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I. INTRODUCTION

I.1 Brief overview of the institution and the unit.

Ball State University is a comprehensive, publically assisted institution of higher learning with approximately 20,000 students, whose mission is to provide excellent education. Ball State University offers a strong undergraduate liberal and professional education and selected graduate programs. In addition to core academic programs in arts, sciences, and humanities, the university offers more than 140 undergraduate major and minor areas of study, as well as over 100 master's and doctoral degrees, through its seven colleges: Applied Sciences and Technology; Architecture and Planning; Business; Communication, Information and Media; Fine Arts; Sciences and Humanities; and Teachers College.

Ball State was founded as Indiana Normal School, Eastern Division, in 1918. Its antecedents were also normal schools, owned and operated under various names. In 1918, the Ball brothers, prominent Muncie industrialists, purchased the school in order to maintain its presence in Muncie, and donated it to the state of Indiana. Control was transferred to Indiana State Normal School in Terre Haute. In 1929, the Indiana General Assembly separated the two colleges and named the campus in Muncie as Ball State Teachers College.

The head of the professional education unit is the dean of Teachers College. As the unit head the dean is responsible for the administration of all initial and advanced programs related to educator preparation in the unit. The unit consists of programs that are located in Teachers College and five other colleges in the university. Each identified program has an assigned program manager who is responsible for the integration and oversight of program activities within the Unit. These individuals may also serve as the content area advisor for candidates enrolled in their program. Program managers are responsible for the aggregation, review and dissemination of program level data within their departments. The unit convenes an informal discussion group, referred to as the Decision Point Dialogue (DPD) Group, to
which all program managers are invited, as an additional mechanism for communication within the unit. The primary role of the DPD Group is to facilitate communication among all stakeholders involved with educator preparation.

The Teachers College portion of the unit is divided into six departments -- Educational Studies, Elementary Education, Special Education, Educational Leadership, Educational Psychology, and Counseling, Psychology, and Guidance Services. These departments enroll the vast majority of candidates at both the initial and advanced levels, enrolling 3088 total headcount Fall 2010. The unit offers seven Bachelor's degrees, 18 Master's, two Educational Specialist, and nine Doctoral degrees.

A Professional Education Committee (PEC), comprised of elected representatives from the six colleges, the dean and associate deans of Teachers College, and the department chairs for Teachers College, as well as representatives from P-12 schools and candidates, governs policymaking for the unit. All program and curricular changes in education programs are approved by the PEC, prior to being forwarded to the Undergraduate Education Committee (UEC) or Graduate Education Committee (GEC) of the university. The PEC is responsible for the analysis and review of unit assessment data for all programs, including oversight of various annual reports produced by the unit. The PEC can initiate program and curricular changes as informed by data and/or respective advisory groups.

I.2 Summary of state partnership that guided this visit (i.e., joint visit, concurrent visit, or an NCATE-only visit). Were there any deviations from the state protocol?

According the State Protocol policy, Indiana is an NCATE-only state. As a result, the policy indicates that the "state will send one consultant for each visit that has been trained for the DPS/NCATE system and is an employee of the DPS." This consultant is considered a non-voting member of the team and is directly involved in all pre-visit and team meetings and the exit conference. The only deviation from this involved the state sending two consultants. Prior to this visit, Indiana Department of Education only had one individual trained to serve as state representatives for NCATE visits. The IDOE had just hired a second individual, and it was agreed by both the dean of Teachers College and the NCATE BOE team chair that this new hire could attend this NCATE visit as a form of training.

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

The unit does not offer any programs at branch campuses or off-campus sites. However, the unit has significantly increased its online course and program offering in the past few years, primarily at the graduate level. Full-time faculty were part of the interview process. They indicated that they are involved in the development and delivery of the online courses. In addition, the assessment system was analyzed to make sure candidates in online courses and programs received the same assessments as traditional candidates. Data for these online programs were made available through the UAS and rGrade. Finally, candidates in the online courses were part of the interview process. Even though this did involve online programs, candidates were part of traditional face-to-face interviews, so no technology was needed to conduct these interviews. This was due in part to February 21 being a holiday where many schools were closed, thus allowing candidates the opportunity to attend interviews on campus.

I.4 Describe any unusual circumstances (e.g., weather conditions, readiness of the unit for the visit, other extenuating circumstances) that affected the visit.
February 21, 2011 is the national holiday of Presidents' Day. As a result of this, many of the area schools were closed requiring us to move school visits to Tuesday morning. For a streamlined visit, this did create a little bit of a delay in collecting all information. However, because of this holiday, many of the candidates who would normally be interviewed during the onsite school visits, were actually part of the Monday interviews on campus. This included candidates in their student teaching as well as candidates in some of the online courses. In addition, the weather went from cold rain to snow late Monday. As a result, schools in the area either canceled school for Tuesday or delayed the beginning of the school day. We had scheduled two school visits for Tuesday morning, but one of those schools delayed the opening of school two hours. Because of the time limitations for a streamlined visit, this visit was canceled. Team members did visit one school, which was a lab school operated by the unit on campus.

II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.

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

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

The unit's conceptual framework was updated in 2009 and was re-examined in light of the then newly updated institutional vision statement, where Ball State University expressed a desire to be a "national model of excellence for challenging, learner-centered academic communities that advance knowledge and improve economic vitality and quality of life" (BSU Strategic Plan 2007-2012). As a result of this analysis of the conceptual framework, the unit synthesized the concepts into the three major themes of Expertise, Engagement, and Context.

Expertise is defined as the development of competence in such knowledge areas as subject matter; pedagogy and pedagogical content (including technology); developmental characteristics of learners and of learning; the influence of culture on the development of learners and of learning; the purposes and ends of education more generally; and professional conduct in the classroom.

Engagement is defined as the development of skills in areas such as creating complex learning environments and ecologically-valid tasks such as case-based instruction, authentic tasks, and situated learning strategies. It also described the creation of learning environments that emphasize collaboration, social negotiation, and shared responsibility for learning. With the candidates as the key concept for engagement, this theme includes helping candidates understand their own role in constructing knowledge, as well as emphasizing student-centered instruction, which includes inquiry and problem-based learning.

Context is defined by the growth of competence in a variety of considerations. Examples include utilizing professional best practice during encounters with students and clients, or working to strengthen linkages among developmental settings (home, school, neighborhood) that influence students and clients. The context of understanding cultural values and beliefs and the ability to apply these to instruction falls within this theme. And finally, helping candidates engage the broader systems within societies to better cultivate the developmental and educational assets of the community.
In addition to these three general themes, the conceptual framework indicates that the areas of diversity and technology are treated as foundational competencies and infused throughout all aspects of the framework. Both are described as integral to the mission of both the institution and unit. In addition, the unit describes diversity and technology as informing all aspects of practice. Citing to both Darling-Hammond and Miranda, the unit addresses the broader concept of diversity beyond race and ethnicity, acknowledging that many unique circumstances on the individual's development can influence learning, which connects back to the major theme of Context.

This embedded concept of technology clearly connects to the larger themes of expertise and engagement. Technology requires considerable expertise to operate efficiently, especially within an educational arena. The conceptual framework makes candidate expectations with respect to technology very clear, including "using web-based resources to plan lessons or enrich curriculum; assisting students to use technology as a learning tool; interacting with parents through a variety of communication options; charting student progress and assessing instructional success; fostering problem-solving ability and student collaboration through available technologies."

The conceptual framework is integrated across the unit in three primary ways. First, the conceptual framework was aligned with several professional standards as it was updated. These standards include NBPTS, NASP, ASHA, ISLLC, CACREP, as well as the INTASC standards. In addition, the course syllabi demonstrate clear connections to the conceptual framework through course objectives and assessments. And finally, connected with the assessments in the syllabi, the unit's rGrade system provides clear connection between the decision point assessments and the conceptual framework. For each decision point a program utilizes, the rGrade system provides a link to a table where the program faculty have aligned the decision points with the major themes of the conceptual framework.

**Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions**

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

1.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Ball State has 54 initial and advanced education programs. In Indiana, programs may select either the SPA process or the Indiana State Review Process. The program matrix in the exhibit room is divided into the following review categories (a) content areas approved through SPA process, (b) content areas approved through Indiana program approval process, (c) programs approved through national organizations, and (d) programs approved internally. Since the off-site report, the Program Area Matrix (Exhibit Standard 1) was updated to better delineate which programs were initial and which programs were advanced. Twenty-four programs were assessed through the SPA process. And of the 24 programs, 16 have received national recognition and six received recognition with conditions. Two of the programs originally submitted, Teaching Major in Exceptional Needs: Blind or Low Vision, and Mathematics: Middle School Option, met the NCATE definition of low enrollment programs, and as a result were not resubmitted for SPA approval.

were presented. The majority of licensure areas have 100 percent pass rate while other programs range between 90 percent and 99 percent. However, a program with a 90 percent passage rate had 10 test takers that year. Three years of data were available for each program. The following data were submitted (a) dispositional, (b) unit assessments, (c) decision point data, (d) exemplar candidate work for each key assessment, (e) rubrics for all key assessments, and (f) national and Indiana State Teacher Standards. The unit generally uses a common four-point rubric (unsatisfactory, basic, proficient, and distinguished) with varying criteria to assess their candidates.

Initial candidates are required to successfully complete four Decision Points. Each Decision Point has required content and unit assessments (e.g., portfolio assessment, summative student teaching assessment, student teaching portfolio), which includes a unit disposition rubric that reflects the unit’s CF (i.e., expertise, engagement, context). Candidates must successfully complete one Decision Point before they can move to the next Decision Point. Successful completion of Praxis I is tied to Decision Point 2. Initial program candidates begin field experiences during their first year in the program and continue throughout the program and student teach in their final year. Decision Point 4 requires candidates to formally present student teaching portfolio using specific classroom-based exemplars that show evidence of candidates meeting standards. Interviews with initial candidates made it clear that they utilize the decision point process in helping them understand their program requirements and keeping them on track to completion.

Candidates in advanced programs (i.e., other school professionals and continuing education of teachers) also complete four Decision Points. Advanced programs have common assessments which include: disposition assessment, content knowledge assessment, assessment on student learning and field experience or research course assessment. Program advisors are primarily responsible for communicating program requirement and creating a candidate profile in the rGrade system, determining field experience and following through to degree requirements. Through exhibits, faculty interviews, and candidate interviews, it was determined that advanced programs for teachers have a variety of assessments such as action research projects, problem-based learning assignments, and diversity project. These assessments range greatly across programs.

Several surveys were conducted at various levels. The following is a list of surveys: (a) teacher fair survey, (b) beginning teacher survey, (c) exit survey, (d) experience teacher survey, (e) advanced program survey, and (f) school counseling survey. The teacher fair survey provides some information about the type of new teachers school districts are seeking to hire. These surveys also contain some feedback about school districts’ past experiences with the Teachers College teacher education graduates they have hired.

The beginning teacher survey which consists of first year teachers, mentors and supervising administrators using a rating scale of distinguished, proficient, basic, unsatisfactory or no opportunity. The response rate for 2008-2009 the first year teachers was 23.3 percent, mentors 51.2 percent and supervisor administrators 35.5 percent. Generally the ratings range from basic to distinguished with proficient as the average rating.

Initial candidate exit survey data reported the vast majority of respondents rated their teaching experiences favorably with more than half rating the quality of student teaching experiences and the quantity of student teaching experiences as excellent, and rating assistance of university supervisors during student teaching excellent or good. The candidates overall undergraduate teacher education experience rated their experiences favorably with ratings of excellent or good. Approximately two percent rated their experience as fair or poor. For example, in spring 2010 96.8 percent of candidates strongly agreed or agreed that they were encouraged to reach their highest potential. Initial candidates echo this confidence in their education during candidate interviews. Candidates express clear
understanding of their content, pedagogical knowledge, as well as the commitment for all students to learn.

The unit also has conducted an experienced teacher survey using a four-point rating scale of distinguished, proficient, basic and unsatisfactory self assessing graduates' basic knowledge and skills, classroom performance, collegial, family and community relations and personal and professional growth. Overall responses range from basic to distinguish with proficient being the most common rating.

The advanced program survey provides data to the programs about their candidates' satisfaction regarding their program. The highest rated professional knowledge and skills items included professional ethics, writing, verbal communications, understanding student learning and development, and content area knowledge, which were all rated at least proficient by over 90 percent of all respondents. About 92 percent of respondents rated their knowledge of specific content in their teaching field at least proficiently. Nearly 97 percent of all respondents rated their skills proficient or distinguished with regard to encouraging all students to achieve to their highest potential. With regard to seeking assistance from colleagues when needed and working collaboratively with teachers were each rated proficient or distinguished by at least 94.6 percent of all respondents. Approximately 73 percent of all respondents indicated they referenced and used Indiana Professional Standards Board Teaching Standards at a distinguished (20.1%) or proficient (53.3%) level.

With regard to other school personnel, the school counseling program candidate survey data utilized two points (basic and unsatisfactory) across professional knowledge and pedagogical skills, performance and implementation, disposition and problem solving, and personal professional growth. All candidates responded at the basic level.

Overall, Ball State graduates highly rated their preparation experience believing they are well prepared across a variety of areas (e.g., research-based practice, variety of instructional strategies). Principals and mentors highly value graduates with the majority of graduates rated as proficient (which would be 4 out of 5 point Likert scale).

The unit assessment system provides significant evidence to support Standard 1. While initial programs typically utilize four decision points within the assessment system and implemented through rGrade, each of those decision points may contain several means of assessing candidate knowledge, skills, or dispositions. For example, in the second decision point for elementary (initial), the candidates must complete two disposition checks, have their portfolio assessed, maintain minimum grades in specific courses, and pass Praxis I. Since candidates do not progress to the next decision point until each is completed, this process helps ensure candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions. This competency based process also allows candidates opportunities for improvement in a given area before moving on to the next component.

1.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

First, a total of 22 programs have been reviewed through SPA process with 16 receiving national recognition and the other six receiving conditional recognition. Ten programs have received accreditation through the Indiana program review. The exhibit room shows that each program (initial and advanced) had data available through an electronic assessment system. The IR and program reports show that the data (rubrics and key assessments) are continually reviewed for program improvement. Course syllabi integrate national, state, INTASC standards as well as the unit's conceptual framework. Survey data are regularly collected from stakeholders, (e.g., mentors) employers, and candidates. While these improvements are commendable these improvements are not necessarily outlined in the criteria for
The unit's continuous improvement for Standard 1 is directly connected to its creation and continued development of its unit assessment system, especially its utilization of the rGrade component. Faculty continue to develop and use various forms of assessments for the candidates' content, content-based pedagogy knowledge, and impact on student learning. This evidence supports Standard 1 and has demonstrated improvement since BSU's last visit.

1.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

The primary step taken for the unit to meet target on Standard 1 involved the continued development and implementation of the unit assessment system. The ability of the unit faculty to understand the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of their candidates is directly tied to the UAS. There is considerable evidence of the collaboration across departments and programs in how to develop and utilize the data assessment system. Program faculty continue to respond to the data in ways to improve candidate performance with respect to Standard 1. And this applied to initial, advanced, and online programs, though the initial programs demonstrated being further along on this process.

1.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

The unit asked to be reviewed at the target level for this standard, as well as Standard 2. At the initial level, several elements indicate the unit has moved significantly toward target. Based on data, interviews, and the institutional report, examples of where the unit meets the standard at the target level include:

* Teacher candidates have in-depth knowledge of the content that they plan to teach as described in professional, state, and institutional standards. They demonstrate their knowledge through inquiry, critical analysis, and synthesis of the subject.
* Teacher candidates reflect a thorough understanding of the relationship of content and content-specific pedagogy delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards. They have in-depth understanding of the content that they plan to teach and are able to provide multiple explanations and instructional strategies so that all students learn.
* Teacher candidates reflect a thorough understanding of professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards. They develop meaningful learning experiences to facilitate learning for all students. They reflect on their practice and make necessary adjustments to enhance student learning.
* Teacher candidates focus on student learning and study the effects of their work. They assess and analyze student learning, make appropriate adjustments to instruction, monitor student learning, and have a positive effect on learning for all students.

1.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

1.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
1.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.6 Recommendation for Standard 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

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

2.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The unit has worked to implement an effective system to collect and organize candidate performance data. There have been continued efforts to improve the Unit Assessment System (UAS) and the rGrade™ management process in order for this data to guide the implementation and development of programs. The UAS is described in the Education Unit Assessment Handbook adopted by the Professional Education Committee (PEC) during the 2008-2009 year. The UAS includes both common and unique components for both initial and advanced programs.

Data are used in routine and transparent processes and procedures to guide program development. Data trends are reported in the narrative of the Annual Program Reports. A formal Unit Operations Plan (UOP), which was updated in 2010, identifies major assessment data and outlines an annual cycle for the appropriate stakeholders to review the data. The UOP also suggests types of programmatic decisions based on how the data relates to unit operations. The UOP supports the systematic review of data. Annual progress reports are generated and allow for feedback to the various programs. In addition to the internal data sources, external data includes (1) Title II Report (1.2), showing the pass rates of initial candidates on required state licensure exams; (2) the Teacher Licensing Report illustrating the number of licenses issued by license category to candidates each year, (3) the First-Year Teacher Survey and the Experienced Teacher Survey which provides comprehensive data on program completers’ skills as related to the CF, and (4) focused graduate surveys from programs requiring post-graduate data.

Rubrics and other measures are standardized. Licensure programs are organized around Decision Points modeled in rGrade™. All programs are assessed through program specific knowledge, performance, and impact on P-12 student learning components. The Decision Points Model identifies key assessments for every program. Decision point data for the past three years are accessible in the Program Area Matrix. The unit has aligned assessments to a revised conceptual framework with the three themes incorporated in all syllabi for the professional education courses and related to first year teaching performance through the First Year Teacher Survey.
2.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

The assessment system follows outlined procedures for data collection, aggregation, disaggregation, analysis, and dissemination. This process is depicted in the UAS Data Flowchart. Candidates and advisors can monitor progress on all Decision Point [DP] requirements. One faculty member commented that emphasis on performance-based data and access through rGrade had led to opportunities for program assessment which has led to making informed decisions about program components. In 2007 DP meetings were replaced by monthly Decision Point Dialogue (DPD) meetings allowing for unit level communication for both initial and advanced programs focused on the UAS. The DPD provides an informational sharing outlet across programs with strong collaboration from faculty both inside and outside the College of Education. Unit administrators prepare for these meetings by regularly analyzing data and developing agenda items. This process has contributed to changes such as revisions of the Unit Dispositions Assessment during spring 2008, the Decision Point 3 Digital Portfolio Rubric for Initial Programs in summer 2009, the incorporation of a writing emphasis in Educational Leadership, and the elimination of the Professional Growth Plan. An annual meeting with deans of other colleges allows for summarization of reports, status review, and gap analysis of data related to programs.

The Digital Portfolio and the Summative Student Teaching Assessment are rubric-based assessments for Initial Programs that are aligned to INTASC principles. A chart outlining each program's alignment to the conceptual framework can be found in rGrade effectively documents the CF themes of context, engagement, and expertise to assessments required for each Decision Point. The Unit Dispositions Assessment is used to assess both Initial and Advanced level candidates and is aligned directly to the Conceptual Framework. Master syllabi for all courses were updated in 2008 to reflect CF themes. The assessments provide a mechanism for continuous monitoring for both formative and summative purposes. The unit has taken steps to eliminate bias and improve rater reliability in the data collection processes and data analysis. Additionally, the Graduate Survey which was last administered in 2008 is being revised by faculty from school counseling, school psychology, educational leadership, career and technical education, educational studies, and elementary education with the new survey to be implemented in spring 2011. Interviews with education program faculty provided several examples of how data have provided a basis for program improvement. Faculty in elementary education (interviews) reported using data in making program decisions such as making diversity a required course and connecting a decision point to the course on family and community relations. Language arts program faculty reported using feedback from rGrade to identify patterns at decision points resulting in changes to portfolio requirements and adding specificity to unit and lesson plan assignments. Likewise school psychology faculty reported using data reports generated through rGrade to assure that program components model the skills and knowledge expected of candidates particularly in aligning the program to specialty organization standards.

2.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

The unit has concentrated on strengthening the UAS and is making progress toward meeting the target-level performance criteria for Standard 2. The assessment system provides appropriate measures of candidate development and achievement related to professional standards. It is clear that the unit has made efforts focused toward the development of a sound effective assessment system. The unit offers the following points to illustrate improvements made in the UAS since the last visit:

- Programs are aligned to the Conceptual Framework.
- Programs are reviewed at multiple levels on an annual basis.
- Programs that qualify have submitted SPA recognition reports.
- Key assessments across programs are linked to professional and/or state standards.
• All programs have been modeled in rGrade™ and include at a minimum: content assessment(s), dispositions assessment, effect on student learning assessment, and pedagogical assessment(s). The DPD framework that guided the modeling of Advanced Programs includes multiple assessments at multiple decision points (4-5 decision points per program) in order to demonstrate candidates’ developmental progress through their program in relation to professional standards. Initial programs are modeled consistently in compliance with INTASC standards.
• Programs have been revised based upon data analyses and the need to address current professional and state standards. Data-driven decision-making is the foundation of unit operations.
• Programs no longer rely solely on course grades to assess content; emphasis in key assessments is on performance.
• rGrade™ allows for consistent flow of data among all stakeholders; candidates are strongly encouraged to monitor their progress through their programs via rGrade™.
• rGrade™ is a dynamic data management tool that is continually revised to accommodate evolving data analysis needs and requirements.

2.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

The unit has a robust assessment system which is used systematically by program faculty across the various colleges which are involved in teacher education. The system provides a tool for programs to make data-based decisions toward continuous improvement. The Decision Points are effectively modeled in the assessment system and data for related assessments captured through the rGrade data management system. There is a high degree of collaboration involving all stakeholders in collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data related to candidate performance. An analysis of the evidence supports that the unit is at the target level for this standard.

2.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

2.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The unit's assessment system, assessments, and rubrics are not linked to the conceptual framework.</td>
<td>1. The CF has been revised and assessments and syllabi have been linked to the framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although unit operations are addressed by the unit's new Assessment Plan, no program area has yet documented how it will comply with the three plan elements related to unit operations.</td>
<td>Graduate programs have been revised to include an assessment of the impact on student learning, candidate dispositions, and content specific knowledge and skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The unit does not ensure that all its assessment measures are fair, accurate, consistent and free of bias.</td>
<td>Unit Assessment Handbook was developed and adopted by the Professional Education Committee to describe the operation of the unit assessment system and to provide a common framework for its implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The unit has limited evidence that candidate performance data are used to drive program improvement decisions.</td>
<td>There is a systematic review of data and a process for using the data to guide program development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

| AFI                                                                 | AFI Rationale                                                                 |
### 2.6 Recommendation for Standard 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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.

#### 3.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The unit has an extensive Professional Development Schools (PDS) Network, member institutions of which have contributed to the development of unit assessments and field experiences. Sample Memorandums of Understanding (MOU) and individual Affiliation Agreements for both PDSs and individual field experience sites are presented in the exhibits to confirm the extent of BSU-school partner collaboration. University supervisors, including both tenure track and non-tenure track faculty, indicated in interviews that the quality of placements is generally high regardless of whether or not a school was a PDS site. Candidates are placed for student teaching and internship experiences at sites within a 75 mile radius to facilitate the supervision process. Supervisors typically visit at least once every two weeks, though more in necessary cases.

The unit collaborates extensively with its school partners in the design, implementation and evaluation of field experiences. Field experiences are sequential in terms of focus, time and evaluation, beginning with an "Introduction to Teaching” course, and then varying by program but totaling 500-600 hours at the initial licensure level and 1,000-1,500 hours at the advanced level. Both initial and advanced programs have field experiences at the Burris Laboratory School, which includes a newly added cohort of high ability learners, in addition to placements in a variety of other settings. In particular, all elementary education candidates have observational, planning, small group and whole class teaching experiences at Burris, prior to a student teaching experience elsewhere. Experiences at Burris range from observations in the initial program to the bullying prevention program run by School Counseling. In interviews candidates consistently spoke of the field experiences as being a strength of programs at both the initial and advanced levels, though it was acknowledged that the Burris Laboratory School is not typical of public schools in general. In particular, graduate candidates referenced the sequencing of practicum experiences beginning with a pre-practicum in year 1, a practicum in year 2, and the internship in year 3, as being a beneficial feature of their respective programs.

Candidates must meet specific requirements at each of the program "decision points," including at entry to and exit from field experiences. This is confirmed in rGrade and the student teacher application is presented in the exhibits. In interviews, candidates confirmed their use of rGrade to track their progress. Additional exhibits document admission requirements and procedures at the advanced level in School Counseling, School Psychology, and Educational Leadership.

Candidates were positive about the quality of supervision during field experiences at all stages and about
the quality of their cooperating teachers. This was consistent across programs at both the initial and advanced levels. They also felt they are well prepared relative to the use of technology, both in terms of their own understanding and the use of technological applications in the classroom. Advanced candidates also felt that they were prepared to use a variety of technologies.

### 3.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

BSU student teachers at the initial level undertake a sixteen (16) week student teaching experience, considerably in excess of the Indiana state minimum of nine (9) weeks. In fact one program, Early Childhood Education, requires 24 weeks of student teaching. This suggests the clinical experience is sufficient in time for candidates to demonstrate the requisite knowledge, skills and dispositions to help all students learn.

Ensuring that candidates have experiences in ethnically and culturally diverse settings is a challenge that BSU has addressed by tracking the diversity of field experience placements in rGrade to ensure that candidates do not go through their programs without a field experience in a diverse setting. "Diverse Field Experience Analysis" reports from rGrade are presented as evidence for both initial and advanced programs though it is not clear from these reports that all candidates receive field experience in a diverse setting. Defining diversity broadly, candidates interviewed indicated that they did receive a range of field experiences in terms of socio-economic status, gender, developmental level, inclusion, and ethnicity.

The IR documents several accomplishments relative to Standard 3 since the last NCATE visit. These include increases in the number and diversity of available field experiences, greater tracking of placements within the Unit Assessment System, overseas experiences, and improved measures of impact on student learning. Faculty interviewed suggested that improvement has occurred as a result of an increased emphasis on the consistent review of data at the decision points. This has resulted in the revision of assessments and decision point requirements. Faculty confirmed that rGrade data is easy to input, use and retrieve, and that data is reviewed at monthly core faculty meetings.

### 3.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

Not applicable.

### 3.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Strengths of the program are:
- Relationship to the conceptual framework through the application of content related expertise in a variety of settings.
- Interactions with teachers, university faculty and supervisors.
- Qualified and experienced clinical faculty and supervisors.
- Practicum evaluations are tied to professional standards.
- Strong collaboration between school and university faculty.

### 3.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

#### 3.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?


The unit does not have systematic and explicit guidelines that delineate requirements for field experiences at the advanced preparation level.

The unit does not systematically collect assessment data during field experiences.

Data screens in rGrade confirm that there are specific requirements for field experiences in all programs, both initial and advanced, based on successful completion of each "decision point." These requirements are also documented in course syllabi.

Data screens in rGrade indicate that there is systematic collection of assessment data for field experiences in all programs, at both the initial and advanced levels.

### 3.5.2 What AFI{s} remain and why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.5.3 What new AFI{s} does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFI{s} may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.6 Recommendation for Standard 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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.

#### 4.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The unit conceptual framework defines diversity with this statement: ""..., cultural diversity must consider all the unique influences on the individual's development that can influence learning. These may include family constitution, socioeconomic status, level of acculturation, sexual orientation, language fluency, and presence of exceptionality to name a few (Miranda, 2008)."' To prepare for diversity, the candidate must have knowledge of the various elements that comprise diversity but also an appreciation for the candidate's own background and possible biases."

The evidence indicates that the unit provides the skills the candidates need to help diverse student populations achieve. All initial preparation programs require coursework directly related to cultural
diversity as well as projects within these courses that provide experiences with diverse populations. For undergraduate initial candidates, this experience begins in their freshman year with EDEL100, a course that requires 50 hours of outside community service in high risk neighborhoods. Assessments for initial level candidates include case studies and reports on various exceptionalities. Examples of and data about candidate assessments that include diversity expectations are provided. Alumni of undergraduate and graduate programs believe they are prepared to work with diverse learners and communities (Exit Survey Spring 2010. Ninety percent of responding candidates strongly agree or agree that they can work effectively with students with cultural differences.) Student teachers from various programs who were interviewed feel strongly that they were well prepared to work with diverse learners. Candidate work, as well as portfolios and reflections, indicate the candidates have developed projects for students from diverse populations during their student teaching experiences. Examples of projects and reflections from candidates for other school professionals show that they are also required to provide evidence of the skills, dispositions and knowledge for working with diverse populations. All candidates in both undergraduate and advanced programs are assessed with the dispositions evaluation that includes diversity components. Course syllabi align with the conceptual framework that encompasses the unit's broad view of diversity. Candidates in other school professional programs cited examples of course requirements that address issues of diverse learners. Each program requires artifacts linked to professional standards that relate to serving diverse populations. For example, in Educational Leadership, the candidate must provide an artifact for each standard in the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards. Each of these six standards begins with the words: "A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by..."

Evidence of policy and commitment of funds for recruitment of diverse faculty is provided and data indicate an increase in ethnic minority faculty from 13 percent in 2006-07 to 14.5 percent in the current school year. Minutes from university and unit committees on multicultural issues indicate the involvement and input of members of the unit faculty. The Faculty Table from the 2010 Fact Book reports that 20 percent of the faculty of Teachers College are ethnicities other than white. The IR reports that in 2009-2010, the Department of Educational Studies had 24 percent minority faculty.

Diversity in candidate ethnicity for the university has increased about two percent during the 2006-2010 time period. Non-white candidates make up about 17 percent of the university, approximately the same ethnic percentage as for the geographic area of the university. Data document the university's commitment to providing various opportunities for interactions with diverse peers, including sponsoring 11 multicultural organizations on campus and allowing 25 religious organizations on campus. In 2010, the university received two awards for their commitment to diversity: on the website Disability Friendly Colleges as "one of 75 colleges that go beyond the mandates of the federal legislation in meeting the students' needs" (IR) and as a university committed to diversity by Minority Access at its annual National Role Models conference.

The descriptions of the field experiences and clinical practices for initial, advanced and other educational professionals indicate that candidates have the opportunity to interact with/ and plan for/ students from diverse populations. The demographics for schools in the area show a variety of diversities including socio-economic levels, ethnicity, and language, as well as disabilities. Candidate work samples and presentations of projects refer to lessons that are differentiated for students. The rGrade system provides tracking for each initial candidate that clearly designates whether candidates have been placed in a setting that is considered diverse. However, the term "diverse setting" is not defined. The only tracking data for advanced programs are for M.A.E in Educational Administration, beginning with Fall of 2009.

Candidates in Educational Leadership, School Counseling, and School Psychology felt their placements and experiences offered diverse experiences and cited as examples working with Hispanic students; low socio-economic students; in rural and urban settings. However, the Teacher Education Institutional
Report Addendum states: "An example of a policy change intended to strengthen the unit’s commitment to diversity at the advanced level will be implemented in January 2011 in Education Leadership. Prior to this time, candidates in the online principal preparation program were allowed to complete their field experience in the own school. The policy is intended to allow flexibility for candidates still actively involved in a role in a K-12 school district. ...after careful examination of the policy and State and NCATE guidelines, the program now tracks all internship placements to assure a diverse placement prior to approval by the internship director."(p.15) If this is a new policy, there is no assurance that advanced candidates under the former policy have internships in diverse schools.

4.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

Since the last visit, the conceptual framework was revised to reflect diversity expectations. Program requirements that include course work in diversity and multiculturalism have been added. Diversity issues and planning for diverse needs are woven throughout courses for content programs.

4.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

N/A

4.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

N/A

4.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

4.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Candidates do not have opportunities to interact with diverse faculty. ITP, ADV</td>
<td>The university has committed funds and created committees with the goal of recruiting diverse faculty. Faculty diversity has increased in unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Advanced programs do not consistently provide opportunities for candidates to demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to diversity. ADV</td>
<td>Evidence of projects and presentations from advanced programs demonstrate the knowledge and skills related to diversity and all candidates are assessed using the unit dispositions rubric that includes diversity components.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Candidates do not have opportunities to interact with diverse peers. ITP, ADV</td>
<td>The university has made steady gains in increasing the diversity of students. The university has been recognized on a national level for their commitment to candidates with disabilities and to overall diversity efforts. The percentage of non-white candidates in the university is comparable to that of the geographic area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Not all candidates participate in field experiences or clinical practice that include students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups. ADV</td>
<td>The evidence does not show that candidate placements in field experiences for advanced programs guarantee experiences with diverse population. Some programs have candidates self-select placements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4.6 Recommendation for Standard 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

5.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Interviews and exhibits provided by the unit show that faculty are qualified for their teaching assignments and related responsibilities. The Professional Education Faculty Qualifications and Experiences chart lists degrees held; assignments; faculty rank/tenure status; scholarship, leadership, and services; and teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools. All professional faculty are required to hold certification in the area in which they teach. The approval of professional education faculty status is only valid for a five-year period.

A review of course syllabi reflects elements of the conceptual framework within unit courses. Syllabi and interviews with candidates indicate that faculty model instructional relevant instructional strategies including the use of technologies for their teaching and instruction such as Blackboard, rGrade, RapidWeaver, smart classrooms, and the Internet. Course syllabi and interviews with candidates indicate that course content is aligned with professional and state standards in respective disciplines. Review of course syllabi also indicate that faculty use a variety of instructional methods including inquiry, reflection, role play, and direct instruction to convey course content.

Current teaching load assignments for faculty are four courses each semester; professional staff can be released from teaching a course for scholarship activities such as writing or implementing grants/research. Review of faculty vitae show evidence that tenure track faculty are engaged in scholarship activities such as publication, participation in professional conferences, editorial duties, and grant writing.

Per institution policy each faculty member is evaluated related to teaching effectiveness. The unit has implemented an evaluation of faulty teaching utilizing forms of assessment such as course evaluations.
by candidates, peer evaluations, and department chair evaluations of teaching. Faculty evaluations of teaching recently have been put online across the institution this year (2010-2011). According to data obtained by college deans, 60 percent of candidates in the Teachers College participated in online evaluations in the fall 2010.

The Professional Education Faculty Qualifications and Experiences chart also demonstrates faculty involvement in service to the community, schools, and local, state, and national professional organizations. Evidence from vitae attests to faculty community service such as advisory board memberships of local organizations, and delivering workshops for districts.

Interviews with unit faculty indicate there are opportunities for professional development. The institution website lists a number of centers for faculty development, including the Office of Emerging Technologies, the Multicultural Center, and the Counseling Center. The Innovation in Teaching, Assessment, and Scholarship (ITAS) also is available to staff for support and feedback related to teaching. New faculty members, including adjunct, are paired with mentors to acclimatize them to unit policy and procedures, and model quality scholarship and teaching. Clinical faculty (cooperating teachers) were not able to be interviewed due to logistical issues, however, interviews and meeting minutes indicate that they collaborate with faculty and participate in decision-making processes.

Faculty indicates that the unit is collaborative and functions in a cohesive manner. Faculty meet regularly at department (two time per month) and college level (one time per month) to make programmatic changes and improve services. Both deans and faculty indicate that they have adequate faculty and equipment to function effectively.

5.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

Of concern in the previous NCATE visit was a heavy reliance on contract staff (nontenure track faculty) to teach unit courses. At present, the unit has acquired a number of tenure line positions. According to the head of the Department of Educational Leadership, this will enable the department to move toward a more "scholarly vision" of their program.

Also of note is implementation by the unit of rGrade, a comprehensive data collection system. Interviews with department heads, faculty and candidates indicate that rGrade has made data collection and dissemination easier both within and among departments. Interviews with current candidates indicate that they are using the rGrade system to receive feedback from faculty and monitor their individual academic progress. Faculty members suggested that, after several years of implementation, rGrade was now being used to make programmatic and curricular changes rather than used only for data entry.

The unit also has continued to provide relevant opportunities for professional development of faculty. Faculty noted the use of the Innovation in Teaching Assessment and Scholarship (ITAS) as useful for support and feedback related to teaching. Non-tenure track faculty also indicated that a monthly workshop was made available to them to develop and refine on line courses (distance education). The unit continues to provide funds and release time when possible for scholarship and teaching enhancement.

5.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

Not applicable to this standard
5.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFIs</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

5.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFIs</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFIs</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFIs</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6 Recommendation for Standard 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher preparation</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Teacher Preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

6.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Teacher preparation programs are located in six of the seven colleges at Ball State University (BSU). There are 47 initial licensure programs and 25 advanced programs. The teacher education programs are lead by Dean Jacobson who joined BSU in 2009, (representing a change since the last NCATE visit). Programmatic decisions are the responsibility of the Professional Education Committee (PEC; 6.2.e). The committee reflects salient stakeholders and has representatives from the six colleges with teacher education programs, representatives from school districts, ex officio members (such as the dean and associated dean of Teachers College, and department chairs), and candidates from BSU. The PEC is a standing subcommittee of the University Senate and holds monthly meetings. All policies related to teacher preparation (such as program and curriculum changes) are approved through PEC. Minutes from
PEC meetings are archived on the Unit Assessment System website.

From 2007 to 2008 through 2008 to 2009, the total amount allocated to the professional education unit increased from $12,106,058.00 to $12,416,260. Budgetary allocations provide a continued level of support for teaching, service, and scholarship. As indicated in an interview with the president and the provost, the university has been proactive in adding tenure track positions. The unit's resources are equal to or exceed those of other units/departments at the university.

There currently are 206 faculty employed in disciplines related to teacher preparation. Faculty must complete an application for Category I or II status. Category I approval is required for those teaching a professional methods course or supervising of candidates in student teaching. Category I status requires (a) a doctoral or specialist degree, (b) teaching credentials, (c) a minimum of one year of germane experience, and (d) display of continued involvement in educational programs. Category II faculty must have a doctoral or specialist degree and a minimum of one of three elements listed in Category I (although four elements are detailed in the IR).

Full-time tenure track unit faculty teach, advise, work in the laboratory school and partner schools, conduct research, publish, and secure grant funding. The academic workload for tenure track faculty is 24 credit hours for the academic year, six credit hours for the summer term, and 12 credit hours for the summer semester. Full-time tenure track faculty who demonstrate scholarly and/or creative productivity may be assigned three to four credit hours each semester. This productivity must be current and ongoing to merit assigned time. Full-time non-tenure track faculty members, known at BSU as full-time contractual faculty, are assigned to teaching and not to other responsibilities such as research and administration. However, non-tenured faculty members whose assignments include responsibilities other than teaching will receive assigned time, additional salary, or other compensation to be determined by their department chairperson per the Faculty and Professional Personnel Handbook. During an interview with full-time contractual faculty, teaching workloads were discussed. Faculty state they rarely have overloads and typically teach four classes per semester.

With respect to the use of part-time faculty, data found in Exhibit 6.2.d. indicates the types of assignments held by the Professional Education Faculty. Regular faculty are known as tenure track faculty and full-time contract faculty, or non-tenure track faculty. There are five part-time positions across the unit and the remaining assignments are held by either regular or non-tenure track full-time faculty members. Physical Education has three tenure track faculty and one non-tenure track faculty member. Elementary Education has 17 tenure track faculty and 12 non-tenure track faculty. Math has seven tenure track faculty and nine non-tenure track faculty. One faculty member in math is listed as just "contract" so it is not known if that individual is full or part-time.

Facilities of the unit are adequate and include among others, the Teachers College building, Burris Laboratory Schools, Counseling Practicum Clinic, and the Neuropsychology Laboratory. Technology is available for both faculty and candidates, and includes the Center for Technology in Education. Library holdings are available in Bracken Library. The library is state of the art and provides resources and support to not only candidates on campus, but those taking online courses as well. As a result of the increase in on-line education, distance education candidates are afforded the following resources: Academic Libraries of Indiana's Reciprocal Borrowing Program, interlibrary loan, thesis research, and troubleshooting off-campus connection problems.

6.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

Since the last visit, the unit has addressed concerns in reference to the heavy use of part-time faculty.
Data found in Exhibit 6.2.d. showed only five part-time faculty exist across the unit. The unit has also added tenure track faculty where needed. For example, several non-tenure track positions in the educational leadership program were converted to tenure-track lines. In addition, contractual faculty was an area of concern. Previously, a heavy concentration of contractual personnel was found in the areas of elementary education, math, and physical education. Again, referring to (6.2.d.) the remaining teaching assignments are filled by either full-time tenure track faculty or full-time non-tenure track faculty.

6.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?
Not applicable

6.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?
Not applicable

6.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

6.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The unit relies heavily on part-time and contractual faculty.</td>
<td>The data and interviews demonstrate that the vast majority of faculty assignments are either full-time tenure track or full-time non-tenure track faculty. Exhibit 6.2.d. show five part-time positions across the unit and the remaining assignments are held by either regular or non-tenure track full-time faculty members.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6.6 Recommendation for Standard 6

| Initial Teacher Preparation | Met |
| Advanced Preparation | Met |

IV. SOURCES OF EVIDENCE
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| Ball State List of Exhibits Vol 1 |
| Ball State List of Exhibits Vol 2 |
| Ball State Interviews |

See Attachments panel below.
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