MEMORANDUM

TO: Indiana State Board of Education

FROM: Scott Bogan, Coordinator of Educator Preparation

DATE: May 2, 2016

SUBJECT: New Program Proposal from Indiana University Southeast

The Indiana University Southeast School of Education (SOE) Educator Preparation Program (EPP) recently submitted a new educator preparation program proposal for the following areas:

- Fine Arts: Instrumental and General Music (P-12)
- Fine Arts: Vocal and General Music (P-12)

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 proposal from Indiana University Southeast:

Fine Arts: Instrumental and General Music (P-12) and Fine Arts: Vocal and General Music (P-12)

The IDOE will continue to monitor the progress of both programs by reviewing all annual reports required of Indiana University Southeast, 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.

Glenda Ritz, NBCT
Indiana Superintendent of Public Instruction

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 are 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

<mark>**Guidelines:** Please limit this section to <u>*no more than two pages*</u></mark>.

	Evidence	For Approval	Inadequate	Not Approved	Approved	Comments
1.1	**Program Description**	Proposal identifies content area, licensure level and delivery model of the program. 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.	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.			

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

	Evidence	For Approval	Inadequate	Not Approved	Approved	Comments
2.1	**Matrix aligning program to appropriate educator standards**	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. For an example click here.	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.			
2.2	**Syllabi for required courses**	A syllabus is submitted for each required course. 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: • Course objectives and goals • List of required texts with citations • Outline of class schedule • Description of required assignments • Sample of 2-3 assessments *Please include a table that highlights in which specific courses program candidates are instructed and assessed on the following:* • *Assessment,* • *Use of Technology to Impact P-12 Student Learning,* • *Cultural Competency,* • *Scientifically Based Reading Instruction (SBRI).* For an example click here.	Syllabi do not reflect all required components or not all are included. Courses may not model effective pedagogy. Materials and assignments may be outdated. Delivery method may not match assignments/assessments appropriately. List highlighting courses focusing on Assessment, Technology, Cultural Competency, and SBRI is incomplete.			

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.*

	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	Proposal clearly describes tracking system to ensure diversity in field placements as well as appropriate grade level coverage. CFE provides opportunities for candidate to participate with students of diversity[1] 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.	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. 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 students[1] learn.			

---

[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**	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. Description includes a flowchart and timeline for collection and analysis of data.	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			

| | | Student teacher evaluation tools or rubrics are well designed, reliable, valid assessment instruments.

When rubrics are used descriptions of indicators are given at all levels. | 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. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **4.2** | **Evaluation of student teaching** | | | | | |

Standard 5: Governance

	Evidence	For Approval	Inadequate	Not Approved	Approved	Comments
5.1	**Governance**	Brief descriptions of program leadership roles and responsibilities are provided.

Leadership for program ensures effective coordination of systems needed. Governance process manages curriculum, instruction and resources needed to support high quality program. | Leadership does not ensure effective coordination of all systems needed to ensure high quality program. | | | |

Standard 6: Schedule

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

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.

New Program Assessment Rubric

Standard I: Rationale
      1.1 Program Description:

Indiana University Southeast School of Education (SOE) Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) seeks approval to add two new licensing areas to its list of approved programs. We request approval to add a license in the area of Fine Arts (P-12): Instrumental and General Music P-12 and a license in Fine Arts P-12: Vocal and General Music P-12. The courses will be delivered in the traditional mode with the exception of one on-line course – P250 General Educational Psychology. The program is designed to meet the needs of the 21st century candidate in that it utilizes the latest technology in the content area and there are ample opportunities for field experiences working with children in multiple grade levels. With so many retirements in the teaching profession, music programs in schools will be hardest hit because there are often only 4-5 music teachers in a school district. Large districts, such as Jefferson County Public in Louisville, KY, have over 200 schools to serve the community. In the case of the Jefferson County Public Schools this currently includes 146 music teachers. Indiana currently has 2,453 music teachers. In both cases and on both sides of the Ohio River, there has been a history of school districts needing to issue emergency licenses to those without appropriate preparation or rehiring retired teachers because of a lack of licensed candidates. In addition, Congress has just passed a rewrite of the national Elementary and Secondary Education Act that now integrates the arts into STEM education (science, technology, engineering and math). This was signed by the president and promises to increase interest in further developing music programs in the schools. Therefore, we need to have more music educators with a license ready to step in to fill this looming gap in the teaching profession. Also, IU Southeast is located in a metropolitan area with schools that have a large number of extraordinary award winning bands, orchestras and choral students and we need to prepare new music educators to be ready to serve our communities.

The Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) ensures that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practices are central to the preparation. Working with music educators in the field as partners, candidates will understand how theory and practice are linked. The EPP uses multiple indicators and appropriate technology-based applications in performance evaluation. The early field experiences will be designed with school partners to ensure that candidates can demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students' learning. Field experiences begin early in the program with the first course and continue throughout the program through almost all pedagogy courses culminating with Clinical Practice/Student Teaching. Clinical Practice is based on the St. Cloud State University model of co-teaching. Several SOE faculty are trained in this model and offer training to teachers in Indiana and Kentucky as needed. In addition to the pedagogy component, the curriculum is content-rich in the discipline. (Please see **Appendix 1: Curriculum for the BS in Music: Music Education).**

      1.2 Needs Assessment Data

The need for the licensure program was established from two angles. The first is to look at teacher shortage and the number of schools in the area, most of which have music programs; the second is to examine the desires of perspective students to major in music education. The teacher shortage most recently addressed in Indiana does not address shortages in the music education area. The shortages are primarily in math, science and special education and these shortages are related to several factors. However, shortages in any content may occur due to teachers moving from or leaving their jobs at

relatively high rates. So, while there is not data to prove there is a shortage of music teachers for P-12, turnover, for whatever reason, leaves open a teacher position that must be filled. A survey conducted by the IUS Music Department in 2014 indicates strong interest in pursuing a degree in music education by students in the southern Indiana and Jefferson County, KY area. An even higher number 218 of the 583 surveyed indicated they would more likely attend IUS if the university offered a music education degree (See **Appendix 2: Survey of Student Interest in Music Education**). This is not surprising as Music Education is the most popular major in higher education for music students nation-wide. Research and theory document the value of music in early childhood. We know that music can benefit children with special needs; it helps with math and influences increases in general intelligence and academic success. Music has some impact on early language development as well as developing creative thinking, mental discipline and communal activity. (See **Appendix 3: Article on the Benefits of Music Education**) The need for music in the schools cannot be disputed. The need to have well prepared music teachers who can integrate and provide support for all learning is important for all children. It is important to underscore that other music degrees may provide important skills, and knowledge in music but do not provide future teachers with the breadth of musical, technological and pedagogical skills and knowledge required for teaching in P-12 schools. Therefore, merely adding pedagogy courses to the typical BA or BM degree in music performance, for example, is not adequate to the task. Rather, a specialized curriculum in music education is required.

An additional benefit to this curriculum is that it prepares students to teach in private schools as well as churches with music education programs. (See **Appendix 4: Graphs Depicting Numbers of Schools and Churches in a portion of the IUS service area.)**

Standard 2: Curriculum
     2.1 Matrix aligning program to appropriate educator standards—Appendices 5-8
     (Appendix 5: Education Standards for SOE Pedagogy Courses)
     (Appendix 6: Arts Standards for Vocal and General Music P-12)
     (Appendix 7: Arts Standards for Instrumental and General Music P-12)
     (Appendix 8: Curriculum Alignment with NASM Standards for Music Education**)**

The matrices that include Core Music courses and courses in the concentrations for Vocal and General Music P-12 and Instrumental and General Music P-12 address P-12 content in music and the matrix for pedagogy courses from the School of Education addresses professional education requirements. The NASM matrix includes information on General Education.

     2.2 Syllabi for required courses

     College degrees at the undergraduate level have three components: general education; the major; and electives. Each of these components makes an important contribution to a student's education. Courses in general education contribute to the development of knowledge and intellectual skills that all college graduates, regardless of their degree, should have. They also add breadth of study by including disciplines outside the major. They are designed to provide not only course content but also support the development of critical and creative thinking. Courses in the major contribute to the development of knowledge and intellectual skills that are specific to the discipline chosen. Finally, elective courses permit a student to round out a degree based on his or her individual interests.

General Education and Electives in General Education (The Music Education curriculum is so content specific that it does not allow for additional credit hours for electives within the major.) Courses are listed in the Curriculum in Appendix 1. Sample syllabi are forwarded separately in a zip file.

The following information is a description of the General Education requirement for all students at IU Southeast, including students in the BS in Music: Music Education. Some requirements are quite specific, such as: First Year Seminar, English W231 and the Diversity course specifically required for all education majors, M300. These syllabi are enclosed. Where students have options, we have included syllabi for the most frequently enrolled options (English W131 –writing) and S121(Speech) or have included syllabi for courses that serve as examples of courses students may take in that category (e.g. sections on Quantitative Reasoning, Sciences). In some categories, students have so many options that we have opted to explain the category requirements with examples of the types of courses that are applicable (additional science options, Arts and Humanities and Social and Behavioral Sciences). The information below is a paraphrase of the IUS webpage on General Education Requirements. Please note our additional comments in italics.

Requirement for Baccalaureate Degrees

General education at IU Southeast includes both campus-wide requirements, which apply to all baccalaureate degrees, and requirements that are specific to each degree. Some degrees have extensive general education requirements of their own, whereas others have relatively few requirements beyond those established by the campus. The goal of general education is to develop essential skills including:

1. Written communication skills – Students are required to take ENG – W131 Elementary Composition or HON-H103 if they are honors students. Students are also required to take one course, selected on the basis of their major, from the list of second=level approved courses. *We have included syllabi for W131 and W231 Professional Writing Skills for the Music Education curriculum.*
2. Oral communication skills – students are required to take SPCH-S121 Public Speaking (or the honors equivalent). *We have included a syllabus for S121*
3. Quantitative reasoning – *These are primarily math courses. We have included a sample syllabus from a course that would most probably be taken by a music education major.*
4. Reasoning about ethical questions or Diversity. *M300 Diversity is required for all education majors. The syllabus is forwarded with this application.*
5. Critical thinking – This is met through completion of the Central Ideas, Issues and Methods for Inquiry in the Arts and Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences and Natural and Physical Sciences. No additional course is required in this section.
6. *Information Literacy Library Instruction – First Year Seminar and other academic courses include this information, as do Music Literature and History. Syllabi for First Year Seminar and Music Literature and History are included in this application.*
7. Central Ideas, Issues and Methods of Inquiry. Students are required to take one science course with a lab. *A syllabus for Chemistry with lab is included. Otherwise, there is a great diversity of courses students may take in this category:*
   Arts & Letters (Humanities)- Fine Arts, Music, Theatre, English Writing and Literature, Communication Studies, Philosophy, Religious Studies, Humanities, Modern Languages
   Natural Sciences: biology, chemistry, geology, physical geography, physics, computer science, math, astronomy
   Social and Behavioral Sciences: psychology, sociology, history, human geography, journalism, criminal justice, anthropology, international studies, gender studies

General Education courses are progressive and model innovative pedagogy. General education helps students understand humanity and the world through the Central Ideas, Issues and Methods of Inquiry found in the Arts and Humanities, the Natural and Physical Sciences, and the Social and Behavioral Sciences.

The Major – Syllabi for courses in the major (BS in Music: Music Education) are included in this application. These include Core Music courses required of all music majors as well as Music Dept. and School of Education courses specific to the concentrations in Vocal and General Music P-12 and Instrumental and General Music P-12. Please note that Piano instruction (either private lessons P100/P200 and above or Piano Class P101) is required for all music majors at IU Southeast. As stated in the course listings for the Music Education concentrations in both Vocal and General Music P-12 and Instrumental and General Music P-12, music education students are expected to continue studying piano either at the university or independently until they can pass P105 Piano Proficiency. Syllabi for major ensembles are represented by concert choir and community chorus (X070 and X001), as well as Orchestra (X040 and X001). X001 is the 0 credit course for these ensembles; they are required and graded regardless of the difference in credit hours. Concert band and brass band are also available option for students. Syllabi for these ensembles would be similar to the orchestra syllabus. Students at IU Southeast also have available to them as electives: Guitar Ensemble and Percussion ensemble. These are not required or available to fulfill the ensemble requirement and, therefore, syllabi are not included. We have additional performance opportunities in music clubs/extracurricular activities: an acappella singing groups, bluegrass, jazz, rock and other small bands, a pep band and a nascent marching band. Syllabi for Applied Music are represented by V100 and P100/P101 which are required, as well as Piano, Voice and Trumpet at various levels. We offer instruction in every band and orchestra instrument in addition to organ and guitar. Syllabi for these instruments would be similar to those included for Voice, Piano and Trumpet. Please also note that several courses (String, Brass, Woodwind, Percussion and Marching Band Techniques) are identified as coming from IU South Bend. We are adopting these courses from our sister IU campus and use these syllabi with the permission of the IUSB faculty.

The goal of the major is to have students acquire a depth of knowledge in a specified area of study. Within the context of a specified area of study, students learn to reason, to think both critically and creatively, and to solve problems. Course objectives and student learning outcomes are included for most syllabi with assignments, assessments and rubrics. Delivery methods include lecture, group work, individual work, on-line work (discussions, forums, etc.), projects, and ample field and clinical experiences. In the education pedagogy courses field and clinical placements are central. Examples of Impact on Student Learning assessments from two different secondary pedagogy methods courses (Math M457 and English M452) are provided in **Appendices 9 & 10**. Rubric and grading examples are included.

Courses focusing on Assessment, Technology, Cultural Competency and SBRI

TOPIC	Course Syllabus Reference
Assessment	M323, M338, M337 (EDUC M441 Social Studies Methods, M452 Language Arts Methods, M457 Math Methods, and M446 Science Methods)
Cultural Competency	M337, M338, F413,EDUC, M300
Technology Integration	EDUC M314, MUS A301, MUS M323, MUS M337, MUS M338, MUS F466

SBRR/SBRI	EDUC M464, MUS M323, MUS M337, MUS M338

Assessment: M323 Elementary Music Methods, M338 Methods of Teaching Choral Music, M337 Methods for Teaching Instrumental Music include the topic of how teachers assess the skills and developmental growth (in music) of students and/or vocal and instrumental ensembles. Students in these courses develop skills for creating rubrics to evaluate their future students' progress. All Secondary EDUC methods courses have assessment as a major focus. Elementary Student Teaching also has an Impact on Student Learning project as a way to learn about pre and post assessment and educational intervention strategies.

Diversity: M337 and 338, as well as F413 Choral Repertoire include study of music from diverse cultures. Students in both tracks of the Music Education concentration are required to take M300 for their general education requirement "Ethical Questions or Diversity" This is a diversity course specific to education majors on our campus.

Technology appropriate to the discipline is included in coursework throughout the curriculum, most particularly:
A301 – teaches students Sibelius and Finale music publishing programs, as well as how to create digital samples and recordings using computer /midi technology.
M323, M337, M338 (pedagogy courses noted above) include discussion on technology available for teachers in those subject areas.
F466 Techniques for Marching Band dedicates significant time in the course to the software used to create marching band programs

SBRR/SBRI: The three music pedagogy courses, M323, M337 and M338, will include evidence-based, developmentally appropriate instruction strategies for addressing the reading and writing literacy standards for music. although SBRI will receive the most attention in M323, Elementary Music Methods, instructional strategies will be taught in the choral and instrumental music methods courses as well (M338, M337).

Standard 3: Clinical and Field Based Experiences
    3.1 Location and learner contact

The average hours of Clinical Practice/Student teaching is 533 clock hours. The range of weeks is 10 weeks for Secondary Program, 13 weeks for Elementary Program and 16 weeks for Special Education ([P-5] 8 weeks and Jr-Sr. High [8 weeks]. This proposal is for P-12, so the candidates will student teach in two levels similar to what happens in Special Education. They will have 16 weeks of student teaching (Secondary and Elementary student teaching). During clinical practice/student teaching, candidate learning is integrated into the school program and into teaching practice. Programs ensure this by having candidates implement lessons that are part of the school curriculum and instruction requirements; providing professional development for school faculty based upon the school's needs and the candidate's knowledge; reviewing and preparing lessons aligned to standards and best-practice, practicing the co-teaching model appropriate for the content being taught. Candidates observe and are observed by others. Candidates observe other teachers and all candidates are observed by a school-based supervisor and a university supervisor. Candidates interact with teachers, families of students, administrators, college or university supervisors, and other interns about their practice regularly and continually. Candidates attend all school-sponsored activities; participate in parent conference and team

meetings; and candidates interact during seminars or meetings with other candidates and supervisors. Candidates are required to have clinical experiences/practicum prior to Clinical Practice/student teaching. Each block for all undergraduate programs includes Clinical experiences/practicum. The number of hours and days for Clinical Experience leading up to Clinical Practice increases with each block.

Candidates reflect on and can justify their own practice. Programs have structured systematic means for evaluating candidates that include journals that are read by supervisors; reflective responses at the end of a project or activity; peer seminars to reflect on experiences in the field. Candidates are members of instructional teams in the school and are active participants in professional decisions. They participate in PLCs and on instructional/grade level teams; involved in school improvement efforts and use research projects to determine how to make informed decisions about instruction. Some candidates do presentations for teachers in the building where they teach. **Appendix 11** provides a listing of sites for Clinical Experience and Clinical Practice along with demographics of each school.

3.2 Supervision

Candidates in clinical practice/Student Teaching are assessed throughout their experiences by P-12 school faculty called School-based Supervisors (SS)/or classroom teacher and by the Unit's clinical faculty called University Supervisors (US) which could be full-time faculty or adjuncts hired to serve as University Supervisors.

Elementary, Secondary, and Special Education University Supervisors meet regularly with the student teacher- at least 5 times in Elementary, 5 times in Secondary, and 6 times in Special Education. University supervisors are employed as adjunct or full-time faculty member with knowledge of the content. Supervisors provide systematic formative candidate feedback based on actual observation of a candidate's performance. Our last Title II report shows that we had 3 adjunct faculty hired for student teaching supervision and we had 14 full-time faculty serving as university supervisors. The Music Dept. will be hiring additional adjunct faculty with experience teaching in local schools for additional supervision. The CFE Supervisor observes student teachers on average 5 times. Two examples of an observation instrument are attached (Special Education and Elementary Education), see **Appendices 12 and 13**. Criteria for Clinical faculty are found in **Appendix 14.** Music faculty supervisors will be added to the faculty as the program gets started.

Prior to the final placement of candidates, information concerning the qualifications of the school - based supervisor or mentor (classroom teacher) is reviewed to ensure "high quality". This is validated by principals or the superintendent who personally selects (with some input from IUS) classroom teachers. School based supervisors/classroom teachers must have a master's degree or evidence of PD experiences, an appropriate license, and experience in the area being supervised.

School of Education programs collaborate with school partners to design, implement and evaluate field and clinical experiences. SOE programs ensure clinical experiences are supported by handbooks containing goals, guidelines, and candidate expectations to support clinical faculty as they work with candidates. Throughout each experience, candidates reflect on their teaching and collaboration with peers and university faculty. At the end of the clinical experience, undergraduate candidates are given the opportunity to evaluate P-12 and university field/clinical faculty. Summaries of data are reviewed by faculty, program teams, the Dean, and/or advisory groups.

All of the initial license programs are moving toward a co-teaching model. Candidates placed in our urban setting (Jefferson County Public Schools) can only be in classrooms where the co-teaching model is implemented. SOE full-time faculty are trained to deliver professional development on co-teaching for Indiana schools where candidates are placed. This is an innovative and collaborative model supported by best practices in clinical field placement. **Appendix 15 describes the models and strategies.**

Each program uses assessments to ensure candidates have mastered content and pedagogical and professional content knowledge prior to admission to clinical work. These include results on key assessments, GPAs, PRAXIS/CASA or other approved standardized test scores, and assessments on dispositions. The Music program additionally requires auditions for admission to the program, juried performance exams for all applied music study, a P105 Piano Proficiency Exam, and a Sophomore Gateway exam. Music students must earn a minimum grade of C for each required music course in order for it to count toward the degree. Student Teaching Handbooks with more details about the Clinical and Field Based Experiences are part of **Appendix 16 (Secondary) Appendix 17 (Elementary).**

3.3 Candidate Impact on Student Learning

The School of Education/EPP follows the standards established by our accreditation organization regarding impact on P-12 student learning. The CAEP standard 4 requires that as a provider we demonstrate "the impact of the (their) completer on P-12 learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools." CAEP views candidate and completer impact on student learning as the "ultimate" measure by which preparation would be judged. We are required to provide pre-service assessments of candidate impact on P-12 student learning. We administer capstone assessments that sample multiple aspects of teaching. These assessments include measures of impact on P-12 learning and development as well as lesson plans, teaching artifacts, examples of student work and observations or videos judged through rubric-based reviews by trained external reviewers. All of our programs are (with the exception of the MS in Counseling, which is reviewed only at the state level) are nationally recognized by their Specialized Professional Organizations (SPA), and one of the required pieces of evidence for recognition is to demonstrate through data our candidates' impact on P-12 learning. This is done through several measures. One is the impact on student learning project. An example of impact on student learning by a Secondary Math candidate during student teaching is described in the next paragraph.

> This assessment [*impact on student learning project]* is part of the 10-day unit that is created in the specific mathematics methods course, taught during student teaching, and data is collected concerning their students' learning. Candidates do a pre-test of the classroom students, teach the lesson and then do a post-test to determine learning. The results are analyzed by the candidate and it is determined if re-teaching is needed or not, which students learned and which did not to determine if individual (one-on-one) needs to be done and /or if the class is ready to move on to the next learning objectives. In the student learning assessment, the candidates evaluate their assessments in terms of fairness and biasness. This analysis includes attention to gender, race, socio-economic levels, and language differences.

All undergraduate program (Elementary, Special Education, and Secondary) candidates complete an Impact on Student Learning Project during student teaching. Several examples of impact on student learning projects were provided in Appendix 9.

3.4 Diversity and Grade Level Coverage

All candidates are required to complete F200 Examining Self as Teacher prior to applying to the EPP/School of Education. This course requires 30 hours of field experience in schools that are diverse. Pre-service candidates must do 15 hours in an elementary school and 15 hours in a secondary school setting. After they are admitted to a program, they are required to do hours in a middle school, secondary, or elementary school when they are enrolled in their first block. Education students also are required to take M300, the diversity course, where they are required to do a field experience in a school with a high percentage of ENL students (syllabus for M300 sent as zip file). During their third block all candidates are required to observe in a special education pull-out classroom and also in a regular classroom where there is special education co-teaching going on. Each program is responsible for ensuring candidates have a field experience in a diverse setting. Students are also required to enroll in K200 Special Education Seminar. During student teaching the candidate is expected to attend school faculty meetings, after school programs, sit in on parent-teacher conferences, and attend professional development with the faculty. The field placement office documents the demographics of all field placements school sites to make sure there is diversity of all types as much as possible. See Appendix 10.

Standard 4 Evaluation

4.1 Summary of UAS

The EPP maintains a unit assessment system (UAS) to assist stakeholders to evaluate initial and advanced candidates as they matriculate through and complete our program. Key assessments and decision point evaluations are used to evaluate and monitor the development of candidates. The UAS is undergoing changes as we move to the assessment software system –Taskstream, to store artifacts. The system is comprised of two processes. One is a process to improve individual candidate's performance and program quality by collecting and analyzing enrollment, demographic, survey and candidate performance data. The second process is designed to examine the effectiveness of the unit's operations. The UAS system is structured to determine if candidates: (1) are high quality, (2) exhibit caring dispositions, (3) have the knowledge and skills needed for transformation of schools and (4) can work effectively in a diverse society.   The structure of the workflow, decision making and planning of the UAS is developed, implemented, and managed by (a) program teams and (b) Quality Teams each of which has responsibilities aligned to new CAEP Standards. The education faculty collects information regarding candidates' grade point averages, CASA scores, Pearson Core licensing scores, dispositions, field evaluations, key assessments, student teacher evaluation, and program evaluations from candidates at the completion of their programs. Program Teams have aligned their curriculum to content standards, state standards, and specialized professional associations (SPA) standards. The UAS is structured to continually provide information to help the unit and its programs answer questions about candidate performance, unit effectiveness and to make program and unit improvements. A visual of the UAS data flow is located in **Appendix 18.**

Fundamentally, the structure of the UAS is a loop of information, decisions, and actions that is in constant motion and state of refinement. The starting point for the UAS is "data." Data flow to the (a) Program Teams, (b) Dean and Coordinators meeting as the School Council, and/or (c) Quality Teams, and from there to stakeholders. The channeling of data is as follows:
Data to Program Teams: Candidate performance data are regularly collected by program teams and are now submitted to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE). The OIE compiles, aggregates, and prepares summary reports the unit and program uses to make decision and improve programs.

Data includes transition points/decision points. Assessments identified for each program's transition points, or summative decision points are called Decision Points (DP). Each program has Decision Point One (DPI) for admission to the program, DPII or DPIII for admission to clinical or capstone, and DPIII or DPIV for completion of the program requirements. The attached chart in **Appendix 19** provides another visual on the SOE Assessment Plan. However, the chart is undergoing changes because CAEP changed its standards and so our quality teams have changed. We are in the process of updating the chart. The data that is collected remains the same and reported to OIE at the end of each semester.

Program Evaluation

1. At IUS all programs must submit assessment data to the IUS Research Office. All IUS program assessment data is reviewed by the office and feedback is provided to each unit and program. (See **Appendix 20:** Music Program Assessment Plan)

    The new music program will be integrated into the Education UAS in the following way.
    a. Candidate data (GPA) will be collected from the Music Program assessment system (as part of admission) following our UAS flow chart.
    b. Once the candidate is admitted into the SOE they will follow the UAS expectations for the SOE regarding GPA, field experiences, and so forth.
    c. The new Music Program will be integrated into the UAS. Decisions based on admission to the Music Education Licensing program will also include the student's success in music. The new FT Music Education faculty member with work with the SOE to access student progress in music as well as pedagogy

    In the subject area of music, students are assessed at a variety of levels:
    1) Students are only admitted to the program by audition
    2) All music education students need to pass a Piano Proficiency exam (P105)
    3) All students in applied music study must take individual juried performance exams each semester in which they are enrolled in applied music
    4) All music students must pass a Sophomore Gateway exam before they can enroll in upper level- music classes
    5) All music majors must earn a minimum grade of C for a required music course to count
        toward the degree
    6) All music majors have a graded senior capstone experience. In the case of music education majors this would be student teaching and the resultant assessment

2. Surveys are completed by employers at the end of the 1st school year of candidates' employment and program completers are surveyed at the beginning of their second year.

9

Another requirement for accreditation is to collect data on the impact of completers from our Education Preparation Program (EPP) on P-12 student learning. At this time Indiana has not finalized a system to collect this information to share with EPPs across the state. To help accomplish this process, EPPs across the state of Indiana are working with the IACTE and the IDOE to develop a model administered by the IDOE to collect data on EEP completer impact on P-12 student learning after one, two and three years out. This data will be shared with all EPP in the state to determine completers' impact on student learning growth. The IUS School of Education also collects data on program completers through employer satisfaction surveys, candidate satisfaction with preparation, and other relevant measures.

Candidate Evaluation

1. The EPP/ Teacher Preparation program assesses program candidates in a variety of ways using formative and summative measures. Programs are designed using a block system strategy, (block 1, 2, 3, 4). For example, a candidate is admitted to the program and begins in block one after meeting admission criteria for acceptance into the program (this will be the same for the new music program candidates). Block one consists of courses and field experiences. At the end of each block students are assessed on their performance and a decision is made by faculty if the candidate has met the requirements for each block and is or is not eligible to move on to the next block in the program. Data collected from the block include such things as GPA, test scores, proficiency on key assessments, dispositions, teacher evaluations and, depending upon which block is being considered, classroom teacher evaluations. Each program has established key decision points usually at that end of each block as part of the formative assessments. A major summative decision is made prior to student teaching and again at the end of student teaching. After a review of all the data on each candidate, program faculty determine if the candidate is ready for graduation, the records specialist reviews all the decision points, GPA and other items to recommend to the registrar that the candidate is ready for graduation from the university; finally, the licensing advisor, after the candidate has completed all course work and passed all state core tests and other state requirements, will recommend to the state that the candidate is eligible for a teaching license.

2. Proposal includes a description of assessment procedures and timelines that reference the approved UAS are found in **Appendices 15, 16, and 17**.
3. Candidates in the new program will be assessed regarding content knowledge as described above (Program Evaluation #1 c). There is also an assessment of content knowledge when they take their licensing tests. All candidates are evaluated on their content and pedagogical knowledge during student teaching by their classroom supervisor and the university supervisor. All candidates must take the Indiana Pearson Pedagogical content test to receive an Indiana teaching license. The requirement for impact on P/12 was discussed under 3.3 of this proposal. Use of technology is addressed in several required courses including methods courses and lesson plans. All candidates take M300 where they learn about cultural diversity and do a field placement in a specific diverse setting. All candidates have diverse placements in F200 and other field experiences.
Elementary candidates take several reading courses and Secondary candidates take a course on how to integrate reading into the content area (M464). Music Education students will take M464 Methods of Teaching Reading. Reading is also addressed in the music pedagogy

courses: M323 Elementary Music Methods, M337 Methods and Materials for Teaching Instrumental Music and M338 Methods and Materials for Teaching Vocal Music.

4. Systematic approaches are used to assist candidates who are making unsatisfactory progress in their programs. Each undergraduate program has procedures for addressing candidates who are not making satisfactory progress. Once a candidate is identified, the team meets to discuss the situation and makes a recommendation to either place the candidate on a Professional Improvement Plan (PIP) or recommend that the candidate be removed from the program. The candidate's advisor (who will be the new Music Education faculty) will meet with the candidate and provide advising as to the other options opened to the candidate (i.e. recommend placement in another program). The plan includes certain actions the candidate must complete with a set time period. The candidate is assigned a full-time faculty member who will monitor the candidate's progress and will make a recommendation to the team as to whether that the candidate has completed the PIP successfully or not. The faculty monitor for music education students in this situation will most likely be the Music Education faculty advisor in conjunction with an SOE faculty member unless the difficulty rests in music content as opposed to pedagogy issues, in which case another music faculty member may be assigned this responsibility.

5. Candidate evaluation includes all required testing requirements for licensure (Decision point chart). Candidates are required to pass the appropriate licensing test to get an Indiana License and, if they plan to teach in Kentucky, they have additional testing requirements.

4.2   Evaluation of student teaching

See **appendix 11** for rubrics used to evaluate student teaching for Elementary, Special Education and Secondary Program. We do plan to develop specific rubrics for the new program that will include indications for all levels.

Standard 5: Governance

5.1 Governance

The Music Program in the School of Arts and Letters has a program Coordinator who provides overall leadership for music curricula, including the new music education program. A new faculty position was approved by IUS for a FT tenure track position in Music Education/Vocal and Choral Music. The search is in process. This position requires a doctorate in Music Education and 3-5 years teaching in the schools. This faculty member will coordinate the Music Education program specifically (the program we are proposing) and will work with an advisor and faculty in the School of Education. The new Music Education coordinator will have responsibility to advise students interested in this new program and help manage the curriculum, instruction and resources along with an advisor in the SOE. Each School's dean is supportive of the new program. Record specialists and academic advisors from each school will work together to ensure a smooth transition between the two schools along with the coordinators. (see **Appendix 21:** Ad for new Music Education faculty position).

Standard 6: Schedule

7.1 Projected Implementation

The new program intends to admit its first candidates as early as fall 2016 if approved. Music Education curricula are four-year programs and students typically audition for admission to the program prior to their entry into college, unlike other students at the university who typically enter the SOE after two years of college. It is not possible for us to recruit for this program prior to a decision about licensing so future students are, for the most part, not already on campus in general education courses. There are potentially around 3-5 current students who are interested in changing majors to music education should licensing be approved and we have had calls of interest from at least 5 additional people. So, we estimate that there are approximate 8-10 or so potential candidates for 2016 who may be qualified after taking the CASA/or other approved admission tests. We will begin to advertise the program as soon as it is approved. Music faculty are interested in visiting area schools to recruit and provide coaching to school ensembles. The IUS large ensembles, particularly the concert band, brass band and orchestra have numbers of public school music teachers participating who would recruit in their schools. Over the years, many area music teachers have expressed dismay that we didn't have a licensed music education curriculum since most music students are interested in this degree so their only alternative was to leave the area to study. These teachers are delighted by the IU and state approval of the curriculum. In addition to this more personal recruiting, both schools will work with IUS marketing to get brochures and other documents ready to distribute. Following approval, advisors will begin to discuss the new program with eligible students. A notice will go out to all local area schools about the program. Our goal is to have at least 5 students graduate spring 2020 (given the four-year program) if all goes as planned. Should we have transfer students either from other schools or other curricula, we may have some additional graduates prior to that date. We will do a press release for the program once it is approved.