



Glenda Ritz, NBCT

Indiana Superintendent of Public Instruction

MEMORANDUM

TO: Indiana State Board of Education

FROM: Scott Bogan, Coordinator of Educator Preparation

DATE: October 25, 2016

SUBJECT: New Program Proposal from Huntington University – Agriculture Education

A new program proposal from Huntington University in Career and Technical Education: Agriculture was submitted to the IDOE for review. Reviewers examined all components of the proposal and utilized the attached *New Program Proposal Assessment Rubric*. It is the conclusion of the review team and, pursuant to 511 IAC 13-1-1, Sec. 1, (d)*, the recommendation of the IDOE that the Indiana State Board of Education approve the following program proposal:

Huntington University – Career and Technical Education – Agriculture (5-12)

The IDOE will continue to monitor the progress of the above program by reviewing all annual reports required of Huntington University, including candidate performance data submitted to the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) and the IDOE.

* (d) The department will review and make the recommendation to the board regarding the status of all newly proposed licensing programs and reviews of existing licensure programs applying for approved status.

Huntington University
Proposal for a New Agricultural Education Program
To Address Content Standards for Indiana CTE—Agriculture

Standard 1: Rationale

1.1 Program Description

Huntington University wishes to propose a new course of studies at Huntington University in Agricultural Education. This program would address the Indiana Content Standards for Career and Technical Education—Agriculture. The program is intended to prepare graduates for licensure in this area, to teach in a secondary or middle school program in agriculture.

Huntington University is a comprehensive Christian college of the liberal arts offering graduate and undergraduate programs in more than 70 academic concentrations. U.S. News & World Report ranks Huntington among the best colleges in the Midwest.

Huntington University began instruction in agriculture in the 2015-16 academic year. Students can major in Agribusiness, focusing their studies in one of eight tracks within the Agribusiness major: Agrimanagement, Agrimarketing, Agrieconomics & Finance, Agripreneurial Small Business Management, Crop Production, Animal Production, Ministry & Missions, and Communications & Public Policy. Courses in place for this major include agricultural sciences such as crop science, animal science, agroecology, soils, etc., as well as business courses and basic science courses in biology, chemistry, and statistics. Students are required to take internships for credit, which are coordinated through the University's Enterprise Resource Center.

The proposed program in Agricultural Education would include courses in Agribusiness and Education that are already being offered, as well as new courses in Ag Education and additional courses in Agriculture that will provide the breadth of academic and practical experience needed by Ag Ed graduates. Instruction will be campus-based, but will also include hands-on vocational skills instruction through local education partnerships and field experiences in agriculture through internships. This program in Agricultural Education will become the newest component of a well-respected Educator Preparation Program at Huntington University. The HU program has been continuously accredited by NCATE for 22 years, with the last accreditation visit in 2013 resulting in all standards met, with only one AFP (Area for Improvement) in the undergraduate program and one in the graduate program.

1.2 Needs Assessment Data

The agribusiness sector in Indiana is large and diverse, with agriculture having an estimated total annual economic impact of \$38 billion, and providing nearly 190,000 jobs in the state (Indiana Business Research Center at IU's Kelley School of Business). With the importance of agriculture in the state, there are more than 150 high schools offering agricultural education courses. There is a shortage of agriculture instructors for high schools. Huntington University already has an excellent education program and this new program represents an opportunity for us to meet a need in the state by training future ag teachers.

In the most recent Purdue/USDA 5-year outlook of employment opportunities for graduates in food, agriculture, renewable natural resources and the environment, there are projected to be 57,900 job openings annually for the next 5 years in those fields, with only 35,400 graduates trained for those jobs. For the combined education, communication, and governmental services sector, 7,200 job openings are expected *each year*, with only 55% of that number being filled by trained graduates. The authors of that study write, "Graduates will find excellent employment opportunities for agriscience teachers in high schools and middle schools. Graduates in agricultural education have skills that qualify them for a wide range of occupations. Because about one-third of the graduates chose occupations other than teaching, schools face an ongoing shortage of qualified high school and middle school teachers."

(www.purdue.edu/usda/employment)

Standard 2: Curriculum

2.1 Matrix aligning program to appropriate educator standards

	Core (Gen. Education)	Professional Education																																			
		All-Teacher Education						AgEd-Specific Educ.				Content-Specific Courses																									
 Huntington University AgEd Content Courses Indiana Educator Standards: CTE-Ag 	EN121 Writing	CO215 Speech	PY111 Psychology	EB211 Macroeconomics	CH141/ Biochem.	BI161/ Cell Biology	MA151 Prob. Stats	ED236 Ed Psychology	SE234 Except. Adoles.	ED364 Assessment Secondary	ED395 Multicult. Pract.	ED440 Topics Problems	ED460 Student Teaching	AE212 Found. Ag Ed	AE296 Soph. Pract. Ag Ed	AE311 Early Adol. Curr./Meth	AE320 Adol. Curr./Meth	ED410A Ag Ed Curr./Meth	AG111 Intro Ag	*AG121 Welding	*AG131 Constr. Maint	*AG141 Ag Machinery	AG221/ Crop Science	*AG231/ Animal Science	*AG241 Agroecology	*AG251 Food Science	*AG331 Soil/Weather Science	*AG335 Crop Pest Manag.	AG495 Internship Ag	elective Crop/An. Sci.	*BA232 Acctg./Fin for Entrepr.	BA252 Bus. Org. Mgt	*BA343 Marketing Ag Prod.	BI321/ Genetics			
1. Agricultural Business, Economics, Finance, and Marketing			X																X														X	X	X		
2. Animal Science					X	X													X				X	X				X	X								
3. Plant and Soil Science					X	X													X				X	X		X	X	X	X								
4. Food Science					X	X													X					X													
5. Genetics and Biotechnology						X													X			X	X				X								X		
6. Agric. Mechanics, Engineering, Construction, and Technology																			X	X	X																
7. Environmental Science and Natural Resources Management																			X				X	X	X		X										
8. Core Knowledge and Skills for Agriculture Teachers	X	X	X				X								X	X	X	X																			
9. Agricultural Education Program														X	X		X	X																			
10. Agriculture Instruction and Assessment	X	X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X																			
* Newly added courses with no predecessor; described as course proposals rather than syllabi																																					

2.2 Syllabi for Required Courses. These are attached separately as zipped file and grouped in folders that mirror the matrix headers.

Table of courses instructing and assessing program candidates for various topics

Topic	Course Syllabus Reference
Assessment	ED 236, ED 364, ED 410AE
Cultural Competency	ED 236, ED 395
Technology Integration	AE 320, ED 395
SBRR/SBRI	AE 320

Standard 3: Clinical and Field Based Experiences

3.1 Location and Learner Contact:

Field experiences are an integral part of the teacher education program and crucial for enabling candidates to apply content and pedagogical knowledge to real learning environments. All components of the Conceptual Framework and all content standards and developmental standards for a candidate's licensing area are applied in a well-designed sequence of field experiences, giving candidates experiences in an essential variety of grade levels and cultural environments. Field experiences early in the program give candidates contact with the local high school. Junior level field experiences for candidates are linked to methods courses. The multiple field experiences described below ensure thorough applications of content and theory and serve as excellent preparation for student teaching.

All candidates experience a total of **almost 200 hours** of early field experience in addition to **14 weeks** of Student Teaching Experience.

The designated field experience courses for Agricultural Education candidates are described below:

☐ **AE 296 Sophomore Practicum Middle School & High School (30 hrs.)**. This course normally occurs either in the fall or spring semester of the sophomore year. This early field experience occurs in a Middle or High School classroom aligned with the candidates' Agricultural content area. Candidates schedule two hours per-week over the course of the 15 week semester in the classroom. During this time they are required to observe classroom activities and interact with students/faculty.

☐ **AE 311 Early Adolescent Curriculum and Methodology (30 hrs.)**. This course normally occurs in the fall semester of the junior year and has an imbedded field experience. This early field experience occurs in a Middle School classroom aligned with the candidates' Agricultural content area. Candidates schedule three hours per-week over the course of a ten week period in the classroom and are required to manage classroom activities, interact with students/faculty and deliver lessons in their content area.

☐ **ED 395 Multicultural Practicum (96 hrs.)**. This course normally occurs in the January-term of the junior year. This early field experience occurs in a diverse setting. It is an immersion experience where candidates are working with Agriculture teachers from the start to the end of the academic day, over a two-and-a-half week period. During this time, they are required to manage classroom activities and interact with students and faculty. In addition, they attend seminars designed specifically to improve candidates' cultural competency.

☐ **ED 410AE Secondary Curriculum and Methodology (40 hrs.)**. This course normally occurs in the fall semester of the senior year. This course is designed as the final secondary field experience before student teaching. Candidates are placed with a High School Agriculture class for a period of six weeks every day during the middle portion of the semester. During this time they are required to manage classroom activities, interact with students/faculty and deliver lessons in the content area. This field placement is supported by ongoing seminars.

☐ **ED 460 Student Teaching in Secondary Schools (14 weeks)**. This course normally occurs in the candidates' senior year for the equivalent of fourteen weeks. As the final field experience prior to graduating, the candidates are expected to function fully as an Agriculture teacher. Their responsibilities include planning and implementation of all the lessons occurring during the academic day and management of students during the course of various daily activities. During this time candidates are supervised by cooperating teachers and university supervisors.

The above field experiences have clearly stated objectives related to candidates' knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions outlined in the Conceptual Framework and in state, national, and professional standards. Candidate performance in these field experiences are evaluated by a comprehensive assessment system which aggregates data on both teaching performance and professional dispositions and uses the data to inform the unit on program quality and changes needed for program improvement.

3.2 Supervision:

The program's field experiences are the product of continuing collaborative efforts between the unit and program stakeholders. Huntington University's close relationship with the local school corporations greatly enhances mutual understanding concerning field experiences. The unit works closely with teachers and principals and regularly invites them each semester to breakfast meetings of the Teacher Education Professional Advisory Council (TEPAC). TEPAC and other meetings each year continue to allow for fresh input from school personnel on the design of field experiences. School personnel have a good understanding of, and a sense of, active partnership in Huntington University field experience expectations, policies, and procedures. All major field experiences have handbooks and specific evaluation forms that guide candidates, university supervisors, cooperating teachers, and principals in expectations and evaluation criteria. Huntington University, the only college in the county, enjoys a long-term, close relationship with the Huntington County Community School Corporation, the only school corporation in the county. Further, the city of Fort Wayne, the second-largest city in Indiana, is only about 25 miles away from the University, offering excellent experiences with a greater ethnic and cultural diversity than is available in most other schools in the area. The unit has clear understandings with the Huntington County Community School Corporation (HCCSC) for how the various field experiences are to be arranged. The proximity of the schools and the long standing collaboration between the University and HCCSC results in a large number of placements in the county schools, both for early experiences and for student teaching. This strong collaboration has progressed to the point that HCCSC no longer places any student teacher from Huntington University with a cooperating teacher until that teacher has been cleared by the unit's Director of Teacher Education.

The University Supervisor for Agricultural Education (to be named) will be a full time faculty member of Huntington University with a master's degree or higher in Agricultural Education and substantial experience teaching high school agriculture.

Attachment 3.2a: Letter from Director of Clinical Experiences re: cooperating teacher qualifications.

Attachment 3.2b: The Student Teaching Handbook is the syllabus for ED460, which can also be found among the collection of course syllabi that is included with this proposal package.

3.3 Candidate Impact on Student Learning:

In addition to the feedback from supervisors and cooperating teachers in the early field experiences, all candidates are required to submit a Teacher Work Sample, completed during the 14 week student teaching experience.

Successful teacher candidates support learning by designing a Teacher Work Sample that employs a range of strategies and builds on each student's strengths, needs, and prior experiences. Through this performance assessment, teacher candidates provide credible evidence of their ability to facilitate learning by meeting the following TWS standards:

1. The teacher uses information about the learning-teaching context and student individual differences to set goals, objectives, and plan instruction and assessment.
2. The teacher sets significant, challenging, varied, and appropriate goals and objectives.
3. The teacher uses multiple assessment modes and approaches aligned with the goals and objectives to assess student learning before, during, and after instruction.
4. The teacher designs instruction for specific objectives, student characteristics and needs, and learning contexts.
5. The teacher uses regular and systematic evaluations of student learning to make instructional decisions.
6. The teacher uses assessment data to profile student learning and communicate information about student progress and achievement.
7. The teacher reflects on his or her instruction and student learning in order to improve teaching practice.

Attachment 3.3. The six page scoring rubric for the TWS

3.4 Diversity and Grade Level Coverage:

In addition to the close relationships and many field experience opportunities with the Huntington schools, the unit also has positive relationships and an excellent reputation with the school corporations in surrounding counties. Although Fort Wayne schools host field experience candidates from a number of colleges and universities in the surrounding area, Huntington University candidates are always welcomed for student teaching, spring Junior Block practicum, and the January Multicultural Practicum described below. Fort Wayne Community School Corporation administrators have been guest speakers in the seminars connected with the Multicultural Practicum. Huntington University contracts with 19 different school districts that are generally located in counties contiguous to Huntington County. These 19 districts represent approximately 154 elementary, middle, and high schools. Candidates teaching in these schools engage a range of cultural settings: rural, suburban and urban. The diversity represented is on a continuum from minimal diversity found in rural schools, which are predominantly white, English

speakers to the multiple racial/ethnic-mix found in Fort Wayne schools. Fort Wayne also provides an unusual degree of language diversity for a city of its size, with 79 languages represented in the school system. The HU Department of Education prides itself in the substantive practicum experiences offered to its teacher candidates. It is our goal, through Early Field Experiences, to have candidates who are confident of their teaching abilities prior to student teaching, and to have candidates after student teaching who consistently exhibit the capacity to positively impact P-12 student learning.

In terms of grade level coverage, the field experiences identified in 3.1 above contain a mixture of middle school and high school placements. AE 311 field experiences always take place in a middle school setting. If a candidate indicates that his/her student teaching experience will be at the high school level, then the ED 395 field experience will also be conducted at the middle school level. If a middle school placement is requested for student teaching, the ED 395 field experience will be at the high school level. AE 296 may be either middle school or high school, but is typically high school. ED 410AE is a high school experience.

Standard 4: Evaluation

4.1 Unit Assessment System (UAS) program evaluation:

Assessment and evaluation of teacher education candidates is centered on three Checkpoints. The Huntington University Undergraduate Teacher Candidate Program Checkpoints are designed to meet three purposes. 1. They provide the HU Department of Education an ongoing set of benchmarks from which to provide feedback to individual candidates on their progress through the program, a means of assessing the effectiveness of courses, and a general program evaluation. A developing unit assessment system is used to capture data from each of these checkpoints for analysis and interpretation. 2. They meet NCATE 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 programs¹. 3. They meet the requirements of an assessment system under Article 3 Performance-Based Process for Accreditation of Teacher Preparation Programs (515 IAC 3-1-1) of Title 515 Advisory Board of the Division of Professional Standards of the Indiana Administrative Code.

The Checkpoints and the various components of each Checkpoint are considered dynamic in that they are consistently being reviewed and updated to best meet the aforementioned conditions. In addition to aggregating data for EPP program evaluation and improvement, data may be disaggregated by individual content area for program assessment.

The Huntington University UAS was chosen as the “target” standard in a 2013 NCATE accreditation report and visit. The final BOE report rated the UAS as “Moving Toward Target” and meeting all requirements of the standard. The following is an excerpt from the BOE’s evaluation of the UAS in its final report. The entire report is available on the Huntington University website.

Documents and through interviews with the assessment committee revealed that the unit addresses fairness, accuracy, and consistency of data by the following:

- (1) Candidates are interviewed and scored by two unit faculty during the admission process
- (2) All candidates have dispositional assessments from multiple cooperating teachers in multiple field experiences.
- (3) All candidates have teaching evaluations from multiple early field placements with different cooperating teachers and university supervisors.
- (4) All candidates in the student teaching experience receive multiple teaching evaluations from both the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor.
- (5) All candidates have multiple evaluators on important components such as unit plans and lesson plans.

Also, the unit showed that assessment data gathered and analyzed are based on mean scores drawn directly from the raw scores of various components of the program. Mean scores are based on raw data drawn from standardized tests, such as the various Praxis scores. Other mean scores are based on program generated instruments such as teaching evaluations and dispositional assessments.

Faculty and administrators indicated that changes to the UAS were necessary to better monitor the effectiveness of the assessment system and expand the scope of its electronic database. Documents show unit personnel and its stakeholders restructured the assessment system from four checkpoints to three. According to documents, the change based upon self-examination of the system indicated that there were elements overlapping different checkpoints and there was lack of clarity about who was responsible for monitoring and evaluating some elements.

Decisions about candidate performance in the program are made at each of the three checkpoints based on multiple assessments from both internal and external sources. The IR and electronic exhibits show candidate proficiencies are aligned with institutional, state, and national standards. The three-point system offers assessments at both the initial and advanced levels, and these assessments are aligned with the conceptual framework.

Onsite interviews with unit personnel validated offsite exhibits and reports showing at the initial level, multiple assessments across three assessment points yield a variety of candidate performance data from both internal and external sources during each semester. Additionally, unit faculty and the data manager explained how data are collected, beginning when a candidate applies for admission to the teacher education program. Further, unit faculty and the data manager explained how artifacts are collected throughout a candidate's progress through the program and maintained in an extensive database.

The unit identified the following as three key assessment checkpoints: Checkpoint 1 - Admission to the Program, Checkpoint 2 - Application to Student Teaching, and Checkpoint 3 - Program Completion. Conversations with unit faculty provided evidence and clear explanations of how all checkpoints are assessed and findings are used for continuous program and unit improvement.

Unit exhibits and other document show the assessment system provides both qualitative and quantitative data, data from coursework and field experiences, data relating to both academic performance and professional dispositions, and data from both University and P-12 sources. Assessment system data are comprehensive which allows the unit to accurately evaluate candidate performance throughout the candidate's program. Further, outstanding candidate performance on important summative assessments like Praxis II, Student Teaching, Teacher Work Samples, and other data found in the SPA Reports provide evidence not only of the quality of the program and its candidates, but also the effectiveness of the assessment system in providing data necessary to monitor and assure candidate progress.

In addition to the three checkpoints, the unit has in place an exit survey, graduate survey, and a Biennial Checkpoint Report to provide additional data to support candidate performance. Exit surveys of candidates give the unit immediate feedback from program completers on the quality of instruction, effectiveness of field experience, and other factors relating to program quality. The unit conducts a graduate survey with program completers one year, four years, and seven years after their graduation. This survey continues to give valuable feedback about program quality from program completers who have the added benefit of classroom experience to inform their responses. The Biennial Checkpoint Report gives a review at the end of each two-year period of the previous five-year time period. The report focuses on program admission information, a review of the checkpoint information for the last five years, and detailed reporting of data from both the exit survey and the graduate survey for the five-year period of the report. (NCATE Board of Examiners Report on Huntington University, 2013)

Checkpoint 1: Admission to the Program. This checkpoint normally occurs mid-way through the second semester of the sophomore year. The candidate must: meet adequate admission requirements (see chart below), demonstrate dispositions appropriate for success in the teacher education program (additionally, special education candidates demonstrate appropriate intention to work with exceptional learners), and demonstrate both oral and written communication skills. Evaluation of these criteria is completed initially through an admission interview. Two interviewers (members of the Teacher Education Committee (TEC)) review written application materials and conduct an interview. The interview is conducted using a form listing 18 potential questions, all tied to INTASC Standards and the Teacher as Effective Steward conceptual framework. Final review of the candidate for admission, upon the recommendation of the interviewers, is determined by the TEC which will recommend admit, defer, or deny. The asterisk (*) denotes documents to be maintained and updated for eventual inclusion in the Reflective Portfolio (Checkpoint 3).

Checkpoint 1: Admission to the Program

Event/Assignment	Criteria	Alignment	Evaluator	Checkpoint Verification
Resume*	Evidence of work experiences, especially with children	Steward: K, D, E, I ² InTASC: 2, 9 ³	Interviewer	Adequate Inadequate
Autobiography*	Adequate writing skills, dispositions and stewardship potential		Interviewer	Adequate Inadequate
Diversity Statement*	Experience with ethnic or racial diversity addressed		Interviewer	Adequate Inadequate
Grade Point Averages	2.5 for both major GPA and all-college cumulative GPA	Steward: K,D, E InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4	TEC	GPA's above 2.5: All-College: Y N Major: Y N
Recommendations from two faculty or staff	Positive on key dispositions like responsibility, dedication, and child-centeredness. Recommendation forms reflect InTASC Standards including dispositions	Steward: D, E InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10	TEC	Recommendations endorse the applicant Both Just One Neither
Core Academic Performance Assessment	State requires a minimum score of 220 on each of the CASA tests or tests are waived if sufficient SAT or ACT scores are achieved. (SAT 1100, ACT 24)	Steward: K InTASC: 4	TEC	Requirement met: Y N
Interview	InTASC and CF-based set of interview questions, focused especially on dispositions, experiences, understanding of CF, and communication skills.	Steward K, D InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 10	Interviewer	Interviewers assess applicant's interview: Adequate Inadequate
Criminal History Check	No criminal history	Steward: D, I InTASC: 10	Dept. Secretary	Criminal history check OK? Yes or No

² Steward refers to the sub-components of the HU Conceptual Framework, Teacher as Effective Steward: K-Knowledge, D-Development, E-Environments, I-Instruction

³ InTASC refers to the 2010 InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards

Checkpoint 2: Application to Student Teach. Normally occurring during the first semester of the junior year, this checkpoint consists of the application for student teaching. The candidate must demonstrate on-going good standing in the program, provide all materials required for application. The Director of Clinical Experiences (DCE) is responsible for reviewing material previously determined adequate (see Checkpoint 1) and evaluating newly submitted material.

Checkpoint 2: Application to Student Teaching

Event/Assignment	Criteria	Alignment	Evaluator	Checkpoint Verification
Updated – Resume*	Evidence of most recent experiences & work experiences, especially with children, error-free	Steward: K, D, E InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10	DCE	Adequate Inadequate
Autobiography*	Previous adequate evaluation, error-free		DCE	Adequate Inadequate
Philosophy Statement*	Adequate writing skills, dispositions and stewardship potential, error-free		Intro. to Ed. Inst. & DCE	Adequate Inadequate
Spec. Ed. Phil. Statement*	Adequate writing skills, dispositions and stewardship potential related to special needs	Steward: K, D, E, I InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 5, 9, 10 CEC Standard 1	Spec. Ed. Inst. & DCE	Adequate Inadequate
Program Good Standing	Good standing in the program (2.5 gpa’s, C- or above in all required courses, successful field experiences)	Steward: K, D, E InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10	Dept. Secretary	GPA’s above 2.5: All-College: Y N Major: Y N
Sophomore Practicum	Professionalism (dispositions), reliability, potential, stewardship of knowledge and learning	Steward: K, D, E, I InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10	Practicum Inst.	The Soph. Practicum evaluation was: Adequate Inadequate
Disposition Evaluation	Adequate disposition evaluations from field placements and education coursework demonstrating professional development	Steward: D, E InTASC 9, 10	Practicum & Course Inst.	Adequate Inadequate (if needed) Responded positively to Dispositional Hearing? Y N

4.2 Evaluation of student teaching:

Checkpoint 3: Program Completion. This checkpoint normally occurs upon completion of student teaching and prior to the date of graduation.

The candidate must demonstrate on-going good standing in the program, acceptable dispositions and successful completion of each required assignment as listed in the Student Teacher handbook and below. The candidate’s university supervisor and cooperating teacher have the primary evaluation responsibilities for this checkpoint. The Teacher Work Sample, Lesson Evaluations, and Final Evaluations are designed to assess both the candidate’s content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge, as evaluated by the university supervisor and cooperating teacher.

Checkpoint 3: Program Completion

Event/Assignment	Criteria	Alignment	Evaluator	Checkpoint Verification
Student teaching journal	Daily analysis and self-critique	Steward: K, D, E, I InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10	Univ. Supervisor	Adequate Inadequate
Teaching of lessons during student teaching	Self-designed lesson plans implemented in assigned field settings resulting in acceptable or above field based evaluations	Steward: K, D, E, I InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 5, 7, 8, 9	Univ. Supervisor & Coop. Teacher	Field based evaluations Acceptable or above Not acceptable (see Attachment 4.2a Lesson Evaluation)
Student Teaching mid-term evaluation	Acceptable or above in all of the evaluation components (InTASC aligned)	Steward: K, D, E, I InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10	Coop. Teacher	Mid-term Evaluation Acceptable or above Not Acceptable (see Attachment 4.2b Mid-term Evaluation Form)
Student Teaching final evaluation	Acceptable or above in all of the evaluation components (InTASC aligned)	Steward: K, D, E, I InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10	Coop. Teacher	Final Evaluation C+ or above Not Acceptable (see Attachment 4.2c Final Evaluation Form)
Teacher Work Sample	Acceptable scores in each of the 8 components of the TWS rubric		Univ. Supervisor	Final Evaluation – Rubric C+ or above Not Acceptable (see Attachment 3.3 TWS rubric)
Reflective Portfolio	Acceptable scores in each of the 7 components of the Reflective Portfolio rubric	Steward: K, D, E, I InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10	Univ. Supervisor	Final Evaluation – Rubric C+ or above Not Acceptable
Disposition Evaluation	Adequate disposition evaluations from field placements and education coursework demonstrating professional development	Steward: D, E InTASC 9, 10	Practicum & Course Inst.	Adequate Inadequate (if needed) Responded positively to Dispositional Hearing Y N
Special education	Special education candidates demonstrate additional skills, dispositions, and field experiences with special needs learners (see criteria below)	Steward: K, D, E, I InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10 CEC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10	Univ. Supervisor	Final Evaluation C+ or above Not Acceptable

•Special education candidates will also include a reflection/evaluation of a team meeting, evidence of collaboration for meeting the needs of exceptional learners, additional examples of lesson plan modification, and evidence of monitoring IEP progress.

Attachment 4.2a. Lesson Evaluation

Attachment 4.2b. Mid-term Evaluation Form (also found in Student Teaching Handbook)

Attachment 4.2c. Final Evaluation Form (also found in Student Teaching Handbook)

Attachment 3.3 TWS rubric

Standard 5: Governance

Leadership and Authority: Huntington University's Education Department has the leadership and authority to plan, deliver, and operate coherent programs. The department is small and can make and implement decisions quickly. The department meets weekly for a business meeting and deals with program issues on a continual basis. The department has the same level of autonomy enjoyed by the other academic departments at the University. Policies and program design are the purview of departments. The unit successfully made changes in the elementary, secondary, and all-grade programs to adjust to the changing landscape of Indiana licensing standards in 2010. New programs go through a standard approval process: Education Department (with input from TEC and TEPAC); Academic Division ; Academic Concerns Committee; and the University faculty. The unit regularly collaborates on program design and revisions with other departments, its division, and public school personnel. Each department in the University is part of a division and must get approval from its respective division and the Academic Concerns Committee for all Catalog changes, such as new course proposals, program revisions, and Catalog policies. All unit faculty members participate in policy revisions and program design, implementation, and evaluation. The Education Department makes the final decision about education program policy changes to be proposed to the University. The unit also works closely with all content area departments if changes are necessary in content area courses.

A source of advisory input and collaboration is the Teacher Education Professional Advisory Council (TEPAC), comprised of the cooperating teachers, principals, and district administrators. This group meets at the University each semester. TEPAC is a key forum for stakeholder input, and the department seeks TEPAC collaboration on program proposals and evaluations each semester. Another source of input and collaboration from beyond the department is the Teacher Education Committee (TEC). The Director of Teacher Education chairs the TEC. The committee is comprised of all the Education Department faculty members, the licensing advisor (University Registrar), the Senior Vice-President for Academic Affairs, two faculty members from outside the department, and two education candidates. TEC makes the final decision on admission of applicants to the education program and serves as part of the appeals process as outlined in the Candidate Handbook. TEC also advises the Education Department on any policies, curriculum changes, program issues, or other matters on which the department seeks the perspective of candidates, licensing adviser, administration, or faculty outside the department. In matters of candidate admission to the teacher education program, the department is subordinate to and advises TEC. But in matters of departmental policy, curriculum, or other program issues, TEC is subordinate to and advises the department.

Like all programs at Huntington University, recruiting and admissions are coordinated centrally through the Admissions Department under the direction of the Vice President for Enrollment Management and Marketing. Admissions personnel regularly arrange for campus visits for prospective candidates, who visit classes and meet with unit faculty members. A special Education Visit Day is held once per semester to focus on Teacher Education programs. Similarly, academic policies, student services, and professional development are also centralized at Huntington University. Academic programs, calendars, and grading policies are published in the Academic Catalog, which is updated every two years in print and continuously online. The Admissions Office publishes program brochures. The Office of Public Relations and the Alumni Office publish the monthly Huntington University Magazine. College-wide student services include career and personal counseling, offered by counselors in the Student Development Office, and tutoring and testing, offered at the Learning Center. Academic advising is offered by the department in which a

student is majoring. Elementary education majors are advised by Education Department faculty members. Secondary education and all-grade education majors are advised in their respective content area departments and through on-going contact with education faculty in professional education courses. The unit also has extensive autonomy in establishing course meeting times and rooms.

Budget: The Education Department has an annual budget of \$23,800 managed by the Director of Teacher Education (budget available onsite). This budget includes wages for student office help but not faculty salaries. The Education Department budget is one of the larger academic department budgets on campus, with only Nursing, Visual Arts, and Music having larger budgets for departmental expenses (budgets available onsite). Larger line items in the Education Department budget are stipends and honoraria for cooperating teachers and travel and conference expense for department faculty (beyond the \$750 individual professional development funds). In addition to the departmental budget, the Education Department has a library budget of several thousand dollars each academic year for the purchase of resources and curriculum materials to support the program. The institution strongly supports the Teacher Education program and provides the resources necessary for teacher candidates to meet state licensing standards. The cost of membership in professional associations like NCATE, AACTE, and many others is funded by the institution. The office of the Senior Vice-President for Academic Affairs also provides funds each year for the AACTE Institutional Representative to attend the annual meeting.

Personnel: The standard faculty workload at Huntington University is 12 hours per semester. The education unit complies with this 12-hour standard for undergraduate teaching and 9 hours per semester for teaching in the M.Ed. program. Supervisors of student teachers receive 2/3 of a credit for each student teacher they supervise. The University prioritizes effective teaching and mentoring (through advising and supervision, for example), and drop-in appointments are common. The unit also encourages and supports faculty participation in scholarly activities, assessment, technology training, leadership training, collaboration with P-12 school personnel, and service opportunities. Unit faculty members have been involved in significant roles in professional organizations nationally, locally, and on the state level.

The use of part-time (adjunct) faculty allows effective management of resources and candidate exposure to working professionals. For example:

- The instructor for ED 311 Early Adolescent Curriculum and Methodology has experience as a Middle School Assistant Principal.
- The instructor for ED 364 Assessment Strategies for Secondary Educators is former Middle School Principal and current High School Principal
- Adjuncts who supervise student teachers (clinical faculty) are valued colleagues and considered adjunct faculty. They are paid at the same rate as other adjunct instructors, reimbursed for mileage, and invited to the TEPAC breakfasts.

The Director of Clinical Experiences, a retired teacher and administrator, who works part-time in the department, is considered a faculty colleague and attends department meetings with the full-time faculty.

Additional institutional funding is available—and has been used by unit faculty—for training in diversity, technology, assessment, leadership, and accreditation. Further, the unit budget has a line item for travel and conferences (budget available onsite), which is used for travel to state and national professional education meetings. Faculty development opportunities on campus include new faculty orientations, faculty workshops on teaching and learning, and technology training offered by staff in the Technology Services Department. Support personnel in the unit include a secretary/administrative assistant and student workers. These personnel provide support in data entry and management, clerical, filing, copying, and communication tasks, significantly enhancing the effectiveness of the department faculty.

Facilities: The Education Department has excellent facilities which enhance learning opportunities and faculty contact with candidates. The unit boasts two model classrooms and an additional classroom used exclusively for teacher education courses. The rooms have curriculum materials, storage facilities, digital projectors, and internet access. Equipment in the primary model classroom includes an Ellison machine (for bulletin board lettering), paper cutter, bulletin boards, and related materials, a large storage area, seven computers, a color printer, and a SMART Board. The unit office, located in a suite on the first floor of the Loew-Breen Hall classroom building, was recently equipped with its own Ricoh Multifunction Printer (MFP). The relatively new Dowden Science Hall houses a large computer lab and offers outstanding facilities and equipment for education candidates taking science courses for their general education (core) or content major requirements. The University library dedicates half of the lower level to curriculum materials, children's and young adult literature collections, learning kits, audiovisual materials, and the regular education stacks. The Thornhill Nature Center, located about six miles north of the University, is staffed and maintained by the University and is used almost exclusively by area schools for nature field trips and programs provided as part of the unit's Sophomore Practicum for Elementary Education.

The Hauptert Institute for Agricultural Studies has offices in Dowden Science Hall to accommodate the addition of a new faculty member who will teach Agricultural Education and other agricultural content courses. Agriculture faculty have access to the lab space in that building, as well as currently farmed crop land owned by Huntington University that is co-located with Thornhill Nature Preserve. The labs are suitable for lab courses in crop and soil science, animal science, and other agricultural content courses. The Institute has a substantial operating budget inaugurated by donations from generous supporters of the agriculture program; as the program continues to increase in enrollment, it will be supported in the budget through tuition dollars.

Unit Resources Including Technology: Forbes has ranked Huntington University among the top 10% of colleges in the U.S. for three consecutive years and The Princeton Review named Huntington as "One of the best in the Midwest." The unit's programs are promoted on the University web site and with publications produced by the University's Admissions Office and Public Relations Office. The University provides a number of student services to enhance the academic success of college students. Services include trained counselors, tutors, and a chaplain. Academic and personal support for candidates is available from education instructors and advisers, at the Learning Center, and in the Office of Student Development. Student Development services include career planning and personal counseling. The Learning Center provides a Writing Center, along with free tutoring. The Director of Learning Assistance oversees tutoring for all candidates who request it and arranges accommodations for candidates with special needs. The RichLyn Library holdings in education outnumber all other undergraduate departments' holdings. In new book funds, the Education Department's allocation is equal to the allocation for

one other department (Bible and Religion) and exceeds the annual allocations for all other departments. The diversity section of the education holdings is one of the more extensive topical sections. The department and individual department faculty members meet periodically with the library director to evaluate holdings and decide directions for future purchases and reorganization of current materials. A curriculum materials section in the library with educational kits and math manipulatives gives education faculty and candidates exposure to a wide variety of textbooks, numerous lesson ideas, and varying curriculum designs. Community members, such as local teachers, can use the University library. This includes accessing books, curriculum materials, educational kits, the children's and young adult collections, and all electronic databases.

The unit's educational software is either installed on the University network or kept in the model classroom where it can be used on the model classroom computers, computer classrooms, or labs. The teacher education candidates prepare materials for face-to-face instruction as well as synchronous and asynchronous learning activities. Moodle is the primary learning management system that the candidates use when they are preparing on-line learning modules. They also review class pages that were developed using School Fusion and Echo (New Tech LMS). Skype, Adobe Connect, Twitter and blog sites are used to communicate with elementary classrooms and to follow students' learning activities. Class assignments require proficient use of Microsoft Office Suite, Google docs and Smart Notebooks. A minimum keyboarding proficiency is also required. The unit enjoys excellent technology resources and technology support services, which enhance candidate learning and the modeling of teaching with various strategies so that all students can learn. All unit faculty members are provided laptop computers for office, classroom, and home use. Advising resources such as candidates' academic records and a degree audit system are online. All classrooms and student meeting areas have wireless networking. Technology Services offers support to candidates for connectivity, mal-ware, and troubleshooting. Classrooms have computer projectors mounted on the ceilings, serial-connected video cords, and either wireless networking or network ports. The University has computer labs and computer kiosks and provides email accounts for all students and employees.

The unit routinely uses technology to enhance data management, information delivery, and candidate learning. The assessment system's quantifiable data is kept on a shared network drive, providing access for the administrative assistant and unit faculty. Requirements for admission to the education program, along with many other helpful resources may be found on the Education Department webpage (Resources tab). The Director of Teacher Education, the Director of Clinical Experiences, and the department secretary email classes, cohorts, or all education majors with pertinent announcements. The weekly university announcement sheet is delivered electronically to all university students, augmenting announcements made in classes and via email listserv.

Standard 6: Schedule

Some students currently enrolled at Huntington University as Agribusiness majors have already expressed an interest in switching to Ag Ed when it is approved. Faculty and staff have talked to high school students at numerous FFA events, during campus visits, and in the recruitment process who have expressed an interest in Ag Ed as a major. We estimate that there could be 5-10 students in the program during the first year, with as many as 10-15 incoming students each year as the program matures. We plan to begin to offer AE courses in the Spring of 2017. Content courses in agriculture have already been approved and will be offered as students progress through the Agribusiness and Ag Ed curriculum. A draft Guide to Typical Program for Ag Education and major Checksheet (used by advisors) are included to illustrate how these courses will be offered for an incoming Freshman class.

FFA conventions will continue to be a means of recruitment and communication about the program. In addition, HU already hosts FFA leadership events, and has built a network of over 80 area high school agriculture teachers. These teachers have personal knowledge of students who are interested in the Ag Education career path, and will be able to direct some students who may be a good fit for HU's small-college approach to Ag Education. Ag Education will be listed among the major programs offered, and will be included in the brochure for the Haupt Institute for Agricultural Studies at HU. If the program is approved and implemented by Fall 2016, we anticipate that some of the students who are currently enrolled and taking Core (general ed) courses could begin graduating from the program by Spring of 2019.

Attachment 6a Agricultural Education GTP

Attachment 6b Agricultural Education Checksheet



New Program Assessment Rubric

Program Reviewed:
Reviewer:
Date:

A note to institutions: In order for reviewers to find information with ease, please be sure to clearly label each standard and indicator. Bookmarking the PDF or providing a table of contents is helpful in keeping the document organized. Please ensure that the information outlined on the rubric is available under the standard listed. Please submit each syllabus as a separate file in a zipped folder. When you are complete, please submit your proposal to sbogan@doe.in.gov.

Guidelines have been provided for each standard with expected page limits. While these are simply guidelines, we anticipate submissions to average around 15-20 pages, not inclusive of course syllabi and content standards matrix.

Standard 1: Rationale

Guidelines: Please limit this section to ***no more than two pages.***

	Evidence	For Approval	Inadequate	Not Approved	Approved	Comments
1.1	Program Description	<p>Proposal identifies content area, licensure level and delivery model of the program.</p> <p>Program is innovative and designed to meet needs of 21st century candidates for this content area. Program may include promising “out of the box” approaches to teacher preparation.</p>	<p>Program does not appear to meet the needs of the 21st C candidate for this content area. Program does not appear to incorporate current best practice.</p>			

1.2	Needs Assessment Data	Data clearly identifies need for licensure program and has established LEA relations or defined state needs in order to ensure local and/or state needs will be fulfilled.	Data does not adequately support need for new program.			
-----	------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

Standard 2: Curriculum

Guidelines: Please submit each syllabus as a separate file in a zipped folder. Include matrix as part of main submission.

	Evidence	For Approval	Inadequate	Not Approved	Approved	Comments
2.1	Matrix aligning program to appropriate educator standards	<p>Program aligns to state approved standards and provides candidates with knowledge specifically relevant to 21st century candidates. Matrix documents standards coverage at the micro or indicator level. General education, professional education and content preparation must be included for initial programs.</p> <p>For an example click here.</p>	<p>Program does not ensure all essential state pedagogy and content standards are adequately addressed and assessed. Matrix documents coverage of standards at the macro level. Excessive coursework may be required.</p>			
2.2	Syllabi for required courses	<p>A syllabus is submitted for each required course.</p> <p>Required courses are streamlined, progressive and model innovative pedagogy. Course materials and assignments are strategic, rigorous and target skills required of 21st C teachers. Syllabi include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course objectives and goals • List of required texts with citations • Outline of class schedule • Description of required assignments • Sample of 2-3 assessments <p><i>Please include a table that highlights in which specific courses program candidates are instructed and assessed on the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Assessment,</i> • <i>Use of Technology to Impact P-12 Student Learning,</i> • <i>Cultural Competency,</i> • <i>Scientifically Based Reading Instruction (SBRI).</i> <p>For an example click here.</p>	<p>Syllabi do not reflect all required components or not all are included.</p> <p>Courses may not model effective pedagogy. Materials and assignments may be outdated. Delivery method may not match assignments/assessments appropriately.</p> <p>List highlighting courses focusing on Assessment, Technology, Cultural Competency, and SBRI is incomplete.</p>			

Standard 3 Clinical and Field Based Experiences – *In Indiana, supervised clinical field experience (CFE) is defined as a university employed adjunct or faculty member assigned or contracted with to provide feedback to candidates based on observation of a candidate’s performance in a school setting. School based partners for initial programs (commonly referred to as cooperating teachers) do not count as supervisors of clinical experiences for this section. For non-IHE programs, supervised clinical experience is defined as non-IHE employed personnel who have teaching expertise that is contracted with to provide feedback to candidates based on observation of a candidate’s performance in a school setting.*

Guidelines: Please keep submissions to 3-6 pages for this standard including any sample assignments or rubrics.

	Evidence	For Approval	Inadequate	Not Approved	Approved	Comments
3.1	Location and learner contact	CFE provides minimum requirements of 10 weeks of full time student teaching with experienced teacher.	The evidence and narrative do not clearly describe the location of the program’s CFE and/or amount of learner contact, or show a location and amount of learner contact that do not meet state expectations. CFE relies primarily on candidate observation and minimal expectations for actual responsibility for teaching.			
3.2	Supervision	CFE Supervisor is a university employed adjunct or faculty member knowledgeable in candidate’s anticipated educational role and capable of providing multiple forms of feedback. Supervision provides systematic formative candidate feedback based on actual observation of candidate’s performance. Cooperating teacher is rated effective or highly effective. Innovative and collaborative student teaching models are used.	The evidence and narrative do not clearly describe the qualifications of the CFE Supervisor, or the CFE Supervisor is not a university employed adjunct or faculty member. Supervision of candidate’s performance relies predominately on cooperating teacher. Program relies heavily on review of lesson plans rather than actual observation to provide candidate feedback. Minimum requirements for cooperating teacher are not stated or are inadequate to ensure proper supervision.			

3.3	Candidate impact on student learning	CFE includes opportunities to assess student learning outcomes in a variety of ways using formative and summative measures, develops candidate’s ability to enhance learning by analyzing assessment results, and allows candidate to practice developing, delivering and analyzing results of commonly used assessments in the state and schools most appropriate for expected educational role.	The evidence and narrative do not clearly describe the student learning outcome assessments included in the CFE, or the student learning outcome assessments do not meet state expectations. Program relies heavily on candidate reflection on lessons rather than on P-12 student learning data to determine effectiveness.			
3.4	Diversity and Grade Level Coverage	<p>Proposal clearly describes tracking system to ensure diversity in field placements as well as appropriate grade level coverage.</p> <p>CFE provides opportunities for candidate to participate with students of diversity¹ in a variety of ways, including that of the candidate’s expected educational role, as well as opportunities to work with a variety of parents, administrators, and school staff.</p>	<p>Systematic tracking of experiences to ensure all candidates have opportunities to work with diverse students in an appropriate variety of grade levels is not ensured.</p> <p>The evidence and narrative do not clearly describe the diversity experiences or grade level coverage within the CFE, or the diversity and grade level experiences within the CFE do not adequately prepare the candidate to help all students¹ learn.</p>			

¹ “All Students” and “All Learners” refer to diversity created through differences among groups of people and individuals based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation, and geographical area per the NCATE definition.

Standard 4 Evaluation:

Program Evaluation

1. The Unit Assessment System clearly denotes how the program and program participants will be assessed. Specific attention should be paid to addressing how the new program assessment fits within the current UAS and how data will be disaggregated for program assessment and improvement.
2. There are provisions for continuing evaluation of the program based on performance criteria to be met by those graduates completing the program.

Candidate Evaluation

1. The program has systematic procedures for monitoring candidate admission, progress and completion of the program.
2. The proposal includes a description of assessment procedures and timelines that reference the approved Unit Assessment System and specifies:
 - a. products and performances to be assessed, and
 - b. standards of performance required to advance in the program.
3. The proposal should include plans/assessments to address, candidate content knowledge (min of 2 assessments for this area), pedagogical knowledge, student impact/P-12 student outcomes, SBRR reading, use of technology for effective teaching and cultural competency.
4. Systematic approaches are used to assist candidates who are making unsatisfactory progress in their programs.
5. Candidate evaluation includes all required testing requirements for licensure.

Guidelines: Not inclusive of student teaching evaluation rubrics, please limit documentation for this standard to 3-4 pages.

	Evidence	For Approval	Inadequate	Not Approved	Approved	Comments
4.1	Unit Assessment System (UAS) program evaluation	<p>Includes a summary of UAS. Unit regularly examines validity and utility of program data produced and makes modifications to keep abreast of changes in assessment technology and in professional standards. Unit regularly evaluates the capacity and effectiveness of the UAS with internal and external stakeholders. Effective steps have been taken to eliminate bias in assessments and to establish fairness, accuracy and consistency. Data is systematically used for program improvement. Provisions are in place to collect follow-up data.</p> <p>Description includes a flowchart and timeline for collection and analysis of data.</p>	<p>UAS is limited in data collection including candidate and graduate performance information which can then be used to improve program. UAS does not regularly and comprehensively gather, aggregate, summarize and analyze assessment information on its programs. UAS does not use appropriate information technologies to maintain its assessment system. Bias in its assessments has not been examined. Efforts to establish fairness, accuracy, and consistency are not apparent. Data collection system has not been demonstrated to be consistent and successful</p>			

4.2	Evaluation of student teaching	<p>Student teacher evaluation tools or rubrics are well designed, reliable, valid assessment instruments.</p> <p>When rubrics are used descriptions of indicators are given at all levels.</p>	<p>Student teacher evaluation tools or rubrics may not meet state expectations for rigor. Rubrics may not appear to be reliable or valid. Rubrics may not be designed to be an effective measurement tool.</p>			
-----	---------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

Standard 5: Governance

Guidelines: Please limit this section to *no more than two pages*.

	Evidence	For Approval	Inadequate	Not Approved	Approved	Comments
5.1	Governance	<p>Brief descriptions of program leadership roles and responsibilities are provided.</p> <p>Leadership for program ensures effective coordination of systems needed. Governance process manages curriculum, instruction and resources needed to support high quality program.</p>	<p>Leadership does not ensure effective coordination of all systems needed to ensure high quality program.</p>			

Standard 6: Schedule

Guidelines: Documentation for this standard may be as short as a paragraph, but please limit this section to *no more than two pages*.

	Evidence	For Approval	Inadequate	Not Approved	Approved	Comments
6.1	Projected Implementation	<p>Plan for communication, implementation, graduation, and anticipated census are included in proposal.</p>	<p>Inadequate plans have been made for program implementation.</p>			

Approval

1. Programs must be fully approved by the Indiana Department of Education **prior** to being offered.
2. Programs are required to submit reports as requested by the IDOE. All approved programs are subject to Title II low performing criteria.
3. In the event that the program is discontinued, the institution must notify the IDOE.