presumably should be shielded from excessive service obligations.

6c.2. What are the faculty workloads for teaching and the supervision of clinical practice?

Full-time, part-time, and adjunct faculty whose initial program courses include a field or practical element/requirement supervise the candidates enrolled in their respective courses (with the assistance of host teachers in whose classrooms candidates are placed). These faculty receive no additional compensation for field supervision that occurs within the context of a course they teach. Secretarial support for placement of candidates is minimal; thus, faculty generally makes all logistical and other arrangements associated with initial program practicum site placements. At present, no full-time unit faculty is involved with supervision of the capstone student teaching experience. Should they become involved, workload is consistent with the formula used throughout the IU School of Education i.e. supervision of six student teachers is considered the equivalent of one 3-credit hour course.

6c.3. To what extent do workloads and class size allow faculty to be engaged effectively in teaching, scholarship, and service (including time for such responsibilities as advisement, developing assessments, and online courses)?

Despite significant enrollment increases in recent years, class size and faculty-candidate ratios remain within reasonable and manageable limits for initial and advanced programs. In 2000 the Division formally adopted an enrollment cap of 30 candidates for the majority of initial program TEP-related courses and a maximum of 15 candidates for most advanced program courses. These numbers are rarely exceeded, and only when the nature of the course, workshop, or institute allows a larger enrollment without sacrificing course content or program needs and goals. In the past few years, enrollment in initial program TEP courses has consistently been in the range of 15-25 candidates per section; some sections have been as low as 8-10 candidates. The revised MS in Education program has admitted two cohorts to date, of five and eight candidates respectively, and in many instances the cohort of candidates are the only persons enrolled in a particular graduate-level course.

As noted elsewhere, virtually every initial program TEP course, and a few advanced-level courses, includes a field component, which in every instance must be organized and coordinated by the faculty member of record. This creates both a significant burden and a distraction to the faculty member, even when the cohort number is low. Many faculty routinely teach multiple sections that include field experiences each semester, and as a result, they must invest a significant amount of time each week to the myriad of phone calls, emails, site visits, and other similar tasks necessary to effectively deliver this portion of their course.

6c.4. How does the unit ensure that the use of part-time faculty contributes to the integrity, coherence, and quality of the unit and its programs?

The unit has access to a diverse corps of experienced, doctoral-level prepared practitioners, many of whom are P-12 superintendents, principals and/or classroom teachers. In recent years reliance on part-time faculty has been reduced considerably, due to the presence of more full-time faculty. In recent years reliance on part-time faculty has been reduced considerably, due to the presence of more full-time faculty.

Part-time and adjunct faculty members attend a campus-wide orientation session at the start of each semester at which they are introduced to campus-level policies and procedures. At that session they also meet individually with the Dean and/or other faculty from the Division to discuss TEP-specific syllabi, policies, and expectations. All part-time faculty members are required every semester to submit their syllabi to the Dean for review and archiving. In some instances, they will develop a syllabus but most will use a syllabus provided by the Division. Part-time and adjunct faculty are also required to gather candidate evaluations for each course taught using a standard evaluation instrument provided by the Division. These evaluations are submitted to the Dean for review at the completion of the semester. The Dean may occasionally observe part-time/adjunct faculty teaching. These faculty members are invited to participate in selected Division meetings each semester as well.

6c.5. What personnel provide support for the unit? How does the unit ensure that it has an adequate number of support personnel?

Effective July 1, 2009, all advising on the IU Kokomo campus has been restructured. Unit advisors have been physically relocated to an advising suite which houses 2.50 FTE advisors who serve not only teacher education candidates but also students enrolled in Continuing Studies; an advisor in this latter area now also serves teacher education candidates.

This restructuring left the unit with only 1.50 FTE support staff: a 1.00 FTE Director of the Center for Early Childhood Education, and a .50 FTE Director of Student Teaching and Licensing. The .50 FTE Coordinator of Educational and Student Resources position, which oversees day-to-day operation of the unit's Curriculum Laboratory (CuLab) is currently vacant.

The unit has one full-time (1.00 FTE) Administrative Assistant to the Dean, and one part-time (28 hours per week) Secretary who supports faculty and staff needs and also functions as the UAS Data Manager. The Division has attempted to keep abreast of the growing demands associated with its increasing candidate headcount, expanding faculty ranks, and data collection/record-keeping demands. A long-standing request for additional clerical support is still pending, however.

6c.6. What financial support is available for professional development activities for faculty?

Division of Education faculty members have access to a wide range of professional development training and in-service sessions through IU Kokomo's Center for Teaching, Learning, and Assessment http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koctla/. Many of those sessions are offered online, and Center staff is available for one-on-one training with faculty. The training and in-service offered through the Center include a variety of classroom-oriented topics, in particular the use of technology to support instruction; e.g. optimizing the use of Oncourse and developing hybrid courses. All services of the Center are provided without cost to the academic unit or individual faculty member.

Full-time faculty members are provided professional development funds each academic year. The amount available varies each year, but generally is adequate to support travel, lodging, and registration fees associated with at least one relevant state-, regional-, or national-level professional conference. For the past

academic year, each full-time unit faculty received a $700 professional development stipend. Each unit faculty, including the Dean, receives an equal share in the available funds. Each professional staff position is given approximately $500 per year for professional travel from the same pool of funds. This travel allocation may be used to offset expenses associated with travel to relevant professional conferences, seminars, and meetings subject to approval by the Dean. Faculty in need of additional support, most often awarded to those who will present papers at conferences, may apply for supplemental funding through the offices of the Dean of Education and/or the VCAA.

6c.7. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to personnel may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

6d. Unit facilities

6d.1. How adequate are unit--classrooms, faculty offices, library/media center, the technology infrastructure, and school facilities--to support teaching and learning? [Describe facilities on the main campus as well as the facilities at off-campus sites if they exist.]

The Division of Education is housed in a section of IU Kokomo's Main Building. Renovated in 1996, the Division's physical space includes a main Education office for the support staff, with a private office occupied by the Dean. Seven faculty offices are located in a hallway immediately adjacent to the Education office. The Curriculum Laboratory (CuLab) includes a private office that currently resides the half-time Director of Student Teaching and Licensing advisor. The CuLab also offers a spacious area housing reference and instruction materials, children's literature collection, candidate work/study tables, and networked computers for initial and advanced program candidate use.

The Division has regular access to the many high-tech classrooms at IU Kokomo. Education courses also are regularly scheduled in a science/mathematics laboratory classroom in the Main Building which contains space and equipment adequate for the needs of initial- and advanced-level methods courses. All IU Kokomo facilities are well maintained and functional. The overall physical teaching and learning environment on the Kokomo campus conforms to the high standards which define the entire IU system.

6d.2. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to unit facilities may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

6e. Unit resources including technology

6e.1. How does the unit allocate resources across programs to ensure candidates meet standards in their field of study?

The Dean of Education is ultimately responsible for ensuring that faculty have the resources needed to ensure candidates meet standards. Program- and course-related not routinely available to faculty can be requested directly from unit and/or campus administrators.

6e.2. What information technology resources support faculty and candidates? What evidence shows that candidates and faculty use these resources?

All faculty and staff at IU Kokomo are provided desktop computers to access a variety of network software and applications. Training in the use of technology to support instruction and program management is readily available to all IU Kokomo faculty and staff through regularly-scheduled individual and/or group

training sessions provided by the campus' Instructional Technology http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koctla/ staff, and through Computing services http://legacy.iuk.edu/~kocser/ . In recent years, all full-time Education faculty has participated in Oncourse training sessions designed to assist them with the creation of online course content and teaching supplements.

The Dean of Education, the Associate Dean, and the Assistant Dean share access to the unit's assessment system electronic database for both initial and advanced programs. All full-time faculty and professional staff involved with advising have access to a university-wide Student Record Retrieval system which allows immediate access to academic records and transcripts.

All TEP candidates have access to computer laboratories located throughout the campus, including an information commons in the main library located in Kelley Center. All candidates are provided a university email account. Access to library resources, course registration, fee payment, and a variety of other services and information are available online to all IU Kokomo faculty, staff, and candidates through the university's OneStart https://onestart.iu.edu/my2-prd/portal/0 portal. The Division's website is updated on an ongoing basis and includes a wide range of program-related information for faculty, staff, candidates, and constituents.

6e.3. What resources are available for the development and implementation of the unit's assessment system?

The Division's UAS is primarily supported by the office of the Associate Dean for Assessment and Accreditation created in 2007. The Associate Dean works closely with the Dean to oversee the day-to-day management of the UAS and the Access-based electronic database. With the assistance of program advisors, the Associate Dean also organizes regular initial program Benchmark meetings, coordinates e-Portfolio reviews, manages the online field experience evaluation site, and generates an assortment of documents, reports, summaries, and trend data pertaining to candidate performance. The Associate Dean also works with the Dean to develop agendas for Program Improvement meetings. The Assistant Dean for Program Review and Graduate Studies fulfills the same functions for the advanced program.

IU Kokomo provides a significant level of support through IT services, including assistance with the design and implementation of the Division's online field experience evaluation system http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koeduc/forms/p3rubric.shtml, http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koeduc/forms/k6rubric.shtml, http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koeduc/forms/512rubric.shtml, http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koeduc/forms/dispositions.shtml, online e-Portfolio evaluation system, and archive system. The UAS is supported by clerical staff in the form of the Administrative Assistant and part-time secretary housed in the Division's main office. The part-time secretary's job description includes duties in data management. Additionally, all full-time faculty members support the UAS through their direct participation in field experiences, formative and summative e-Portfolio evaluations, Benchmark meetings, and Program Improvement meetings.

6e.4. What library and curricular resources exist at the institution? How does the unit ensure they are sufficient and current?

The IU Kokomo Library http://legacy.iuk.edu/~kolibry/ is the academic hub of the Kokomo campus, offering a large collection of print and electronic materials as well as computing resources for candidates, faculty, and staff. In addition the library is open to the public. Initial and advanced program candidates have access to the IU Kokomo campus library, and through it, to the entire IU library system, statewide. Local and statewide collections can be accessed online through the library's main portal which leads users to several electronic databases. The library provides a user-friendly candidate resources link that guides users to specific resources, such as periodicals and remote access to library services. It also offers online information literacy instruction tutorials. The library features an Information Commons area, an integrated service desk which provides the expertise of both professional librarians, and information technology

professionals to assist users with research and computer needs.

The Division of Education houses a Curriculum Laboratory/Curriculum Resource Center (CuLab) located in Room 176 of the Main Building. This facility houses a collection of professional education-related resource and reference materials, including textbooks, sample instructional materials (magazines and journals, basal texts, posters, teaching units, state standards reference documents, and non-print media such as videos, audio tapes, and puppets), networked computers, scanners and printers, and a collection of over 5000 children's literature titles. The CuLab is wireless-accessible, as is the entire IU Kokomo campus. The CuLab also provides space for collaborative work and functions as an information commons and an all-purpose meeting and work area for candidates. Additionally, it is the site of many TEP-related events such as Book Talks, induction and orientation meetings, Pi Lambda Theta http://legacy.iuk.edu/~koeduc/PLT.shtml business meetings, and Praxis preparation workshops. The Coordinator of Education and Student Resources is responsible for maintaining the CuLab under the direction of the Dean of Education.

6e.5. How does the unit ensure the accessibility of resources to candidates, including candidates in off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, through electronic means?

Electronic access to all campus and Division resources is routine at IU Kokomo. All Candidates pay a technology fee each semester that allows them access to the statewide IU network through a single portal, OneStart. All IU Kokomo candidates are given a university email account, and all are provided basic instruction in how to effectively use the university's online instructional platform, Oncourse. These resources can be accessed by candidates anywhere, at any time. The cohort approach also allows advisors and program administrators to electronically track and communicate with candidates in an efficient manner regarding program information, announcements, events, deadlines, and other important issues.

6e.6. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to unit resources, including technology, may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 6?

2. What research related to Standard 6 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?