

2024 PRAC Report for Indiana University Columbus Division of Education

Background

The Division of Education at IU-Columbus is nationally accredited by CAEP, the Council on Accreditation of Education Programs. The division offers a Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education degree, as well as certification programs in Special Education, Mild Intervention and English as a New Language. All three of these programs have national or state recognition as high quality programs (a requirement to be accredited by CAEP).

Because the programs within the division are on a 7-year cycle for program recognition and accreditation, along with the requirement to provide an annual report to CAEP and to the state of Indiana, the division writes a total of sixteen reports that serve as self-study of the division's work in teacher education. For the PRAC report's purposes, we are providing a copy of our State of Indiana recognition report for our Elementary Education program, along with this background annotation.

Reviewers will notice several linked documents within the body of the document. These links are live and are available for review should the reviewers be interested in the linked information. The most important document among these is the Principles of Effective and Inclusive Teaching, the Division's conceptual framework containing learning outcome statements spanning the four-semester teacher education program. This framework includes alignment to all professional standards for which our programs are evaluated, including Indiana Developmental Standards for Educators, Indiana Content Standards for Educators, CAEP K-6 Standards, and InTASC Core Teaching Standards. Our elementary education program is evaluated against the CAEP K-6 Standards, which is aligned to the Principles of Effective and Inclusive Teaching.

The Elementary Education program report received recognition by the state as an approved program. IUPUC Division of Education will submit our accreditation report to CAEP in March of 2024 for our next accreditation cycle.

All pieces of evidence included as attachments are highlighted in the relevant sections.

Terminology used in this document:

Benchmark-EPP-created assessments that are implemented at the end of each of the teaching placements (Fall, Spring, Pre-Student Teaching, First Eight Weeks, Second Eight Weeks)

Fall Cluster-A set of coursework and fieldwork that is consistently offered every Fall for juniors; Teacher Candidates may enter the program in Fall or Spring and will participate in both Clusters during their junior year.

IUPUC DoE- The education program under review in this document.

Pre-Student Teaching- A set of coursework and fieldwork that occurs during the first semester of the senior year and includes a full-day of clinical experience

Spring Cluster- A set of coursework and fieldwork that is consistently offered every Spring for juniors. (Note: If a candidate enters in the Spring, they begin with this coursework and then complete the Fall cluster the next semester)

Student Teaching- Full-time clinical experience broken into two eight-week sections in the final semester of the senior year; the first eight weeks the candidates remain in their Pre-Student Teaching site in a general education classroom; the second eight weeks the candidates are moved to an ENL or SPED classroom (is seeking SPED or ENL dual licensure) or another general education classroom in a different geographic region and grade level (for candidates not seeking dual licensure).

Teacher Candidate-students admitted to the Education Program at the start of their Junior Year
Supervising Teacher-Clinical school-based educators who provide mentorship and supervision during all four semesters of the education program.

University Supervisors-IUPUC staff who are retired teachers who hold Masters' degrees and taught in the region who serve as a liaison between the Clinical setting and the University.

1. ***Provide a program of the clinical experiences required within this program. Include duration and timing of both field experiences and student teaching or internships/practicums.***

Teacher Candidate Field/Clinical Experience

Elementary Education majors and Teacher Candidates in the K-6 Teacher Preparation Program at IUPUC participate in three phases of classroom field experience/internship. The first phase occurs prior to program admission in the junior year. Education majors participate in twenty-seven hours of field experience as part of their prerequisite classes. In the second phase, after successful application to the Teacher Education Program, the Teacher Candidate completes a combined total of 130+ hours in three placements: 30 hours in Spring Cluster field placement, 30 hours in Fall Cluster field placement and 70+ hours (or one day per week for an entire semester) in a pre-student teaching general education teaching placement during the first semester of their senior year. Candidates are required to complete 70 hours in the Pre-Student Teaching Cluster, however most complete closer to 90 hours. The minimum requirement of 70 hours was to ensure that candidates are exposed to adequate time in field even in the cases where schools take extended Spring and Fall Breaks. This is followed by the third phase which includes two student teaching placements of 40 days each or 320 hours each, one in the general education classroom where they were placed for pre-student teaching and the second in an area they are seeking dual licensure in (ENL or Special Education) or in another general education classroom at a different grade level and school. In total, Teacher Candidates participate in a minimum of 800 hours of field and clinical experience reflective of the EPP's strong commitment to teaching and learning in authentic settings.

Prior to formal admission in the teacher education program, Teacher Candidates participate in a total of 27 hours of field placement in K-6 classrooms as part of their Freshman Year Seminar,

F110, and in their Career Exploration course, F200. Teacher Candidates are placed in local schools to observe instructional and assessment strategies and practices, as well as classroom management techniques.

In both semesters of the junior year the Teacher Candidates participate in 30 hours of field experience each semester, one in a primary grade and the second in an intermediate grade. All field placements are reviewed each semester as new placements are made to ensure that Teacher Candidates have a variety of experience across different grade levels and in schools with varying socio-economic demographics before they student teach. This provides Teacher Candidates with experiences in the full range of K-6 developmental levels. The Fall Cluster of the cohort field placement focuses on child development, learning differences, and social studies, science, literacy and numeracy development in the primary grades. Assignments in the Cluster courses are integrated with field experience work and Teacher Candidates maintain a field experience notebook. One of the course instructors is designated to supervise field experiences. The Spring Cluster field placement focuses on science, literacy and numeracy in the intermediate grades. Assignments in Spring Cluster courses are integrated with field experience work, and in the Fall Cluster of the program. One of the course instructors is designated to supervise field placements. At the close of each of these two semesters, instructors and classroom mentor teachers evaluate Teacher Candidates in Assessment Meetings and through the utilization of feedback on surveys and Benchmark assessments. Candidates are provided feedback about their progress each semester. If improvement plans are warranted, they are co-developed with teacher candidates at the close of each semester.

In the first semester of the senior year (Pre-Student Teaching Cluster) field placement focuses on individualizing instruction and reflective practice. Teacher candidates are paired and placed in a partner school classroom for full day placements once per week for the entire semester as they complete the Pre-Student Teaching methods coursework on campus. In their final semester, Teacher Candidates complete two student teaching clinical experiences with eight weeks in each placement. The first placement is in the same general education classroom as their pre-student teaching experience. Their second placement is with a teacher in an area in which they are seeking a dual licensure or in another general education placement at a different grade level and in a different school. University Supervisors are introduced to the Teacher Candidates during pre-student teaching. They continue with the Teacher Candidate through their first (and when feasible due to geographic placements) through their second student teaching experience. This facilitates open communication among all participants. Teacher Candidates, Supervising Teachers, Full-time Faculty, and the Director of School and Community Relations provide an early alert to any challenges, and all contribute to the growth of the Teacher Candidate. The University Supervisor observes a minimum of 3 times during each placement and more when requested by the Supervising Teacher, Principal, or Teacher Candidate. Feedback is shared using an instrument aligned with the evaluation Rubric. The University Supervisor also

communicates with the Teacher Candidate and Supervising Teacher on a weekly basis. This is a new practice added in 2020 aimed at further developing collegial relationships, facilitating communication, and providing support and resources as appropriate. The University Supervisor meets with the classroom Supervising Teacher to discuss the Teacher Candidate’s professional development each visit. At the four-week mark and at the close of each student teaching placement (8 weeks each) both the University Supervisor and the Classroom Supervising Teacher evaluate the Teacher Candidate and share the evaluation report with the Teacher Candidate.

Year	Location	Duration
First Semester Freshman Pre-program Requisite	Regional School Districts	12 hours
Sophomore Year Pre-Program Requisite	Regional School Districts	15 hours
First Semester Junior Fall/Spring Cluster	East Side Elementary School Edinburgh Community School Corporation, Edinburgh IN	30 hours half day once/week X 16 weeks
Second Semester Junior Fall/Spring Cluster	Hope Elementary School Flat Rock – Hawcreek School Corporation Hope, IN	30 hours half day once/week X 16 weeks
First Semester Senior Pre-Student Teaching	Bartholomew County School Corporation; Edinburgh School Corporation	70+ hours, full day once/week X 16 weeks
Second Semester Senior 1st 8 Weeks Student Teaching	Bartholomew County School Corporation; Edinburgh School Corporation	8 weeks full days (320 hours)
Second Semester Senior 2nd 8 Weeks Student Teaching	Regional Placements, ENL, SPED and Bartholomew County	8 weeks full days (320 hours)
TOTAL HOURS		800+

Freshman: 12 hours

Embedded into First Year Experience Program

Sophomore: 15 hours

Embedded into EDUC-F 200 Examining the Role of Teacher

Junior: 60 hours

30 hours of one morning for 16 weeks in first semester
30 hours of one morning for 16 weeks in second semester

Senior first-semester: 70+ hours

Full day in clinical once a week for 16 weeks

Senior second-semester, Student Teaching: 640+ hours

Full-time student teaching in second semester for 16+ weeks (candidates begin teaching on the first day students are in school, which is usually a few weeks before IUPUC starts our semester)

Total hours for a four-year student: 800+

Total hours for a two-year transfer student: 773+

Total placements for a four-year student: 6

Total placements for the two-year program: 4

Total duration of student-teaching: 16 weeks

[Education Program Course Syllabi](#)

[Division of Education Student Handbook](#)

[Student Teaching Handbook](#)

[Supervising Teachers in Clinical Program](#)

[Clinical Placement Demographics](#)

- 2. Provide a program of study (below or attached) that includes a listing of the courses and experiences required for candidates to complete the program. Please include course titles and numbers and syllabi for all content and pedagogy courses required in the program.*

The Program of Study provides the courses required to enter the program as well as the courses required for teacher candidates once they enter the program. The Student Handbook provides a detailed description of the program goals, timeline, and expectations for students to complete the program on a four-year timeline. All required courses in the program, including pre-program content courses, are in the attachments *Pre-Program Course Content Syllabi* and *Education Program Course Syllabi*.

[Program of Study](#)

[Pre-Program Course Content Syllabi](#)

[Education Program Course Syllabi](#)

[Division of Education Student Handbook](#)

[Student Teaching Handbook](#)

- 3. Provide the following information for each EPP faculty member responsible for professional coursework, clinical supervision, or administration. Include any educator(s) directly involved in teaching the content area education portion of the licensure program.*

Name	Highest Degree Earned	Assignment/Role	Rank	Professional Work/Leadership
<i>Full-time Faculty</i>				
Karen Garrity	MS.Ed.	Faculty and Director of School and Community Relations	Lecturer	Director: SEISTEM 2.0, Southeast Indiana STEM Project. Competitive grant funded by INCHE, \$275,000.
Breanya Hogue	M. Ed.	Visiting Faculty	Lecturer	Professional Publication ¹ and Children's book author
A'ame Joslin	Ph. D.	Faculty and CAEP Coordinator	Clinical Assistant Professor	Mentored three students in research for Honors Program and Office of Student Research: (2019) LGBTQ representations in children's literature, (2020) examining the immigrant experience, and (2021) anti-racist practices in basal readers. Lead Educator "Reading the World Book Club" using children's literature to explore Sustainable Development Goals and anti-racist practices applied in the classroom in efforts to internationalize the curriculum (2020-2021).
Laura B. Liu	Post-doctoral	Coordinator: ENL Program	Assistant Professor	Mentored an ENL teacher candidate in

¹Hogue, B. et al. (2021). Fostering culturally proactive pedagogies: Designing learning events for elementary literacy methods courses. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 60(1).<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/19388071.2020.1779879>

				an IUPUC Office of Student Research (OSR) project ²
Lawrence J. Ruich	Ph. D.	Coordinator: SPED Program	Clinical Assistant Professor	Professional Publications ³
Stephanie Serriere	Ph.D.	Faculty	Tenured Professor	Editorial Board Member for the National Council for the Social Studies' flagship research journal, <i>Theory & Research in Social Education</i> , 2016-current.
Crystal Walcott	Ph.D.	Faculty & Division Head	Tenured Professor	P.I.: SEISTEM 2.0, Southeast Indiana STEM Project. Competitive grant funded by INCHE, \$275, 000.
<i>Adjunct Faculty</i>				
Heath Harrison	Ed.D.	Faculty	Adjunct Lecturer	Current English Department Chair, Whiteland High School, Whiteland, IN
Kathy Ison	MS.Ed.	Faculty	Adjunct Lecturer	Current 2nd Grade Teacher, East Side Elementary, Edinburgh, IN
Lyndsey Linneweber	MS.Ed.	Faculty	Adjunct Lecturer	Current principal CSA Fodrea Elementary School, Columbus, IN

² Liu, L.B., & Brodey, S. (2020). Funds of knowledge in storytelling and recipes. *MOSAIC: The Newsletter of the New York TESOL Association*, 51(1), 3-7. https://drive.google.com/file/d/1R9lguZNB_vloPWjLOMtqVbjyyZWLj1KW/view & Liu, L.B., & Brodey, S. (2020, August 18). *Critical Theory and Critical Pedagogy: Bridging the Gap* [Webinar Panel Presentation]. Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). <https://youtu.be/W1va-ljSaiA>

³Ruich, L. J., & Hursey, J. (2020, July). *Teaching Trauma-Informed Approaches for the Learning Environment: An Exploration of Research, Literature, and Personal Experiences* [Oral Presentation]. Social, Emotional, and Behavioral Wellness Symposium (SEBW), Wayne Township, IN & Ruich, L. J., Browning, T. H., & Butera, G. (2020). Being there as a support, a guide, and to intervene when you have to: Mentors reflect on their work with teacher candidates. *ICPEL: Education Leadership Review of Doctoral Research*. 8, 38-52.

Kassandra Lowery	Ph.D.	Faculty	Adjunct Lecturer	Currently practicing at Brain Performance and Psychology Center, Indianapolis, IN
Erin McNeill	Ed.D.	Faculty	Adjunct Lecturer	Current ELL Coordinator, Center Grove High School, Greenwood IN
Nikki Ruble	MS.Ed.	Faculty	Adjunct Lecturer	Current Instructional Coach, Bartholomew Consolidated School Corp. Columbus, IN
Stephen Souder	MS.Ed.	Faculty	Adjunct Lecturer	Current athletic trainer at Hauser High School, Hope IN
<i>University Supervisors</i>				
Kim Kritzer	MS.Ed.	University Supervisor	Hourly Faculty	Classroom Management Expert Panelist for Student Teaching Seminars
Sue Linder	MS.Ed.	University Supervisor	Hourly Faculty	State and local officer of Delta Kappa Gamma
Ardis Souder	MS.Ed.	University Supervisor	Hourly Faculty	Special Education Expert Panelist for Student Teaching Seminars
Carol Walters	MS.Ed.	University Supervisor	Hourly Faculty	Classroom Management Expert Panelist for Student Teaching Seminars

Click here to enter text.

4. Starting with the most recent academic year for which data is available, provide at least three years of data for both enrolled individuals and the subset of program completers. Provide separate data if the program is offered at more than one site. Please begin with the most recent academic year.

Data available [here](#) under Measure 6.

Academic Year (Indicate Start and End Dates Below)	Total Number Enrolled in the Program	Subset of Program Completers
08/26/2019 to 05/09/2020	102	30
08/20/2018 to 05/05/2019	93	26
08/21/2017 to 05/06/2018	92	31

5. Describe the process by which you and your partners select clinical educators at both the EPP and school-based (P-12) settings and how you ensure each demonstrates a positive impact on candidate preparation? Be sure to include a summary of the selection process used by your EPP in selecting high quality clinical educators and the evaluation process that follows.

Close Reciprocal Relationships with Partner Schools

The close reciprocal relationships formed between the IUPUC Division of Education and the partner schools in the region are invaluable to early field and clinical experiences in which Teacher Candidates participate. These relationships extend from the pre-professional program through the final student teaching placement. Partner schools not only serve as hosts for field and student teaching placements, but they also provide valuable programmatic feedback through many forums: Principal Advisory Board, Teacher Advisory Board, and the ENL Advisory Board. Surveys also provide guidance in IUPUC's continuous improvement efforts. Teachers and principals also support IUPUC programmatically by sharing their experience and expertise with IUPUC Teacher Candidates through class presentations and by providing mock interviews with feedback. IUPUC perceives a primary tenet for these relationships is they must be reciprocal. IUPUC faculty support partner schools by providing no cost professional development and course offerings supported by grants and facilitate grant development and implementation. Faculty play an integral role as consultants to regional school districts during textbook adoption. Service by IUPUC faculty on district committees including the Literacy Task Force and their multiple initiatives, STEM Advisory Board, and the Diversity Committee further deepen the relational ties. Faculty have also supported special school activities such as judging science fairs.

Embedded in our continuous improvement plan, four surveys are completed at the end of each student teaching cycle: Supervising Teachers evaluate the University Supervisors, the University Supervisors evaluate the Supervising Teachers, and the Teacher Candidates evaluate their University Supervisors and their Supervising Teachers. The data from these surveys combined

with bi-monthly meetings of the University Supervisors with the Director of School and Community Relations and feedback from the Principal Advisory Board, Teacher Advisory Boards, and Community Advisory Board help guide needed changes and adjustments to the degree program.

Throughout the student teaching experience, seminars are held on campus, led by the Director of School and Community Relations who coordinates the student teaching program. Presentations by Master Teachers and regional experts from the field provide professional development opportunities for the Teacher Candidates. Topics addressed in the seminars include planning and assessment, facilitating a learning environment, ethical and legal rights and responsibilities, Benchmark III and IV assessments, applying state and national standards, application process for state licensure, interviewing including mock interviews with principals, parental involvement, and collaboration with colleagues' techniques. Other topics are addressed as identified by program assessments, University Supervisor feedback, and requests made by Teacher Candidates. In addition, Teacher Candidates complete seven written reflections addressing these topics. This provides an additional opportunity for focus on the areas identified for further development by the aforementioned groups.

Process for Placing Teacher Candidates in Field/Student Teaching

The placement process delineated below is a collaborative effort involving IUPUC faculty, school administrators and teachers, and the Director of School and Community Relations.

1. Director of School and Community Relations discusses each IUPUC student with faculty. In addition, she reviews each student teacher application (if applicable) to garner a better understanding of the candidate's particular strengths and areas for improvement.
2. Director of School and Community Relations contacts principals and/or central office administrators to inquire about potential IUPUC student placements.
3. Director of School and Community Relations sends student teacher applications (if applicable) to the above.
4. The principal and/or administrator contacts the Director of School and Community Relations to notify regarding available openings.
5. Director of School and Community Relations contacts the IUPUC student to apprise of potential school placement and shares contact information.
6. IUPUC student contacts the school administrator to set up an interview.
7. Following the interview, the school administrator contacts the Director of School and Community Relations to confirm or deny the placement.
8. IUPUC student is informed of the results.
9. If the IUPUC student is not placed (very infrequent), the Director of School and Community Relations meets with the student to review feedback from the interview and potential suggestions moving forward.
10. 1-7 above is repeated for these students.

These criteria and field placement processes were collaboratively developed by administrators in the region with the Director of School and Community Relations and are periodically reviewed by the Principal Advisory Board and the Teacher Advisory Board to identify any changes or additions which might be needed.

Throughout each Teacher Candidate placement, a review of the quality of Supervising Teachers is conducted by the Director of School and Community Relations and the University Supervisors. The review is informed by the following: The University Supervisor meets with the Supervising Teacher during the latter part of the Teacher Candidate placement in Pre-Student teaching to open the lines of communication and to address any areas for improvement. To better inform this communication the University Supervisors contact the Teacher Candidate and the Supervising Teacher on a weekly basis to provide support. This is in addition to the three (minimum) in-person observation visits. If the University Supervisor determines additional support is necessary for the continued placement to be successful, the Director of School and Community Relations participates in observations, weekly communication, and the development of a growth plan. The Head of the Division is apprised of the additional support and provides input regarding the growth plan. As the plan is implemented, the University Supervisors keep the Director of School and Community Relations apprised of the progress. At the end of the placement, input from the surveys completed by the Teacher Candidates and the University Supervisors on which each is specifically asked to indicate if they think another IUPUC Teacher Candidate should be placed with the Supervising Teacher is utilized to inform this discussion. If, after the review, a Supervising Teacher's philosophy and practice are not aligned with the IUPUC program priorities, the Director of School and Community Relations shares the information with the Principal and Teacher Candidates are no longer placed with that teacher. This has only occurred on rare occasions (three times during 2016-2021). Principals have been very receptive and supportive of these decisions, as they recognize our mission and adherence to state and national standards for student teaching practices. IUPUC DoE maintains a database of current Supervising Teachers and track their contributions to education.

Similarly, Teacher Candidates are evaluated using a similar process. In that case, the University Supervisor, the Director of School and Community Relations, the Head of the Division, and the Supervising Teacher contribute to the design of a growth plan. Progress is reviewed weekly by all involved in creating the plan. If at any time the Principal and the Supervising Teacher determine the Teacher Candidate is no longer meeting the needs of the learners in their classroom, the Teacher Candidate is removed. If supports and a growth plan can be implemented effectively, continued support of the Teacher Candidate continues throughout the placement. Removal has only occurred twice during 2016-2021.

[Selection Criteria for Supervising Teachers](#)

[Advisory Boards](#)

[Meeting and Data Collection Timeline](#)

[3 Cycles of Data Semester Reports](#)

[Supervising Teachers in Clinical Program](#)

[Clinical Placement Demographics](#)

6. Indicate the name of the content and pedagogy/developmental assessments required in this program. When is successful completion of both assessments required in the program?

The Content/Pedagogy assessment is one single assessment titled *Benchmark IV: Integrated Sequential Unit*. This assessment asks candidates to create and deliver a unit with three sequential lesson plans integrating at least two separate content areas and describing how the other content areas could be incorporated into a larger unit containing the three sequential lessons. See the assignment description for Benchmark I, rubric and student sample attached. Mean scores are available in the Semester Reports and discussion about low scores is available in the Data Response Chart. Successful completion is at the end of the student teaching semester two weeks before graduation.

[Benchmark IV Content and Pedagogy Assessment](#)

[3 Cycles of Data Semester Reports](#)

[Data Response Chart](#)

7. Include at least four additional assessments required of all candidates in this program. Attach assessment and scoring rubric.

Candidate assessments occur multiple times throughout the duration of the program. Each semester, candidates submit an EPP-created assessment measuring their understanding of learner differences, planning, instruction, assessment, DEI, use of technology, and professional growth. In addition to these assessments, Supervising Teachers in the clinical setting evaluate observable action within the classroom in relation to the above categories. During student teaching, an additional evaluation by University Supervisors is also implemented using the same measures. Candidates also assess their Supervising Teachers, University Supervisors, and our program. In the table below are five of the 24 different assessments used during a candidate's duration in the program to evaluate our program as well as individual candidate growth in meeting state and national standards.

Assessment Type and Focus	Name of Assessment	Type of Assessment	When administered and/or required
1. Content Knowledge: Course Grades	<i>Content Assessment</i>	Mean scores of candidate grades in Content (includes both in-program and pre-program courses)	Content is evaluated at the end of the first semester of senior year. Grades are calculated every semester, but the programmatic mean scores are calculated

			before student teaching.
2. Assessment demonstrating candidate can effectively plan classroom-based instruction	<i>Benchmark III: Designing a Lesson Plan</i>	EPP-created assessment measuring a candidate's ability to effectively plan a lesson, reflect on that lesson, and plan for next steps	First 8-weeks of Student teaching
3. Assessment demonstrating candidate knowledge (professional/pedagogy and content), skills, and dispositions are applied to practice	<i>Supervising Teacher Rubric</i>	Co-created EPP assessment of observable professional skills, pedagogical skills, and application and delivery of content in the K-6 classroom.	Twice during first Student Teaching placement; Twice during second Student Teaching Placement (4 total assessments)
4. Assessment demonstrating candidate impact on student (P-12) learning	<i>Growth Model Report Card</i>	EPP-created assessment measuring the impact teacher candidates make on the learning growth of the learners in the clinical classroom. Includes K-6 student work.	First 8-weeks of Student Teaching
5. Content / Pedagogy Assessment (listed above in item 6)	<i>Benchmark IV: Integrated Sequential Unit</i>	EPP-created assessment evaluating the planning, implementation, assessment, and reflection of a three-lesson integrated content Unit. Includes K-6 student work and video observation.	Second 8-weeks of Student Teaching

Content Assessment (Course Grades)

Pre-Program Content Syllabi

Education Program Syllabi

Benchmark III Lesson Planning Assessment

Supervising Teacher Assessment of Student Teaching

Impact on Student Learning GMRC

First Grade GMRC Student Sample

Benchmark IV Content and Pedagogy Assessment

3 Cycles of Data Semester Reports

Data Response Chart

8. Provide at least three cycles of data for the non-state assessments listed above.

See attachment of semester reports (3 cycles of data) for FA19, SP20, and FA20 as well as the Course Grades (Content Assessment) for Content Knowledge. Candidates enter our program in both the Fall and Spring semesters. Once admitted into the program, they participate in EPP-created assessments each semester of the program and twice during their last semester. These assessments were co-created, validated, and checked for reliability with our Principal, Teacher, and Community Advisory Boards alongside the Division of Education Faculty. At the end of every semester, IUPUC DoE collects the candidate submission assessments, Supervising Teacher evaluations of teacher candidates, University Teacher evaluations of candidates, and surveys from our graduates. IUPUC DoE uses this data to inform our program and make changes to the content, delivery, and assessment. In the next section, IUPUC DoE provides examples of the use of these semester reports to improve our program.

**3 Cycles of Data Semester Reports
Meetings and Data Collection Timelines**

9. Provide at least one example where the results of one of the assessments, including any state required assessment, has been used or will be used to improve candidate performance and/or the program. Provide a general description of the results, the resulting changes and any measurable improvements. If not yet implemented or completed, describe what changes or improvements are planned and the anticipated results.

Each semester, after reviewing the Semester reports, IUPUC DoE holds advisory board meetings with Principals, Teachers, and the Community on three separate boards. IUPUC DoE shares our data with the boards and develop plans to improve in the areas with a mean below 3.0. IUPUC DoE also designs an Assessment Retreat for full-time faculty to engage with the data and seek ways to improve their individual courses to meet the needs of candidates. (See Meeting and Data Collection Timeline)

EXAMPLE 1: Lesson Plan Template The *Benchmark III* and *Benchmark IV* data identified an inconsistency in how candidates are thinking about planning for instruction and assessment. This resulted in developing a standard Lesson Plan template used across the program. The development of this Lesson Plan Template was co-created with clinical partners who provided input and feedback. Using this consistent Lesson Plan Template (attached) for candidate submissions supported candidates with prompts to identify the formative and summative assessments, differentiate for instruction, describe the Universal Design of Learning-UDL practices implemented, and reflect on their application of CAEP K-6 standards (which are aligned to InTASC). Since the implementation of this template, IUPUC DoE has observed

improvement on lesson planning increase from a 2.8 mean score in SP19 for the Benchmark III in “Quality of Instructional Plan” to a 3.1 in SP20. IUPUC DoE also saw an improvement in candidate ability to “differentiate instructional plans to meet the needs of diverse learners in the classroom” increase from 2.8 in SP20 to a 3.0 in FA20. IUPUC DoE attributes the growth to the consistency of the using the Lesson Plan Template across all courses with valuable prompts and an ability to reflect on standards for candidates to meet. One area that IUPUC DoE plans to include on the Lesson Plan Template beginning in FA21 is a prompt asking candidates of their plans to reach out to families for inclusion on the lesson plan Learning Outcomes. IUPUC DoE recognizes that candidates are still striving to meet this goal, with mean scores of 2.8 for FA20 and the Division of Education seeks to improve inclusion of families in classroom content. IUPUC DoE tracks assessment results and interventions in our Data Response Chart. These multiple sources for reviewing the data, assessing interventions, and consistent input from IUPUC stakeholders has resulted in improving our program over time.

[Lesson Plan Template](#)

[3 Cycles of Data Semester Reports](#)

[Data Response Chart](#)

EXAMPLE 2: [Advisory Boards](#) Prior to 2019, the EPP maintained one advisory board consisting of teachers, principals and community members, which met once each semester. After an analysis of board meeting minutes, not only did the EPP recognize that attendance was consistently low, but also teachers were reluctant to speak up in the presence of school administrators. Likewise, community members were reluctant to speak up for lack of understanding education jargon used by professional educators during the meetings. As a result, in 2019, the EPP dismantled the single advisory board into three separate advisory boards: Teacher, Principal, and Community. Each board now represents individuals from our region as they support continuous improvement. These partnerships have resulted in a diverse group of individuals representing a variety of school districts, underrepresented groups in our community, and multiple counties within our region. These boards have supported validation efforts of our EPP-created instruments, improved our recruitment and outreach efforts in the community, and developed stronger partnerships between schools in the outer parts of the region. We've also seen an increase in collaborations with faculty and local teachers that have resulted in conference presentations and publications, service projects with local community organizations, and co-creation of clinical practices. Separating the boards has resulted in teachers sharing more of their areas for improvement without the fears of upsetting administrators who implement plans they might not agree with following. IUPUC DoE is then able to present data collected from the program and advisory boards to the different advisory boards as collective data without naming the individual teacher or principal who shared the information. This has led to an improvement of our clinical experiences and supported the creation of a full-time Director of School and Community Relations position to oversee clinical partnerships. One example of this is the use of Developmental Assets through our community partners in the local schools. By separating each

of the Advisory Boards, IUPUC DoE was able to get honest, relevant feedback from each of the groups about the use of these tools from a variety of levels in our community. These discussions around SEL and Developmental Assets led us to include a workshop on this topic during our 2019 Convocation (Developmental Assets) and our 2020 Convocation (Trauma-informed teaching). Our Advisory Boards now attend our Convocations and invite their communities to attend as well.

Advisory Boards

Meetings and Data Collection Timeline

EXAMPLE 3 Convocation At the beginning of each semester, IUPUC DoE bring our candidates to campus before the start of classes to share information about their clinical placements, assessments they are asked to complete, and to engage with their specific cohorts. In 2018, our convocations were transformed to include a keynote speaker and then by 2019 IUPUC DoE created conference-style breakout rooms. The speaker and breakout sessions address a variety of topics aligned to outcomes associated with lower scores on our assessments. For example, candidates scored 3.0 and 3.2 on a 4.0 scale in their first and second placements of student teaching in 2019 for the criteria "understanding the learner and their community." During our convocation in 2019, IUPUC DoE included a workshop with our clinical partners called *Developmental Assets*, currently being used in the district where each of our candidates have at least one placement. Our exit slips for this convocation workshop demonstrated a huge impact on candidates and their understanding of how children grow and develop and how their families and communities impact their growth. Specific comments from the exit slips included:

Having employees of BCSC [Bartholomew County School Corporation] come to talk was very helpful. The topic was very useful as well as their presence.

I really enjoyed hearing from actual employees from a school corporation.

The developmental assets session was very informing.

The session I found the most helpful was about developmental assets. I could have listened to one who[le] day of information on it. I think it was helpful and engaging.

The developmental asset group material was greatly beneficial for teachers who are compiling their teaching philosophy. The speakers were so enthusiastic.

IUPUC DoE then observed increases by .2 on the above rubric criteria for each student-teaching placement. The convocations continued during the pandemic in a Zoom format.

Convocation Agendas 2019-21

3 Cycles of Data Semester Reports

Data Response Chart

10. How are candidates in this program introduced to the REPA/REPA 3 Educator Standards? How do you ensure your candidates are aware of the standards during each phase of the program?

Candidates are introduced to the REPA/REPA 3 Educator Standards in a variety of ways throughout the program. First, they are introduced to the standards at Convocations where

attendance is required of all candidates regardless of semester they are in the program. These convocations are held at the beginning of each semester (IUPUC DoE admit candidates at both the Spring and Fall semesters as they join cohorts). At these convocations, candidates are introduced to our end of semester assessments with the state and national standards clearly aligned to the outcomes. They receive guidance to read the standards (including REPA, Indiana Content, InTASC and CAEP K-6) and then reflect on these standards as they plan lessons and engage in course content. In addition to this initial introduction, candidates continue to engage with these standards as they review course syllabi and course introductions where our Learning Outcomes are clearly identified and aligned to the standards. Informational sessions for each of the Benchmarks are provided not only at the convocation but also a few weeks before the end of each semester when Benchmarks are due. These sessions are provided in-person, via Zoom, in pre-recorded videos available online, and in written descriptions. In each of these informational sessions, candidates are again connected to the standards that guide our education program gaining a deep understanding of the purpose behind each of our courses, field experiences, and other professional responsibilities candidates engage in during the program. In their final semester, they continue to examine not only the REPA standards, but how these standards apply to their ability to pass licensure exams, demonstrate their preparedness during job interviews and teaching demonstrations, how laws and ethics around the teaching profession rely on candidates' knowledge and application of these standards, and how to use these standards as they move into the teaching profession and adhere to a new set of standards.

[Convocation Agendas 2019-21](#)

[Education Program Course Syllabi](#)

[Lesson Plan Template](#)

11. How do you support candidates who are struggling or having difficulty passing a required assessment (state or EPP)? What are your intervention strategies?

Each semester candidates are introduced to the assessment timeline for both EPP assessments and licensure exams during the Convocation. They are connected to test prep materials on reserve in our campus library, online resources, and the specific faculty who specialize in the various content areas. When candidates are striving to pass a state licensure exam, they are contacted by our Academic Advisor, who receives all the candidates' scores and reviews their areas of strength and improvement. The Academic Advisor encourages them to review their areas for improvement, reach out to the faculty member with this specific expertise, and engage in study groups with other candidates. The Academic Advisor also informs faculty of the need for an intervention at the monthly Division Meetings. Interventions ultimately lead to improvement in course design and opportunities for test preparation embedded into course content. One example is in EDCU-E325, the social studies faculty member offers a group test prep after each of their weekly course classes including sample test questions from the state licensure exam. In addition to these interventions, our Kappa Delta Pi chapter which meets

monthly and provides a space for licensure preparation and sharing of study materials. The IUPUC Division of Education encourages candidates to review the REPA standards for guidance on areas where they may need to demonstrate improvement as the Learning Outcomes are introduced in class each week. Candidates who have already taken the exam or who have retaken exams share experiences in the first-year seminar program and again during the semester before Student Teaching with fellow candidates and pre-program students. This helps to diminish the potential stigma of not passing on the first try and to encourage candidates to seek instructional support, retake the exam and remain in the program. For EPP assessments, assessment teams evaluate the assessments and provide opportunities to resubmit if the assessment data submitted is incomplete or does not meet the expected threshold. The intervention involves a member of the assessment team for the end of semester assessments to support the candidate in completing their assessment and providing supplemental instruction to guide the candidate (we have four teams for each of the four Benchmarks). IUPUC DoE finds that in these cases, it is often that the candidate has become overwhelmed by the work (due to family responsibilities, outside work, or illness) and did not put in the time to review the assessment protocol or provide a complete submission. This has only occurred twice between 2017-2021. In some cases, this results in a candidate retaking a course or student teaching placement to ensure that they are meeting all required expectations to graduate with the intended score of a 3.0 out of 4.0 on all assessments or ultimately being counseled out of the program.

[Convocation Agendas 2019-21](#)

[Division of Education Student Handbook](#)

[Student Teaching Handbook](#)

[Education Program Course Syllabi](#)

12. Diversity and technology are both important cross-cutting themes in educator preparation. Describe how both are integrated within this program. Provide at least one example or evidence for each.

Diversity in Coursework

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion practices are integrated throughout the education program and embedded into the curriculum. A required course for the program, EDUC-M 300 Teaching in a Pluralistic Society introduces candidates (after taking Multicultural education courses pre-program) to the diverse students they will soon be teaching and provides them with information on how discriminatory laws, policies, and individual action determine outcomes for children. An example of an observation assignment with a teacher interview is included in the attachments. Candidates are asked to observe actions, curriculum, and procedures for equity in their field placements and then interview their Supervising Teacher to gain a better understanding how in-service teachers are applying models of diversity, equity, and inclusion in their teaching. As candidates move through their course requirements, they are asked in each of their lesson plan submissions how they examined the content and pedagogy to reach a diverse classroom and

create a bias-free environment. They are asked to recognize the diversity in their classrooms in a variety of ways including race, gender, ethnicity, religion, SES, language, ability, and geographic location. For example, in EDUC-E 341, Methods of Teaching Reading II, candidates examine children's literature and identify the bias embedded within and develop conversations, writing, and other projects to critically evaluate the literature along with their students. In EDUC-E323 Science and Social Studies Methods, candidates are tasked with the creation of a universally accessible playground using sustainable materials and providing play spaces for all children regardless of ability. In EDUC-E325, candidates use primary documents alongside children's social studies literature and dispel racist myths embedded into historical texts. All candidates are required to take EDUC-K 307 Students with Exceptional Needs and EDUC-L 400 Instructional Issues in Language Education as a part of the program. In these two courses, candidates identify the funds of knowledge that everyone brings to the classroom and how to identify those strengths to create a diverse, equitable, and inclusive learning environment. In each lesson plan and Benchmark submission, candidates are asked to identify the individual needs of the learners in their field classrooms and modify curriculum and instruction to meet their needs. Candidates also complete a Professional Growth Plan Self-Assessment each semester to examine their own biases and areas of growth and then create a plan to address areas for improvement. Candidates are placed in our most diverse school district for their longest placement (24 weeks) in efforts to provide opportunities to observe educators in the field design curriculum for a variety of learners and then practice those skills during their student teaching. In addition to each of these steps throughout the program, the Division of Education provides research opportunities for candidates to further examine diversity, equity, and inclusion in education, some of which have resulted in co-authored publications and presentations at national conferences. At each of our Convocations, IUPUC DoE includes content and application of anti-bias practices through workshops, keynote speakers, and group discussions. Our incoming cohorts for FA18, FA19 and SP19 showed a mean DEI score on the Content Assessment of 3.7 out of 4.0. In the FA19, SP20, FA20 cycles of data, candidates were rated a mean score across all three data collection cycles of 3.6 out of 4.0 by Supervising Teachers during their final clinical placement for the rubric criteria: *Candidate uses their understanding of individual differences and diverse families, cultures, and communities to plan and implement inclusive learning experiences and environments that build on children's strengths and address their individual needs.*

M300 Classroom Equity Assignment

Technology & Diversity Cross-cutting

3 Cycles of Data Semester Report

Professional Growth Plan Self-Assessment

Content Assessment (Course Grades)

Diversity in Teacher Candidates and Clinical Practice

At IUPUC, our campus is predominantly white, which is reflective of the region. This means that in the Division of Education, IUPUC DoE has created specific outreach programs,

recruitment efforts, and faculty searches to recruit and retain candidates that represent diverse backgrounds. IUPUC DoE created an [Education Minority Scholarship](#) (see attachment) in efforts to retain candidates entered into our program, IUPUC DoE participates in [Exito Latino](#) (a local program that supports transition of Hispanic/Latino students from high school to college), and IUPUC DoE has a diverse Community Advisory Board that aids in reaching marginalized populations in the region. Our keynote speakers for our Convocations for the last three years have centered on DEI and have addressed trauma-informed teaching, provided examples of examining children's literature for racial, gender, and ethnic bias and supported candidates in uncovering their own privilege and bias, and the needs of English Language Learners in our community. When marginalized students arrive on our campus, IUPUC DoE connects them to clubs, groups, mentors, and resources to support their integration on campus and retain them in the field. IUPUC DoE is striving to diversify the teaching force in our community, and our faculty serve on the *Recruitment and Retention of Underrepresented Teachers* committee within the local school district, *NAACP* in the community, *Anti-Racist Policies and Practices* at IUPUC, and in other community settings to rewrite exclusionary policies and remove barriers to entering and remaining in the teaching field. Our longest teaching placement (24 weeks) occurs in the most diverse district in our region and includes schools with classrooms of linguistic, ethnic, racial, socioeconomic, ability, gender, and geographic diversity. Alongside our Office of Student Research, candidates during the 2019-2021 program engaged in research examining racist language and policies embedded in the K-6 reading programs at local schools. Faculty have served as great mentors to marginalized candidates, developing research projects, and presenting and publishing on that work. IUPUC DoE recognizes the historical and systemic bias embedded into the teaching field and are actively seeking to repair the damage and provide equity and justice for our students.

[Education Minority Scholarship](#)

[Clinical Placement Demographics](#)

[Convocation Agendas 2019-21](#)

Technology

Responses from Supervising Teachers and University Supervisors have shown consistent improvement over the three-year cycle in applying technology in the clinical setting.

Supervising Teachers and University Supervisors rated our candidates FA19 3.5, SP20 3.6, and FA20 3.7 out of 4.0 for the rubric criteria: (a) *Candidate engages learners in using a range of learning skills and technology tools to access, interpret, evaluate, and apply information.* (b) *Candidate demonstrates facility in employing technology in the design, implementation, and assessment of learning experiences to engage learners.* IUPUC DoE received feedback from our Teacher Advisory Board that candidates are bringing innovative uses of technology (i.e., creating instructional videos, WebQuests, online quizzes, geo mapping, audio books, Google products) from their course curriculum and sharing that knowledge with in-service teachers and then applying it during their student teaching placements. Use of technology embedded into

candidate lesson plans is present in each of our program courses, particularly with our strong program emphasis on UDL. One example of an integrated technology assignment is the DiSCALL embedded into the EDUC-E 340 Methods of Teaching Reading I course (see attachment). With a partner (or in groups of three), candidates identify an Indiana academic standard in social studies (civics, economics, geography, or history) at the grade level of their field placement for an integrated humanities lesson. That lesson must incorporate the use of at least one social studies "text" (i.e., videos count) that presents the content related to the social studies learning outcomes. The website created by the candidate and implemented into the clinical setting must include a summative assessment and rubric, and the group must also create digital supports for the lesson (using Google tools) which are designed to facilitate teaching and learning.

[Technology Assignment DISCALL](#)

[Education Program Course Syllabi](#)

[3 Cycles of Data Semester Report](#)

[Technology and Diversity Cross-Cutting](#)