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<tr>
<td>1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions</td>
<td>Standard Met</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
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<td>2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation</td>
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Not Applicable (Programs not offered at this level)

I. INTRODUCTION

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

The Teacher Education Program at the Calumet College of St. Joseph is seeking initial accreditation from NCATE.

The campus is located in Whiting, Indiana, approximately 25 miles southeast of Chicago, Illinois, and is situated next to Lake Michigan. The community identifies itself as being part of the northwest Indiana region, which considers itself distinct from the rest of Indiana.

Calumet College of St. Joseph (CCSJ) is a Catholic institution founded by the Missionaries of the Precious Blood and accredited by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association to offer associate, baccalaureate, and masters' degrees. CCSJ began in 1951 as a two-year extension of St. Joseph's College of Rensselaer. It became a full four-year, degree granting college in 1960 and moved to a store front in East Chicago. CCSJ was the first institution in the region to offer a bachelor's degree. In 1973, the institution separated from St. Joseph's College and received its current seven story building, known as the "vertical campus," donated by the American Oil Company. The first graduate program was offered in 2002. CCSJ successfully completed a capital campaign in 2011 which will allow it to build a student/community activity center, renovate the main building, and increase the endowment.

Current enrollment at CCSJ is 1250 students. Approximately half are traditional undergraduate students. CCSJ has 16 baccalaureate majors and four master's degree programs. Graduate students in education are charged undergraduate tuition rates because of the institution's commitment to increasing the diversity of teachers in the region. Some programs, including the graduate programs for elementary and secondary education, are offered as accelerated programs which use a cohort model and organize
CCSJ has a diverse population, with nearly half of the student body of African American or Hispanic descent. U.S. News and World Report named the College as the second most diverse institution in the Mid West. The recent Core Initiative overhauled the general education curriculum to meet the needs of students from disadvantaged backgrounds. Changes included sequencing coursework, forming learning communities, mentoring first year students, and requiring a capstone project at the end of the general education coursework.

The unit only offers one undergraduate program, which leads to initial licensure in elementary education. There are also two graduate programs leading to initial licensure in either elementary or secondary education. The graduate programs are alternative routes in Indiana, known as Transition to Teaching programs. Candidates can also attain a license without a master's degree. CCSJ is the only institution in the region authorized by the IDOE to offer the Transition to Teaching programs. The Institutional Report (IR) stated there are 124 candidates enrolled in the traditional undergraduate program in elementary education. The graduate programs are Transition to Teaching Programs (T2T). The IR stated there are 28 candidates seeking elementary certification and 15 candidates seeking secondary certification through the T2T programs.

The unit and institution have undergone significant transitions in the last year. The vice president for academic affairs became president and the director of education became the vice president of academic affairs. The curriculum and assessments have been revised as the unit seeks accreditation by NCATE.

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

The state partnership requires an NCATE-only visit assisted by a non-voting state consultant from the Indiana Department of Education. The state consultant who participated in the pre-visit notified the vice president of academic affairs, unit head, and BOE chair on February 23, 2012, that she was leaving her job at the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) and would not be able to participate. Another IDOE staff person was appointed in her place. She was present in the workroom Monday afternoon and Tuesday morning but was not engaged in the process. She attended the exit conference.

According to the program approval letters dated 2011 from the Indiana Department of Education, Elementary T2T programs may require no more than 24 hours of coursework; secondary T2T programs may require no more than 18 hours. The IDOE letters approving the T2T elementary and secondary programs indicate Indiana will require SPA reports for institutions with accreditation visits beginning Fall 2014. Prior to 2014, institutions may use the letters to verify program approval.

No teacher education programs or courses are offered at another site or through distance learning.

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

No teacher education programs or courses are offered at another site or through distance learning.
The state consultant who participated in the pre-visit notified the vice president of academic affairs, unit head, and BOE chair on February 23, 2012, that she was leaving her job at the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) and would not be able to participate. Another IDOE staff person was appointed in her place. She was present in the workroom Monday afternoon and Tuesday morning but was not engaged in the process. She attended the exit conference.

II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.

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

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

The vision of the professional education unit at Calumet College of St. Joseph (CCSJ) is to "shape diverse and effective P-12 teacher candidates towards becoming ethically responsible educators who transform a socially just society through education." The unit's vision flows into its mission, which is to "implement justice oriented educational experiences for teacher candidates and professional educators that reflect current theory and best practice in the profession according to three essential and interrelated pillars: professional preparation; continuous and critical reflection; and ongoing personal and professional transformation. The vision and mission of unit are based on the mission of the College and its sponsors, the Missionaries of the Precious Blood, to prepare diverse candidates for professional careers and graduate education and to contribute to the building of a socially just society." The unit's philosophy furthers the institutional mission through its commitment to social justice and shaping a society that respects and protects individual rights.

The conceptual framework identifies five candidate outcomes: 1) understanding how students learn and how they differ; 2) knowledge of what to teach; 3) continuous personal and professional growth; 4) demonstration of how to teach effectively; and 5) effective implementation of technology. The outcomes are further broken into specific proficiencies, including those related to diversity and technology, and provides a crosswalk to demonstrate how each goal aligns with principles and standards of the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE), Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), and the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). The unit's outcomes and its conceptual framework are integrated in curriculum, school-based experiences, and assessments for all programs and are consistent with educational policies that drive the work of the unit.

The knowledge base is grounded in theorists who envision education as a democratic, caring, socially-situated, moral, and transformative endeavor. It also draws on constructivist principles, critical theory to construct the blueprint for providing courses and experiences designed to "transform well-prepared candidates into reflective, committed, and socially conscious professional educators" capable of leading students to critical thinking and deep understanding in student-centered environments.

Dispositions articulated in the conceptual framework include high expectations for all students, valuing the achievement of diverse learners, commitment to creating a caring and just learning environment, and valuing service learning.
The four transition points in the elementary program and the five transition points in the secondary program are identified in the conceptual framework. Specific assessments are used at the transition points to collect data to be analyzed and used to improve programs and candidate performance. The unit involves members of the unit, the College, and the local professional community in implementing, analyzing, and improving its assessment system.

Candidates, unit and institutional faculty, college administrators, adjunct faculty, professional staff, cooperating teachers, and school administrators spoke with pride and passion about the program's commitment to educating candidates prepared to serve children in disadvantaged areas.

III. STANDARDS

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

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

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

Yes \(\checkmark\)  No \(\checkmark\)

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

1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) requires Praxis I and Praxis II scores for licensure. As of July 1, 2011, a passing score on Praxis I must be attained prior to program admission.

The unit requires that candidates in both the undergraduate elementary and graduate elementary and secondary programs must pass the Praxis I assessment of basic skills in reading, writing, and mathematics, prior to admission to the program. Data from 2009-2011 show 98% of the traditional undergraduate candidates and 100% of the graduate candidates pass. Undergraduates who do not attain a
passing score on all parts of Praxis I may demonstrate content knowledge through a minimum score on other standardized tests (ACT, SAT, or GRE); by holding a master's degree from a regionally accredited institution; or have a composite score of 527 on Praxis I.

Content knowledge for undergraduate candidates is also demonstrated through the GPA requirement of 3.0 in content area coursework. Graduate candidates must have a 3.0 undergraduate GPA or, if they have five years of experience in the teaching field, a 2.5 undergraduate GPA. The Education Program Handbook and interviews with candidates and faculty confirmed the candidate must meet GPA requirements.

Praxis II is used to assess content knowledge. Aggregated data for 2009 to 2011 show 100% of candidates pass the elementary curriculum and assessment test and the reading specialist test by candidates in the graduate elementary program. Graduate secondary candidates must pass Praxis II prior to admission to the program. Aggregated data from ETS for 2009-2011 for candidates in the graduate secondary areas show a 100% pass rate. Interviews with candidates, alumni, supervising teachers provided further evidence candidates have sufficient content knowledge to enter the teaching profession.

All candidates take Praxis I and II tests required for licensure Indiana. Candidates who also wish to seek certification in Illinois do so based on reciprocity.

Interviews with candidates and an inspection of work samples (e.g., lesson plans and portfolios) and rubrics confirmed that candidates are familiar with and able to work with unit, state, and national standards.

Undergraduate elementary candidates are required to complete a 12-semester hour minor in another area. Candidates in the program typically select social studies, language arts, science, mathematics, or visual arts.

The unit is nationally recognized with conditions by ACEI until August 1, 2013. The unit head stated they are working with ETS to have subscores from Praxis I and II tests reported, as required by ACEI. The unit will be submitting additional information to ACEI in the coming months.

The Indiana Department of Education has approved the graduate elementary Transition to Teaching (T2T) program. The graduate secondary T2T program is approved with conditions. The June 2011 IDOE approval memo includes an area for concern about student learning outcomes. The pre- and post assessment candidates were required to do during clinical experiences prior to student teaching was deemed insufficient. The assessment has since been redesigned and is now done during student teaching and requires more analysis of student work. In interviews, candidates noted that they used information from the pre-test to inform curriculum and instruction and provided some examples.

The Transition to Teaching (T2T) programs are alternative routes to certification on the graduate level but do not require earning a master's degree. Candidates demonstrate content knowledge through prior academic work at the time of admission. State regulations prohibit requiring or allowing candidates to take additional courses. According to the program approval letters dated 2011 from the Indiana Department of Education, Elementary T2T programs may require no more than 24 hours of coursework; secondary T2T programs may require no more than 18 hours. The IDOE letters approving the T2T elementary and secondary programs indicate Indiana will require SPA reports for institutions with accreditation visits beginning Fall 2014. Prior to 2014, institutions may use the letters to verify program approval.

CCSJ and the teacher education unit have sent surveys to program completers and employers. The
responses were generally positive, but the response rate was very low. The unit head reported she is currently visiting employers of recent graduates to ask two standardized questions about graduates and their performance but data was not available at the time of the visit.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

| Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation | Not Applicable |

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Candidates in all programs construct a portfolio. A redesign of the portfolio occurred in response to feedback from the IDOE and ACEI reviews and was implemented in January 2012. The redesign included shifting from INTASC standards to ACEI standards for the elementary programs and using a combination of ACEI, INTASC, and NBPTS for secondary. Requirements also became more specific. Whereas in the past candidates could choose any type of artifact for each standard, they are now required to submit a specific type(s) of artifact, as identified in course requirements, such as a lesson plan or observation reflection, to demonstrate knowledge, dispositions, or performance for a standard.

Candidates document pedagogical content knowledge and skills in the portfolio through artifacts addressing the outcomes identified in the conceptual framework: Portfolio requirements address the five outcomes identified in the conceptual framework: 1) understanding how students learn and how they differ; 2) knowledge of what to teach; 3) demonstration of how to teach effectively; 4) effective implementation of technology; and 5) continuous personal and professional growth. Artifacts and reflections provide evidence of candidates' knowledge, disposition, and performance on each standard. Candidates must have at least an 80 percent score on each item in the portfolio. A review of sample portfolios and aggregated data confirmed candidates attain pedagogical content knowledge and skills.

Required lesson plans for clinical experiences and student teaching document candidates are able to plan lessons that connect content and pedagogy. Lesson plan requirements include a broad behavioral objective that connects the lesson to real life, developmentally appropriate learning objectives based on Bloom's Taxonomy and aligned to core academic standards, instructional strategies, multiple teaching methods, and assessment. Candidate work samples and interviews provided further evidence program completers are prepared to teach all students. Candidates readily provided multiple examples of ways to differentiate instruction, such as using learning centers, tiered lessons, and intervention strategies. Interviews with student teachers, cooperating teachers, and school administrators affirmed candidates are proficient in pedagogical content knowledge and skills and well trained to reflect on their performance.

Exhibits included a chart identifying technology activities in various courses in the undergraduate elementary program. The activities require candidates to develop knowledge and skills to prepare them to integrate multiple forms of technology into their teaching. Examples include web quests, YouTube,
Smart Boards, i-Pads, Dora, and Kidspiration. Artifacts related to instructional technology are included in the portfolio. All portfolio artifacts have at least a grade of 80 percent. A review of graduate syllabi and interviews with undergraduate, graduate candidates, and program completers provided additional evidence candidates are equipped to use instructional technology effectively.

For the undergraduate and graduate elementary programs, pedagogical content knowledge and skills are also assessed by the required Praxis II tests in elementary curriculum and assessment and the test for reading specialist. Aggregated scores confirm program completers are prepared. Secondary candidates are only required to take the Praxis II content area assessment.

**Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:**

Candidates are grouped into cohorts for the traditional undergraduate elementary program and the graduate elementary and secondary programs. Each cohort takes courses in a prescribed sequence so that knowledge and skills build upon one another. Written policies require candidates to maintain a GPA of 3.0 in all education courses. Faculty and candidates confirmed academic progress is carefully monitored.

During the first phase of the program, candidates acquire basic knowledge and engage in field experiences that require them to observe students and teachers through a critical lens and connect theory to practice through reflections. In addition, lesson plan artifacts must document how national standards (ACEI and/or INTASC) and state standards for P-12 learning are addressed.

As candidates move into methods courses, they engage in clinical experiences that require them to plan, implement, and assess lessons and reflect on their effectiveness. Field and clinical placements are selected by the course instructor to assure candidates have experience working with diverse populations. Field and clinical experiences typically require assignments that become part of candidates' portfolios. Representative examples are observation reflections, cultural analysis, case studies, lessons for particular content areas, and an assessment. The unit maintains a portfolio database to track the scores of each candidate in a cohort on every required artifact. The spreadsheet affirms candidates attain the minimum acceptable level of proficiency on each item. A review of portfolios and conversations with candidates provided further evidence that assignments that do not meet minimum requirements must be redone.

The Student Teaching Assessment Inventory is used by cooperating teachers and the college supervisor to assess candidates' proficiencies in the broad areas of communication skills, professionalism, preparation and planning, classroom management, and standards. The broad areas are broken into detailed, observable indicators on which candidates are assessed. Representative indicators address
considering cultural diversity in communication; enthusiasm and collaboration; theorist papers and literature reviews; planning to meet the academic and developmental needs of students; modifying instruction, evaluating student progress based on documentation of student work; and involving families in the educational process. Aggregated data from the Inventory provided show candidates' are able to apply professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills effectively during student teaching. Additional confirming evidence was gathered during interviews with candidates, cooperating teachers, and supervising teachers and through observations in schools. This evidence provided confirming examples that candidates consider students' backgrounds, culture, and prior experiences in planning and delivering instruction. Student teachers were also able to provide numerous examples of how they use technology in their classrooms.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

1d. Student Learning for Teacher Candidates

| Student Learning for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Student Learning for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation | Not Applicable |

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The unit implemented a pre-test/post-test assessment as way to measure the impact candidates' have on student learning in fall 2010. The unit further revised the assessment based on feedback from the state review process and the ACEI review process and implemented a new version in spring 2012. The new version requires candidates to develop assessment instruments aligned to state standards for P-12 students for two subjects or topics in their area of licensure. The assessments are administered at the second and eleventh week of student teaching. Unit faculty stated they will continue to develop this key assessment to help candidates become more proficient at assessing their impact on learning. Candidates provided some examples of using assessment data and analysis to improve instruction.

The unit started a summer reading program for elementary children in part to provide candidates with an additional opportunity to gain experience in planning, implementing, and delivering instruction as well as assessing their impact on student learning.

All lesson plans done for clinical experiences and student teaching must include an assessment of student learning. Lesson plans are assessed by cooperating teachers and supervising teachers.

Candidates' ability to use formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social and physical development of the learner is also addressed on the Student Teaching Assessment Inventory. Although scores indicate candidates attain proficiency, the concerns in the reports from the state and ACEI program approval process and the lack of sufficient data from the recently revised pre-test/post-test assessment raise a concern about the level of proficiency actually attained by candidates.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:
### 1e. Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals

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

#### Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

### 1f. Student Learning for Other School Professionals

| Student Learning for Other School Professionals | Not Applicable |

#### Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

### 1g. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates

| Professional Dispositions for All Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Professional Dispositions for All Candidates – Advanced Preparation | Not Applicable |

#### Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Professional dispositions are articulated in the conceptual framework and are assessed by candidates using the Disposition Self-Evaluation and by faculty using the Instructor Professional Dispositions Assessment at multiple points in the program. Dispositions include commitment and enthusiasm, rebounding for challenging situations, respecting and appreciating diversity, high expectations for achievement, and a caring attitude. If faculty become aware of a dispositional concern with a candidate, they fill out a form and work with him or her to develop a remediation plan.

Interviews confirmed candidates attain, practice, and model these dispositions. In the words of one administrator, they have open hearts and open minds.

#### Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

#### Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

#### Overall Assessment of Standard
Candidates demonstrate they have acquired the necessary breadth and depth of knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions needed to be effective teachers. They demonstrate content knowledge and pedagogical skills in planning and implementing instruction that is consistent with the unit's conceptual framework. Proficiencies are developed sequentially through coursework coupled with field experiences, clinical practice, and culminating in student teaching. Candidates attain the dispositions needed to work with diverse students.

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

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AFIs from last visit: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New AFIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The unit does not have sufficient data from a key assessment to determine if candidates are proficient in assessing student learning.</td>
<td>While the unit revised the pre-test/post-test assessment to include more analysis and implemented it this semester, there is insufficient data to know if the assessment is measuring what it is supposed to measure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation for Standard 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

None
Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation
The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.

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

Yes

No

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

Nor applicable

2a. Assessment System

Assessment System – Initial Teacher Preparation
Acceptable

Assessment System – Advanced Preparation
Not Applicable

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The institution has a unit assessment system (UAS) that is transitioning from a number of instruments to Task Stream and other online systems such as Survey Monkey. These instruments are also used to gather assessments at transition points to determine candidate performance and unit effectiveness. Program and candidate outcomes are aligned with the institution's mission and conceptual framework, and correspond with IDOE standards, INTASC principles, NBPTS, and ACEI standards for elementary programs. The assessment system utilizes both internal and external assessments based on standardized tools with its candidates. These include grade point average of at least 3.0 in professional preparation courses, Praxis I scores (or state approved alternatives), Praxis II passing scores, student teaching inventory final evaluations, lesson plans, and portfolios.

The unit has implemented procedures to ensure fairness, accuracy, and consistency in the assessment of candidate performance and routinely conducts training sessions for candidates, faculty, and reviewers to increase understanding and to develop consistency in scoring and establish inter-rater reliability.

Interviews with candidates, faculty, and staff confirmed that faculty, candidates, and other evaluators are regularly provided in-service training to help them better understand the rubrics and expectations and that admissions interviews and portfolio scoring is conducted by teams for inter-rater reliability.

In the undergraduate program there are four transition points for candidates: acceptance, continuation, entry to student teaching, and recommendation for licensure. The initial licensure MAT candidates use the same four transition points and have a fifth transition point whereby candidates have the opportunity to stop after student teaching and licensure or continue on to complete a master's degree.

Candidates are consistently informed of program requirements and certification procedures via Blackboard Learn+, CCSJ Education Handbook, Student Teaching Handbook, and communicated with
through education seminars, student teaching orientation, and advising. To assess professional and pedagogical knowledge the prospective candidates are interviewed prior to acceptance and continuously assessed throughout their programs. While in student teaching the candidates are rated by their cooperating teachers on a 50-item instrument. The candidates are also responsible for compiling an electronic portfolio and are evaluated on artifacts submitted to the portfolio. If for some reason candidates fail to achieve the minimum of 80 percent passing rate required, remediation occurs and candidates are afforded an opportunity for re-submission.

The unit is currently transitioning (began September 2011) from portfolios designed around INTASC standards to ones designed around ACEI standard for elementary candidates and some ACEI standards and some NBPTS standards for secondary candidates. This is in response to ACEI concerns about initial license elementary candidates. The unit is formulating a response to ACEI and is already responding to some of these concerns.

Unit operations are evaluated using candidate grades, faculty self-evaluations, annual reports, assessment reports, student evaluations of instructors, review of assessment plans by the institutional curriculum and assessment committee, Title II data, and other reports and surveys. Feedback from stakeholders including candidates, unit faculty, unit administration, content faculty, external evaluators, and K-12 teachers and administrators assist the unit as it continues to make improvements to develop teachers capable of improving student learning.

All candidates must pass Praxis I for admission to the programs. Indiana requires candidates to have passing scores on Praxis I and II for licensure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2b. Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

| Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation – Advanced Preparation | Not Applicable |

### Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The institution has a systematic and ongoing process for data collection, analysis, and evaluation that includes a time line for collection and review of data. To facilitate this process the unit uses EMPOWER 8 Pro for its database, which is a student administrative system supporting academic management. Faculty use a shared drive via Microsoft Word, Excel, Blackboard Learn+, and EMPOWER to access, produce, implement, score, and report assessments and data. As previously noted the unit and institution are also transitioning to Task Stream and currently using Survey Monkey for student evaluation of courses at the end of each course. This increased use of technology will facilitate the aggregation and disaggregation of data.

Courses within the unit are supplemented by Blackboard Learn+, which is a course management system that holds syllabi, documents, assignments, rubrics, grades, and external links, which are developed by unit faculty. The unit enrolls all candidates in Blackboard Learn+ and uses it as the primary mode to communicate with the students, store assignments, and post grades. A review of selected courses on Blackboard and discussions with candidates and faculty indicate that Blackboard is widely utilized.
Candidates are evaluated on a regular basis in courses and at transition points using standard forms based on rubrics, which are aligned to state and national professional teacher standards. Key assessments and artifacts are captured within the candidate's evaluation portfolio and artifacts are required for selected courses and must meet an 80 percent pass rate. Candidates' scores are managed through Blackboard, Microsoft Access and/or EMPOWER database system by the unit office manager. As noted, the unit is converting to Task Stream for its database and management system and at the time of the visit was in the pilot stage. It is anticipated that this new system will eliminate the need for some of the other tools currently being used and make aggregation of data much easier and more comprehensive.

Student rights and responsibilities, as well as the associated policies and procedures, are disseminated in the student catalog. This details a process for dealing with student complaints that outlines specific procedures to be followed until a resolution is reached. A record of student complaints and their resolutions is maintained by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and was reviewed during the visit.

Unit faculty are evaluated annually based on performance in three areas: teaching, scholarship and service. As part of this evaluation student ratings of instructors are used along with instructor self-evaluation and administrator evaluations which are tied to the mission of the institution. The VPAA writes a review to each full time faculty member annually based on the materials compiled.

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

N/A

### 2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Data for Program Improvement – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of Data for Program Improvement – Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:**

Data are collected and analyzed on a regular basis from various surveys, research, formal meetings (senior staff, Academic Affairs, Academic Council, Academic Support, Retention Committee, Enrollment Committee, Technology Committee, Marketing Committee, Development Committee, Budget Committee, and faculty department meetings), and from informal engagements, and discussion with various stakeholders. The unit assessment system, assessment timelines, and institutional assessment plan are designed to systematically gather, summarize, and evaluate data for program improvement to strengthen candidate performance in the overall program. While a number of instruments and processes are utilized, the transition to Task Stream will make this process much easier.

These assessment processes involve the collection of data from a variety of internal and external sources, the aggregation and disaggregation of data at the program and department level, the analyses of the data by unit faculty and staff, the reporting and sharing of the data, and the implementation of data-driven changes. The president has recently required each unit within the institution to develop more comprehensive systems for accountability. Evidence of the use of data was found in two separate History of Change Documents (one for the unit and one for academic affairs), and in data sets that are collected and analyzed on a regular basis from various surveys from candidates, cooperating teachers, clinical teachers, and local administrators. Interviews with various groups noted above and in minutes of
meetings (although not always detailed) confirmed the review and discussion of data. These reviews have led to numerous changes to the unit programs over the past seven years that were confirmed by interviews, documents, and other materials. Although interviews confirmed the unit has been responsive to suggestions from various stakeholders over time, the team did not find evidence that such input about the assessment system itself is gathered in a systematic or formalized manner from the professional community.

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

| N/A |

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit utilizes a consistent set of rubrics in courses, at transition points, in candidate self evaluation of dispositions, and in candidates' electronic portfolios. The unit provides candidates with multiple opportunities for reflection in courses and as they progress through transition points. Key assignments are captured within the candidate's evaluation portfolio and require reflective essays, description of performance, and analysis of student outcomes. The cohort model in both the undergraduate and graduate level programs provides a structure in which candidates performances can be strengthen and compared to each other. This focus on reflection provides the unit with self-evaluation and the ability for continuous improvement. The institution and unit are utilizing data for improvements and have utilized a variety of sources and instruments to gather and analyze data. The transition to Task Stream will assist the unit in more easily aggregating and disaggregating data.

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

| N/A |

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AFIs from last visit: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New AFIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) The assessment system has not been developed in collaboration with the professional community.</td>
<td>While the unit has solicited input from various sources including local administrators and a stakeholders group, there is limited evidence of regular meetings of an external advisory committee and no evidence was found regarding the development or evaluation of the unit assessment system by an external group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Recommendation for Standard 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Corrections to the Institutional Report

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

None

### Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

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

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

Yes  
No

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

### 3a. Collaboration between Unit and School Partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaboration between Unit and School Partners – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration between Unit and School Partners – Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The unit has developed partnerships/relationships with multiple school districts in northwestern Indiana and the Southeastern part of the Greater Chicago metro area, including Chicago Public schools. These school districts represent urban, suburban, and rural settings. Other partners include the Education Committee comprised of CCSJ faculty, and the Stake Holders Committee, with members representing local school district administrators, P-12 teachers, unit faculty, and CCSJ candidates. While there was limited written documentation, interviews confirmed the Stake Holders Committee meets three times a year.

The Director of Field Placements is in constant contact with P-12 partners and together, after reviewing traditional undergraduate and graduate Transition to Teaching candidate applications, decides on the placement of each candidate for field experiences and clinical practices. Evidence and interviews confirm that the unit routinely seeks feedback regarding school sites, teacher quality, and candidate performance.
During student teaching, cooperating teachers are responsible for observing the student teacher candidates on a daily basis and provide on-going feedback on how candidates can continue to improve. Formal counseling sessions occur a minimum of two times during the student teaching experience: 1) At the mid-term evaluation period and 2) at the final evaluation period. The cooperating teacher schedules time with the student teacher candidate to review the mid-term or final evaluation. The cooperating teacher explains in detail any deficiencies that the student teacher candidate has and provides strategies by which he or she can improve.

Minutes from meetings, as well as interviews, confirm that the unit faculty and P-12 partners meet formally and informally to discuss the status of field and clinical experience and to suggest any changes and/or improvements deemed necessary. One such suggestion resulted in changing the sequence in MAT courses because it was felt by committee members that candidates needed certain coursework at an earlier stage in order to be better prepared for clinical experiences.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice – Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:**

Field and clinical experiences for undergraduate and graduate Transition to Teaching candidates are designed to be sequential, increasing in the level of difficulty and responsibility. Each experience has clearly stated measurable objectives that are related to the overall goals and objectives of the program. As student teachers, candidates are monitored on a regular basis by school and unit supervisors. Monitoring activities include multiple observations, formative and summative evaluations, and regular communication through e-mails and telephone calls.

Teacher candidates submit three documents prior to receiving a grade for successfully completing each methods course and clinical experience; 1) Field/Clinical Experience Tracking document, 2) Clinical Experience Evaluation form and 3) Clinical Experience Reflection document. Documents, portfolios, artifacts, and interviews confirm that field and clinical placement expectations and outcomes are reviewed periodically and modified as needed.

Candidates are regularly exposed to and utilize technology throughout their coursework, field experiences, observations, and clinical experiences. Candidates and faculty discuss required projects using a variety of technology. All teacher education candidates utilize Blackboard in their course work, field experiences, and clinical experiences. This allows for clear and concise communication between candidates and unit faculty. Other technologies include, but are not limited to, video tapings, Internet research, PowerPoint presentations, a wide range of hardware in several platforms, netbooks, educational software, use of SMART Boards, and use of document cameras. Candidates are regularly
evaluated on their utilization of various technologies.

Prior to admission into student teaching, candidates must have developed a level of competency in content, professional, and pedagogical studies by completing requirements at departmental transition points. Applications for student teaching are due by mid-term of the semester immediately preceding the term in which student teaching will occur. Student teacher candidates must complete and submit a student teaching application by the beginning of the semester prior to student teaching. In addition to submitting the application the teacher candidate must successfully meet the following criteria: submit a current resume; submit an updated Philosophy of Education; pass Praxis I; pass an interview by the Education Committee; have an overall minimum cumulative grade point average of 2.75/4.00; have a minimum grade point average of 3.00/4.00 in professional education and content area courses after acceptance into the Education Department; secure a current criminal history clearance; and complete all prerequisite education and major content courses.

To qualify as a cooperating teacher, the teacher must meet the standards of a highly qualified teacher, hold a practitioners or advanced practitioners license, have a minimum of five years' experience in the subject/grade being requested and be recommended by the building administrator of the school as well as the District School Placement Field Experience Director. Cooperating teachers attend an orientation provided by CCSJ on general guidelines and timelines associated with student teaching placement and are in-serviced to provide productive and on-going feedback to the student teacher, how to counsel the candidate, and procedures for completing the mid-term and final student teaching inventories.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates’ Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates’ Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn – Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Candidate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions are measured by performance on the unit assessment instruments completed by cooperating teachers and unit supervisors during student teaching. Candidates also complete a self-assessment on dispositions.

Candidates, unit supervisors, and school-based faculty are all involved in assessing candidate performance during student teaching. Candidates reflect and assess their strengths and weaknesses on each lesson. Unit supervisors conduct a minimum of four performance-based observations related to unit, state, and professional standards.

Candidates are assessed on the conceptual framework, state standards, and impact on student learning multiple times through classroom experiences, observations, and lesson plan evaluation. Informal and formal student teacher evaluations are completed by cooperating teachers and unit supervisors.
The unit focuses its efforts to provide field experience and clinical practice that involve multiple and diverse opportunities. Opportunities for reflection and feedback are embedded in coursework, and closely aligned with field experiences. Interviews substantiated that initial teacher candidates work with students from diverse populations.

Interviews and assessments confirm that during the student teaching experience, candidates develop knowledge, pedagogical skills, and professional dispositions. Cooperating teachers regularly provide feedback and help the candidates reflect on their experiences as they gradually assume responsibility for the total class experience.

During multiple interviews with P-12 principals, it was repeated several times, that if an opening was coming up in the local school where a CCSJ candidate was student teaching, there would be no hesitation in hiring the candidate on a full-time basis. One principal, on asking to compare CCSJ candidates' qualifications to other institutions' candidates replied, "Well, when I had openings last year, I hired the candidates from CCSJ." He also went on to state that CCSJ candidates, "not only come with open minds, they also come with open hearts and that is noticed by not only the students, but their parents as well."

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Assessment of Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The unit meets the criteria established for field experiences and clinical practice at all levels. Multiple partners work together to provide meaningful experiences for candidates. Candidates have the opportunity to apply their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions in a variety of settings appropriate to the content and level of their programs. They also have the opportunity to systematically examine their impact on P-12 learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Areas for Improvement and Rationales**

**AFIs from last visit: Corrected**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AFIs from last visit: Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New AFIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Recommendation for Standard 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Standard 4: Diversity
The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P–12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P–12 schools.

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

Yes
No

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences – Advanced Preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The unit clearly aligns its 12 conceptual framework proficiencies to IDOE and INTASC standards as well as NBPTS. Confirmed through interviews, documents, and exhibits, information in the IR was validated. Specific to the three major themes of the conceptual framework: preparation, reflection, and transformation (PRT), candidates learn about diversity from a diverse faculty, student body, and required field experiences. Affirmed through course syllabi the diversity curriculum is established and put into practice and assessed across specific professional education courses and field experiences. The latter occur in prescribed locations, where all candidates have experiences with diverse races and ethnicities among students and their families and a range of attributes that include mid-range to low socio-economic diversity, gender, languages, faiths, and exceptionalities.

Six undergraduate education courses as outlined in the course descriptions in the undergraduate catalogue are linked to the development of awareness of diversity issues. These include EDU 313 Child Development, EDU 391 Human Diversity, EDU 400 Children's Literature, EDU 430 The Exceptional Child, EDU 483 Language Arts and Social Studies Methods; and EDU 487 Integrated Arts, Music, PE/Health. In the graduate education program, similar course expectations exist, but in fewer courses as per IDOE limits. Within these curricular and field-based activities, the unit's PRT theme is evident. Assessment data indicate strong candidate scores aligned to diversity and dispositions.

Interviews, candidate artifacts, and exhibits indicate a multitude of opportunities to work in unique areas of the community and provide multiple learning experiences and levels of service to meet the needs of individuals, groups, and organizations locally, nationally, and internationally. While not all candidates participate in each opportunity, all candidates participate overall and interviews provided evidence that the knowledge, skills, and dispositions associated with these experiences are integrated into the instructional program. Candidates indicated the depth with which faculty-guided thinking about social justice challenged their preconceptions, and strongly encouraged them to go beyond their comfort zone as they prepared to teach. Faculty encouragement and program requirements provide numerous opportunities to strengthen course-based expectations.

The top three criteria for student teaching placement are: a culturally diverse environment, evidence of the infusion of technology throughout the curriculum, and school populations of students with exceptionalities. During student teaching multiple observations by faculty and cooperating teachers occur. Student teaching evaluations by college faculty indicate a range of scores from 3.41-3.66/4.0 over three years regarding the candidates' capacities to articulate student goals and expectations, differentiate instruction, develop and teach through a range of resource-based teaching contexts, and effectively use methodologies for teaching diverse populations of students. During this time period, cooperating teachers' evaluations averaged 3.41/4.0. Interviews in the schools with student teachers, cooperating teachers, and administrators confirmed the capacities of candidates to teach, assess, and support student learning in P-12 school settings.

The ACEI report indicated Standard 5.2 collaboration with families, colleagues, and community agencies was not met. Candidate interviews affirmed unevenness in this area of preparation, and the unit is increasing expectations to strengthen candidates' capacities in working with families, colleagues and community agencies.

Interviews and documents indicated the candidates have strong capacities for critical reflection as they analyze interactions with students, instruction, curriculum, and assessment. Candidates speak to the complexities of teaching and learning modeled and discussed by faculty who understand students and schools and enliven teaching through meaningful and current anecdotes, assignments, and feedback. In addition, they underscored their critical reflections and field experiences are transformational in making
career decisions with those who once thought only of employment in suburban schools switching to teach in urban schools.

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

4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty – Initial Teacher Preparation
Acceptable

Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty – Advanced Preparation

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation

Candidate interactions are with professional education faculty and faculty in the schools. Traditional elementary program candidates also have interactions with faculty from other units, but the graduate candidates do not unless a candidate has one or more content area courses needed for licensure. Within the education programs, the IR was validated through exhibits, documents, and interviews indicating candidates interact with males and females, at least two ethnic/racial groups and school faculty from various racial/ethnic groups. Placement of field and clinical experiences are tracked to ensure candidate interactions. The IR Table 8 (p. 50) indicates full- and part-time faculty diversity at 30 percent. School-based faculty diversity is 13 percent.

Interviews, exhibits, and the IR indicate an institutional commitment to hiring diverse faculty. The five-year strategic plan from 2012-2017 indicates a commitment to developing teachers from underrepresented groups to align the teaching force of area schools with their student populations. Concomitantly, an institutional commitment to hiring a diverse faculty was expressed by administrators and faculty members from various departments. In 2001, the unit developed faculty recruitment strategies to offset what was reported as an institution with over 50 percent of the student body being people of color and one full-time faculty member of color. A 2007 task force was charged with "developing policies, procedures and strategies" for hiring and retaining faculty members of color. Faculty training, an updated Equal Opportunity Employer statement, and a uniform resume rating form and interview scoring guide were developed and put into practice. Additional structures to assist faculty hires with promotion and tenure processes were developed along with evaluation structures that assist with retention. Interviews with faculty in other units point to the success of these practices in increasing faculty diversity. Through expected retirements in the near future, the institution expects opportunities to hire from a more diverse pool of faculty candidates.

The faculty and staff hiring processes include a review of an applicant's commitment to the social justice theme and individual actions substantiating that commitment. Through interviews and documents, the expectations of adherence to the institutional theme maintain a consistent employee base that is committed to serving students and the community. Recent work rule changes allow each employee to include three hours a month of work in the community as part of her/his regularly scheduled employment.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:
4c. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation

Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates – Advanced Preparation

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

U.S. News and World Reports indicated that Calumet College is categorically among the most diverse comprehensive colleges in the midwest for the last six years with its student body being 60 percent women and 55 percent from underrepresented groups. In the academic year 2012-2013, the institution will meet the qualifications associated with being a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI). To acquire the distinction as an HSI, Calumet College must have over a time period of three consecutive years at least 25 percent of the student body identified as Hispanic. Data indicate academic years 2009-2012 have met the requirement. Interviews indicated a recent redoubling of efforts to recruit Hispanics from Chicago, and evidence in enrollment management includes recruitment, recruitment materials, and academic advising in both English and Spanish.

Academic Support Services are in place to sustain a diverse student body. Enrollment management includes a careful review of the academic performance of each student, and based upon the review the student is placed into an appropriate learning community with mentors and additional support services that provide first-year students with ample opportunities to be academically and socially successful. These institutional qualities ensure good faith efforts to increase and maintain as much as possible that traditional and non-traditional undergraduate students will matriculate through their respective programs. A corrected Table 9 (pg. 52) indicates 45 percent of the candidates in the program from underrepresented groups and 72 percent are females.

Interviews with candidates suggest that the undergraduate program is more diverse than the graduate program. Regardless, documents, exhibits, and interviews point out candidates work together in courses, on projects, and in field placements.

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

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

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

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

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Candidates within the unit have various opportunities to develop and practice knowledge, skills and
dispositions as related to diversity. Multiple learning activities within and across the six program courses emphasizing diversity include case studies related to diversity, guest speakers, lesson plans and observations that are designed to provide candidates with differentiated understandings of students, their families, and the educational services needed for their success. Understanding of the social justice theme and an indirect assessment of the conceptual framework themes occur during a comparative analysis assignment where candidates analyze educational delivery systems between public and private schools. A significant outreach from the program occurs during the summer reading program where candidates work directly with students and their families to improve reading abilities among K-6 grade students. Access to the program is limited and a waiting list develops each summer with some families waiting years to enroll their child in the program. Interviews of candidates and family members in separate settings affirmed the IR through multiple accolades regarding the Summer Reading Program.

Candidates are placed in diverse schools for both field and clinical experiences including student teaching. All school placements are tracked by the program to ensure candidates have multiple experiences observing and working with P-12 learners. In the graduate education program, candidates use vacation time or put in extra field hours to complete field and clinical experiences in designated schools.

Candidates are assessed by unit faculty through the Student Teaching Inventory and the Student Teaching Assessment Book. Evidence, interviews, and data indicate candidates have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed for working with all students. Education seminars are responsive to changing conditions in the schools and reflect topics suggested by student teachers, teachers, and administrators. Interviews, exhibits, and the IR affirm candidates receive peer feedback through the education seminars, courses, and work in the field.

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

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit has shown a strong commitment to infusing diversity into the curriculum, field and clinical experiences. Through interviews, review of unit documents, and site visits, it is evident that the unit has incorporated clearly defined diversity proficiencies and has worked diligently to incorporate assessments using a variety of methods throughout the preparation program. Unit leadership and faculty have interwoven the curriculum, field, and clinical experiences with emphasis on social justice and learning for all students. Candidates have ample opportunity to interact with diverse peers and faculty.

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

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected
AFIs from last visit: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New AFIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation for Standard 4**

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

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

Table 8 corrected as: Total diverse faculty in the institution n=36.

Table 9 corrected as: (numbers are n, %)

Candidates in the initial teacher preparation programs:
- American Indian or Alaska Native 0, 0%
- Asian 0, 0%
- Black or African American, non-Hispanic 38, 20%
- Hispanic or Latino 38, 20%
- Multi-racial 10, 5%
- White, non Hispanic 103, 55%
- Total 189, 100%

All Students in the Institution
- American Indian or Alaska Native 6, 5%
- Asian 8, 7%
- Black or African American, non-Hispanic 307, 28%
- Hispanic or Latino 302, 27.9%
- Multi-racial 0, 0% [sic]
- White, non Hispanic 457, 42%
- Total 1081, 100% [sic]
Female 531, 49%
Male 550, 51%
Total

Diversity of Geographical Area Served by Institution
American Indian or Alaska Native 315, 0% [sic]
Asian 1,494, 1%
Black or African American, non-Hispanic 27,547, 25%
Hispanic or Latino 19,481, 18%
Multi-racial 5,248, 5%
White, non Hispanic 55,019, 50%
Total 109,104, 100%

Female not reported
Male not reported
Total 109,104, 100%

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development
Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

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

Yes
No

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

5a. Qualified Faculty

| Qualified Faculty – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Qualified Faculty – Advanced Preparation      | Not Applicable |

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

The professional education unit provided evidence of faculty qualifications, performance, and development through several assessments and exhibits. During the 2010-2011 academic year, there were 20 professional education faculty; four tenure-track and seven with terminal degrees. Faculty rank included three associate professors, one assistant professor; and 16 part-time instructors/lecturers. All of the full-time faculty hold terminal degrees and have experience in P-12 schools that are consistent with their current teaching assignments. Two of the external evaluators, which are contracted staff positions, also serve as lecturers/instructors.

The role of clinical supervisor is shared by faculty in the unit, as well as additional part-time adjunct clinical supervisors who are hired and possess many years of P-12 classroom and/or administration...
experience. Principals and the director of field experiences work collaboratively to select school-based faculty. Their qualifications include a minimum of three years of teaching experience. All school-based faculty members who supervise candidates in field experiences and student teaching experiences are licensed in the field they are supervising.

There are three part-time external evaluators, which are considered staff position. However, two of the evaluators are also part-time faculty members. The external evaluators are contracted to work approximately 40-50 hours a semester. Their responsibilities include reviewing applications for admissions into the professional program, portfolio assessment and re-evaluation, participating on unit committees (i.e., Education Committee), interview student teachers, and review and compile data for the unit. They also discuss with faculty candidates' shortcomings and have provided input into redesigning the interview for the graduate program. They report to the Director of Teacher Education.

5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

| Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable |
| Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching – Advanced Preparation | Not Applicable |

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

Based on candidate and faculty interviews and candidate evaluations, professional education faculty have a thorough understanding of the content they teach. Teaching by professional education faculty helps candidates develop the proficiencies outlined in professional, state, and institutional standards and guides candidates in the application of research, theories, and current developments in their content and pedagogy. Faculty align the conceptual framework components, which are identified in most syllabi, to the expected outcomes and to the standards of three professional educational organizations (INTASC, NBPTS, and ACEI). This is evident through syllabi, coursework, fieldwork, internships, and student teaching. Student teachers provide a reflective analysis of their teaching video and reflection, critical thinking and problem solving are monitored using journals, position papers, interview assignments and personal philosophies.

Faculty members model a variety of instructional strategies through their teaching, including co-teaching, direct and hybrid instruction, cooperative learning, online instruction, integration of technology, simulations and development of rubrics. Various assessment techniques are modeled which include comprehensive exams, projects, case studies, research papers, formative and summative evaluations. Technology is modeled and integrated throughout their teaching, beginning early in the sequence of the undergraduate and graduate programs. All courses use Blackboard Learn+ and integrate the following applications in their instruction: Grade Quick, E-Portfolio, Kidspiration, Diagnostic Online Reading Assessment, and others. MAT candidates are required to take a technology course. Diversity and multicultural education is also integrated throughout the undergraduate and graduate programs, including service learning projects. At the end of each course, candidates also evaluate their learning and the effectiveness of instruction and provide feedback using a rating instrument. This feedback is reviewed by each faculty member, as well as the department chair and the VPAA.

5c. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship

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

| Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship – Advanced Preparation | Not Applicable |
Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship – Advanced Preparation

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

According to the CCSJ Faculty Handbook, scholarly achievement includes research products, publications, presentations, grants, software/technology development, and applied research. CCSJ is dedicated to the academic, spiritual and ethical development of students. Faculty scholarly activities align with the institution's mission and unit's conceptual framework. Evidence verifies that faculty scholarly activities include workshops, publications, and grants at the institutional, local, regional, state, and national levels. All faculty share their knowledge professionally at conferences, through peer reviews, round table discussions, grant writing, and development of new programs.

5d. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service – Initial Teacher Preparation

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service – Advanced Preparation

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

The institution's and unit's mission both share common principles for fostering social justice. To further the mission of social justice, many faculty serve on various boards in the community, as well as model professional service through local and international community service participation. This includes participation in the rebuilding of New Orleans and work in Guatemala. Service to the college is evident through participation on advisory boards, committee chair assignments, workshop presentations, and membership on various college and unit committees. The unit collaborates with P-12 school teachers and administrators, as well as being active with many professional organizations. Service is embedded in the tenure process for faculty. The faculty is responsible for developing and initiating student service learning projects as well as actively participating in service of their choice.

Clinical faculty demonstrate contemporary professional experience through their expertise in P-12 classroom activities and provide professional development workshops to P-12 teachers and students. The clinical faculty members have been classroom teachers as well as administrators and work closely with schools through observations, workshops, supervision, and leadership.

5e. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance – Initial Teacher Preparation

Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance – Advanced Preparation

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

The evaluation process begins with the annual review being submitted by faculty to the appropriate
program director and department chair. Every faculty member develops an Annual Plan for Professional Development. This plan serves as the foundation of the Annual Self-Evaluation process for all faculty and reflects the standards discussed in the CCSJ Handbook. Using this information, as well as student evaluations and other documentation, the program chair, VPAA and department chair evaluate the performance of the faculty during the previous year.

Evaluation of performance is one of the essential factors in determinations concerning tenure, promotion, reappointment, and merit raises. The Annual Self Evaluation and Merit Review requires faculty to identify annual goals in teaching, scholarship, and service. The majority of unit faculty (as rated by candidates on course evaluations, or Student Instructor Rating Instruments) score in the Agree or Strongly Agree categories, indicating faculty members perform well on teaching evaluations. The response rates have been low; however the College anticipate an increase in the response rates as they transition to an online survey. Faculty evaluation ratings are analyzed and aggregated in three ways: (1) by evaluation item, (2) by course name, and (3) by course level.

5f. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Facilitation of Professional Development – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Facilitation of Professional Development – Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Faculty course evaluations are completed after each course and interviews are conducted annually with each full time faculty members with the VPAA; part-time faculty are observed and evaluated by their respective program director. Feedback from course evaluations is provided to faculty within a few weeks of course completion. Faculty also participate in various professional development activities. These include activities in technology, classroom management, assessment, and diversity.

As part of the annual evaluation process, faculty members identify areas for improvement, which usually then generates the request for professional development support to the director. The director will then forward the request to the Office of the VPAA. According to an interview with the vice president of finance, no request for professional development has been denied.

**Overall Assessment of Standard**

Faculty are qualified for their positions 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 P-12 schools. The unit systematically evaluates performance and facilitates professional development.

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

**Areas for Improvement and Rationales**
AFIs from last visit: Corrected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

AFIs from last visit: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

New AFIs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Recommendation for Standard 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Not Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources
The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

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

Yes

No

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

6a. Unit Leadership and Authority
The Department of Education serves as the unit for the preparation of teachers and is one of the three largest programs in the College. The Chair of the Department of Teacher Education is the unit head and reports directly to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The department chair has the responsibilities for managing, coordinating, planning, delivering, and operating all education programs. The governing structure also includes the Education Committee, which is comprised of the Department Chair, program directors, unit faculty representatives, unit staff representatives, faculty and staff from the college, a cooperating school representative, and candidate representatives. This committee meets monthly, and evidence and interviews indicate that they participate in program design, implementation, and evaluation of the unit and its programs. The unit also regularly collaborates with the Office of Enrollment Services, Information Technology, Academic Support and the library.

Unit admission and degree requirements are clearly and consistently described in College catalogs, departmental materials, and online resources. Additionally, information regarding the application process and key transition points within programs are clearly articulated in unit materials. Student support includes tutoring, mentoring, career services, a writing lab, and three computer labs. A full time faculty member provides advising for all undergraduate students. Candidates in MAT programs are advised by program directors.

Full-time faculty participate in weekly meetings where issues are discussed, analyzed, and communicated to/from external stakeholders. External stakeholders include administrators and teachers of area schools who provide feedback concerning ways the unit can continuously improve programs for preparation of new teachers. Stakeholder meetings are held annually to discuss new and innovative ideas for continuous improvement of the unit. Community partners, also external partners, share resources and expertise to meet shared goals during stakeholder meetings.

6b. Unit Budget

The financial status of the College is stable, but tuition-driven. Unit budgets are developed based upon need and faculty members who request funding for professional development activities have been awarded funds. Although there are no other units comparable to the Department of Education at the college, evidence indicates that funding is adequate to support curricular programs and support the preparation of candidates to meet standards. The unit budget supports teaching, scholarship, and services that extend beyond the unit to the P-12 community. Support for the unit consists of one full-time and one part-time staff member. According to documentation (Education Department Expenses 2009-2011) the unit's expenses were 4.23% of the total college expenses. The decrease in the unit's expenses in fiscal year 2011 resulted from an unfunded faculty position, which was eliminated based on the closing of a
6c. Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel – Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):
The unit follows the campus-wide policies concerning faculty workload, tenure and promotion, and other faculty-related matters as described in the Faculty Handbook. Although the normal teaching load is 24 semester hours per academic year, faculty in the Department of Education are on 12-month contracts, and their teaching load is 36 semester hours per year. For supervision of student teaching, five candidates equate to a 3-hour course. Part-time faculty are selected based on recommendations, background, and expertise in content area. They are provided an annual orientation where expectations are discussed. Part time faculty are evaluated annually and they are mentored by full-time faculty, who also observe their classroom teaching effectiveness. Release time is available for the department chair, the candidate adviser, and the program directors. Workload policies encourage faculty to engage in a wide range of professional activities which include teaching, service, research, and creative activities.

6d. Unit Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Facilities – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Facilities – Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):
The main campus consists of a seven-story building which houses administrative offices, faculty offices, classrooms, three computer labs, the library, a cafeteria, support offices (e.g. registrar, financial aid, tutoring, etc.), bookstore, and chapel. Evidence indicates that classrooms, faculty offices, library, and other university facilities adequately support the various research, teaching, and learning activities of the candidates and faculty members. Full-time faculty members have their own offices with Internet access and faculty computers are replaced every four to five years. Construction is being done in the library to expand its facilities and service. A three-story, attached extension is also being constructed to house additional classrooms, the science lab and student services.

6e. Unit Resources including Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Resources including Technology – Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Resources including Technology – Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):
Preparation:
Many classrooms are equipped with ceiling-mounted projectors, computers with online access, and TV/VCR/DVD capabilities. The unit has obtained technological hardware and equipment to enhance classroom instruction, including portable Smart Boards, and Elmos. The 5-year technology plan includes a life cycle for faculty and staff computers, expanding wireless connections throughout the campus, and maintenance of existing infrastructure. Evidence reviewed indicates that the university technology infrastructure that provides communication software and course management software is stable and maintained. Many classrooms are equipped with ceiling-mounted projectors, computers with online access, and TV/VCR/DVD capabilities.

Through interview with library staff and a tour of the facility, the team confirmed that the library houses over 100,000 volumes. They are currently going through some substantial renovations that include updating many of their out-of-date documents, and reorganizing space within the facility. A room within the library has been designated for educational resource materials and includes copies of the Indiana State P-12 textbook collection. Although a formal process is not in place, departments request resources online or in person. According to the interim director of the library, the education unit receives the largest percent of the requests, primarily because they request more resources. There are reciprocal agreements with other universities in the area, which benefits all students, especially the MAT candidates. The library is opened during times that are conducive for both the traditional day programs, as well as the Saturday programs, which allows it to serve the surrounding communities.

Overall Assessment of Standard
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. The unit has designed, established, and maintains a structure and governance system for planning, delivering, and evaluating programs that includes school practitioners as well as faculty and administrators in other units of the institution. The budget adequately supports the unit through professional development funds, technology support and operating expenses.

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

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AFIs from last visit: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New AFIIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Recommendation for Standard 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Teacher Preparation</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Preparation</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

IV. SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

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

Documents Reviewed

Persons Interviewed

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence List With Initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview Sign In Sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Sign in Sheets #2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Attachments panel below.

(Optional) State Addendum: