



The Standard of Excellence
in Teacher Preparation



(Part C of the AACTE Annual Report)

Section 1 - Institutional Information

NCATE ID:	11405
AACTE SID:	275
Institution:	Ball State University
Unit:	Teachers College
Next Accreditation Visit:	S10
Last Accreditation Visit	S03
Deadline to Submit Final Version of Part C:	11/18/2005

Section 2 - Individual Contact Information

Unit Head Name:	Dr. Roy Weaver
Unit Head Title:	Dean
Unit Head Email:	rweaver@bsu.edu
Unit Head Phone:	(765) 285-5452
Unit Head Fax:	(765) 285-5455
Institution Unit Phone:	(765) 285-5452
1st NCATE Coordinator:	Dr. Judy Ann Miller
1st Coordinator Title:	Director
1st Coordinator Email:	jamiller5@bsu.edu
1st Coordinator Phone:	(765) 285-1168
1st Coordinator Fax:	(765) 285-2854
2nd NCATE Coordinator:	Dr. Laurie Mullen
2nd Coordinator Title:	Associate Dean

2nd Coordinator Email: **lmullen@bsu.edu**

2nd Coordinator Phone: **(765) 285-5252**

2nd Coordinator Fax: **(765) 285-5455**

CEO: **Dr. JoAnn M. Gora**

CEO Title: **President**

CEO Email:

CEO Phone: **(765) 285-5452**

CEO Fax: **(765) 285-5455**

Corrected Unit Head:

Corrected Title of Unit Head

Corrected Unit Head Email:

Corrected Unit Head Phone:

Corrected Unit Head Fax:

Corrected 2nd Unit Head:

Corrected Title of 2nd Unit Head

Corrected 2nd Unit Head Email:

Corrected 2nd Unit Head Phone:

Corrected 2nd Unit Head Fax:

Corrected Institution Unit Phone:

Corrected 1st NCATE Coordinator:

Corrected 1st Coordinator Title

Corrected 1st Coordinator Email:

Corrected 1st Coordinator Phone:

Corrected 1st Coordinator Fax:

Corrected 2nd NCATE Coordinator: Dr. Laurie Mullen

Corrected 2nd Coordinator Title: Associate Dean

Corrected 2nd Coordinator Email: lmullen@bsu.edu

Corrected 2nd Coordinator Phone: 765-285-5252

Corrected 2nd Coordinator Fax: 765-285-5455

Corrected CEO Full Name:

Corrected CEO Title:

Corrected CEO Email:

Corrected CEO Phone:

Corrected CEO Fax:

Section A. Conceptual Framework(s)

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

Please indicate evaluations of and changes made to the unit's conceptual framework (if any) during this year:

No changes were made to the Conceptual Framework during the previous year.

During the previous year, the document "Expert Engagement in Context: A Conceptual Framework for Advanced Programs", which documents the application of the Conceptual Framework in advanced programs of the professional education unit and shows the alignment with national standards for advanced programs, was finalized. The final version was approved by the Professional Education Committee on October 21, 2005.

Section B. Candidate Performance

Standard 1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

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

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

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

These two areas for improvement will be treated together, as they both address the same issue - the availability of data to document specific elements of candidate performance in relation to standard one. An understanding of our response to these areas for improvement first requires some background on our work following the spring 2003 BOE visit.

At the time of the 2003 BOE visit, an extensive and sophisticated system for collecting and aggregating data had been developed for all initial programs. This was codified in a "Decision Points Document" that specified uniform assessments across all programs. At the advanced level, however, no such uniform system was in place and each program was in the process of developing the structure for collecting, aggregating, and analyzing data. Though several programs had prepared explicit assessment programs and offered some aggregated data sets, the BOE rightly noted that a unit-wide system was not yet developed for advanced programs.

In the spring of 2004, the Unit Assessment Plan for Advanced Professional Education Programs was adopted by the Professional Education Committee. This document outlines principles and procedures for each advanced program to develop and implement an assessment system which:

- is aligned with the conceptual framework
- assesses performance across the multiple domains of knowledge, skills, and dispositions, (content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, professional knowledge and skills, disposition, and student learning)
- utilizes multiple types of performance assessments
- includes significant programmatic decision points at which data are aggregated and reviewed.

In the fall of 2004, each advanced program outlined Decision Points consistent with this plan as adopted by the Professional Education Committee. In addition to securing assessment plans from all advanced programs in conformity with the approved framework, each of the programs was asked to assemble available data from the 2003-2004 academic year, and data from fall 2004. These data were organized around the five performance areas included in Standard 1. These reports and data were made available to NCATE examiners when they visited our campus in the spring of 2005.

In addition at the time of the 2005 BOE focus visit, the UAS reports and data were shared with the visiting team. The advanced programs had been incorporated into the rGrade web-based software used to manage the initial programs for the UAS. This program management capability was demonstrated to the BOE team.

In summary, the unit has vigorously addressed this issue. The following responses have been made with respect to these areas for improvement:

- A plan for systematic collection, aggregation, and analysis of data from all advanced programs has been adopted through the unit's governance system.
- All advanced programs organized assessment and data analysis procedures consistent with the approved plan.
- All advanced programs have summarized data from 2003-2004 and fall 2004 to document performance.
- All advanced programs have been incorporated into the web-based rGrade UAS management system.
- The report generation functions within rGrade have been developed for advanced programs.
- The extensive amount of progress made by the unit in the past two years was shared with the BOE team during the 2005 focused visit.

Standard 2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

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

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

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

The unit does not ensure that all its assessment measures are fair, accurate, consistent and free of bias.

The unit has limited evidence that candidate performance data are used to drive program improvement decisions.

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

This concern relates to a broader issue identified in the original 2003 BOE report. They concluded that "the initial and advanced teacher education programs do not clearly align performance-based preparation of candidates' knowledge, skills

and dispositions with the unit's conceptual framework." We believe that this was a misinterpretation, related to the fact that we were transitioning to a new conceptual framework at the time of the 2003 visit.

We believe that this area for improvement has been vigorously addressed. The significant progress was noted by the BOE team during the spring 2005 focused visit and they recommended that this area for improvement no longer be cited. Specific linkage of conceptual framework principles to the assessment system and its constituent pieces is occurring in several ways.

First, an abridged version of the formal CF document has been approved by the Professional Education Committee and is now studied in all introductory courses to insure that candidates are introduced to the CF themes at the entry point of their preparation. This document may be viewed at the Introductory Course Group (<http://bsu.edu/web/icg/>) website, Click on "Common Elements" and then on "Latest Version of the Conceptual Framework." In the introductory course, conceptual framework elements are related to various requirements and assessments required throughout the program.

Second, the conceptual framework is integrated into the official NCATE course syllabi for all professional education courses. Faculty revised all course syllabi to include a specific section that addresses the relationship of the three conceptual framework themes to course content and activities. This explicit inclusion of conceptual framework linkage to course syllabi formalizes for both candidates and faculty the expectation, and therefore the necessary assessment of conceptual framework elements.

Third, many of the assessments included in the system are built around the INTASC principles. The conceptual framework is significantly aligned with these principles. It should be noted that the two major assessment procedures in the system, the digital portfolio assessment and the student teaching assessment, are both expressed in detailed rubrics that are built directly on the INTASC principles. The portfolio assessment rubric used for all initial licensure areas is aligned with the INTASC principles. As a result, the relationships direct correlations to the conceptual framework elements can be exploited extensively as candidates are assessed in these two major elements of their programs.

The alignment of the Conceptual Framework themes with the standards for the advanced programs has also been documented. These include the standards for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) Standards, American Speech Language Hearing Association (ASHA) Standards, Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards, and Standards of the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Programs (CACREP). The document Expert Engagement in Context: A Conceptual Framework for Advanced Programs was developed over the last year as a way to specifically address the integration of the Conceptual Framework in the advanced programs. The alignment with these national standards for advanced programs is included in the appendix of that document.

Fourth, analysis of candidate performance in the first year of teaching in relation to the three conceptual framework themes has been incorporated into our beginning teacher assessment. Beginning in 2003-2004, data from beginning teacher surveys included an analysis designed to reveal how beginning teachers demonstrated the conceptual framework themes in their work, as perceived by the candidate, his/her mentor, and his/her supervisor.

Fifth, the formal assessment of dispositions, which has been implemented for the 2004-2005 academic year, is built on a rubric directly tied to the conceptual framework. Thus, two major pieces of the assessment system are now directly correlated with the conceptual framework. Since the disposition assessment is incorporated into the rGrade UAS management system, data aggregation and reporting have been facilitated.

In summary, the relationship and alignment of the conceptual framework to candidate performance has been articulated in the design of the conceptual framework itself and is being made increasingly explicit within coursework and activities. The conceptual framework document is systematically introduced to all initial candidates at the onset of their programs as a part of their orientation to professional education. This document is also being utilized in advanced programs and with school partners to build a consistent conceptual base for professional expectations. The conceptual framework has been integrated into all professional education course syllabi, thus making explicit to instructors and faculty the relationship of conceptual framework themes to course activities and assessments. The conceptual framework is explicitly linked to major components of the assessment system, and integrally linked to many other components through its relationship to the

INTASC principles and other national standards.

The second area for improvement has been addressed above in the discussion of Standard 1. Compliance with the unit's new Assessment Plan for Advanced Professional Education Programs by all advanced programs occurred and was documented in fall 2004. This documentation of each program's compliance with the plan was presented to the NCATE focused review team in spring 2005.

The third area for improvement under this standard related to the Unit Operation Plan, as with other elements of Ball State's UAS, the linkage of assessment procedures to unit operations was still developing and emerging at the time of the 2003 BOE visit. Though this linkage was implied, it had not been detailed and documented.

In the spring of 2004, a formal Unit Operations Plan was adopted by the Professional Education Committee to guide the unit in the use of data generated within the assessment system. That document identifies major pieces of assessment data and outlines, on an annual cycle, the ways in which that data is to be reviewed by relevant stakeholders. The Unit Operations Plan thus provides a structure for relating assessment data to unit operations and suggests types of programmatic decisions which might be made as a result. Implementation of the Unit Operations Plan during the 2004-2005 academic year highlighted the need to both review the data as it becomes available and also to review all data and annual reports at the unit level on a yearly basis. Consequently, in July 2005, the Professional Education Committee held the first of what will become an annual retreat to review all data and UAS reports for the previous academic year and to recommend changes and improvements for future implementation.

Also, during the past year a web site has been developed as a UAS resource (<http://www.bsu.edu/teachers/faculty/>) to facilitate communication with faculty members. Although the information has been available through other avenues, it was not easily accessible to individual faculty members and stakeholders external to the university. The unit also maintains a UAS web site (<http://www.bsu.edu/teachers/uas>). With a large and diverse program, use of the electronic communication makes the information easily accessible to all faculty when needed. Additional modifications to the Unit Operations Plan will be implemented to assure that the unit implements improvements based on the data collected.

Section C. Unit capacity

Standard 3. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice.

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school personnel develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes and/or improvements related to Standard 3 that occurred in your unit this year:

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

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

Individual programs at the advanced level do specify with considerable detail the requirements for field experiences in each of their own programs. This concern apparently relates to the absence of unit-level guidelines encompassing all advanced programs.

The Advanced Level programs are also accredited by other accrediting organizations, for example the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP), Council on Academic Accreditation (CAA) in Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology, and the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Programs (CACREP). Because of the requirements of these organizations and the requirements for certification by other organizations, such as the Certificate of Clinical Competence of the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association, a variety of constraints are placed on the field experiences of candidates for these advanced degrees.

Advanced level programs that lead to licensure have very specific field experience requirements that are aligned with the appropriate national program standards and the standards required for state licensure. However, not all advanced level programs, for example a content area Masters degree, have a specific field experience requirement.

We continue to work to develop a comprehensive, systematic, and explicit description of field experience guidelines and to make that description available through annual reports, as well as in field experience and supervisor handbooks.

In one sense, the second area for improvement under this standard can be seen as part of the larger issue of systematic data collection for advanced programs in general, which has been discussed above. In that discussion, we noted that considerable data are being generated to provide evidence of candidate performance at the advanced level. Indeed, a good proportion of that data is coming from field experience and internship elements of programs.

The rationale in the BOE report for this noted area of improvement states that, "The unit is not conducting assessments of field experiences for advanced level programs." Those advanced programs that incorporate field experiences do have performance-based assessments. These assessments were implemented at a program level and the data were not previously aggregated at the unit level. For those programs that incorporate a field-based component, successful completion becomes part of Decision Point 3 at the Advanced-level. Now that the programs have been incorporated into rGrade, aggregation of the data at the unit level is possible.

Standard 4. Diversity

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. These experiences include working with diverse higher education and school faculty, diverse candidates, and diverse students in P-12 schools.

Please indicate any significant evaluations, changes and/or improvements related to Standard 4 that occurred in your unit this year:

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

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

The faculty and administrators in advanced programs work hard to arrange field experiences and clinical practice activities that include diverse student and client populations. It is our assumption that the significance of this identified area lies with the term all. In other words, the issue appears to be a lack of assurance on the part of the BOE that all candidates benefit equally from this effort.

This issue will be addressed as advanced programs comply with the guidelines of the Unit Assessment Plan discussed above. In describing program activities and assessments, individual programs are asked to track field experiences and clinical assignments in terms of important dimensions of diversity. These will be reviewed annually for the purpose of adjusting policies and practices with regard to this identified area for improvement.

The faculty and administrators in advanced programs work hard to insure that candidates are provided opportunities to demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to diversity. In fact, in our rejoinder to the original BOE report, we listed a large number of such opportunities as found in several of our advanced programs.

The final statement in the original BOE report regarding this element of Standard 4 provides the best summary of our condition: "Much effort has been made to recruit and retain diverse candidates, but the actual numbers remain minimal." The demographic realities of Ball State's enrollment population are not within the control of the professional education unit. We have, as the BOE report notes, worked hard to address these realities, and we will continue to do so.

The number of incoming minority freshmen this fall (2005) is 293, which represents an increase of 41 over the previous year. The total number of incoming freshman decreased by 17 this fall, so this increase in minority enrollment is significant.

Once again, the unit's ability to significantly affect the balance of diversity among university faculty is limited. The BOE report noted that, "although the unit has made efforts to recruit and retain diverse faculty members, the numbers remain fairly consistent since the last NCATE visit." As with the recruitment of a diverse student body, we will continue our efforts in this regard.

One matter of significance needs to be noted with regard to these cited areas. The Professional Education Committee adopted the Diversity Standards for Professional Education at its March 2, 2005 meeting. This document articulates the

alignment between the themes of the conceptual framework and the NCATE Diversity Standard. The document codifies the unit commitment to the preparation of candidates to meet these standards.

Standard 5. Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development.

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

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

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

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

The identification of the area for improvement by the 2003 BOE team came about largely from the observation by the team that the unit's conceptual framework was not explicitly mentioned in course syllabi examined by team members. As previously noted, this matter has been addressed and official NCATE syllabi are updated to include specific reference to conceptual framework themes in relation to course content, activities, and assessments. A review of the previous response above will be helpful in understanding the unit's work with regard to the conceptual framework and other ways in which faculty are incorporating the unit's conceptual framework into their courses.

In summary, this area has been addressed specifically as noted in the report of the 2005 BOE Focus Visit Team and we are continuing to vigorously incorporate conceptual framework themes into all aspects of professional education programs.

Standard 6. Unit Governance and Resources.

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

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

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

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

The use of part-time and contractual faculty in the unit has been a part of unit operations for some time. It can be argued that the use of such faculty does not negatively impact the quality of programs. Nevertheless, it is accurate to note that the level of use of such faculty had not changed since our last NCATE visit.

Hiring patterns, as described in our Institutional Report, have necessitated continued reliance on part-time and contractual faculty. We will continue to work toward a reduction in the number of such faculty.

The total number of candidates who completed education programs within NCATE's scope (initial & advanced) during the 2004-2005 academic year?

849

Please enter numeric data only. (Include the number of candidates who have completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings in the 2004-2005 academic year. They should include all candidates who completed a program that made them eligible for a teaching license. It also includes licensed teachers who completed a graduate program and candidates who completed a program to work as a school administrator, school psychologist, school library media specialist, school psychologist, reading

specialist, and other specialties in schools. These include the candidates who have completed a bachelor's, post-bachelor's, master's, specialist, or doctoral program. The programs are not tied to a state license.)

Name of the Person Filling Out the Report: Judy Miller

Draft *Deferred*
 Final

Creation Date: 10/03/2005 03:48:03 PM Last Modified By: 11405 Last Modified Date: 11/11/2005 Date Received over Web: 11/11/2005

Exempt