

**Trine University
Franks School of Education
Bachelor of Science major in English/Language Arts
Education 5-12**

**Request for Approval of New Program
Submitted May 9, 2016
By**

Karen S. Hamilton, Ph.D., Dean, Franks School of Education

Amy Nicholls, Chair, Department of Humanities and Communication

**Sarah Young, Ph.D., Assistant Professor, Department of Humanities and
Communication**

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Standard 1: Rationale..... | 3 |
| Standard 2: Curriculum..... | 5 |
| Standard 3: Clinical and Field Based Experiences | 18 |
| Standard 4 Evaluation..... | 19 |
| Standard 5 Governance | 21 |
| Standard 6: Schedule..... | 21 |
| Appendix A: Zipped file of Course Syllabi | 21 |
| Appendix B: Four-Year Program Sheet for Licensure Program..... | 22 |
| Appendix C: Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric & Student Teaching Lesson rubric for individual lessons observed..... | 23 |

Trine University
Franks School of Education
Bachelor of Science major in English/Language Arts 5-12

Standard 1: Rationale

1.1 Program Description

The proposed 5-12 English/Language Arts licensure program would offer Trine University students in the Franks School of Education (FSOE) the opportunity to earn a Bachelor of Science (B.S.) degree with 5-12 English/Language Arts licensure. This licensure program will require 120 hours of coursework and be attainable in four years. The program is modeled on Trine University's already-successful licensure programs in social studies, mathematics, chemistry, and life sciences. In addition to general education courses that have been carefully selected from the University's general education matrix to address English/Language Arts standards, students will take 34 hours of English content-area courses through the Department of Humanities and Communication (HAC) and 42 hours of professional education courses through FSOE. Courses would mostly be offered face-to-face on the University's main campus, with the option for students to take a small number of courses online. Many freshmen and sophomore general education courses are offered online throughout the year, and some residential students opt to take a few of these courses during their undergraduate career.

1.2 Needs Assessment Data

The rationale for the new program is to provide, upon graduation, highly effective practitioners prepared to teach English/Language Arts in a 5-12 setting. The proposed program meets a definite national and regional need for highly qualified English/Language Arts teachers.

According to the U.S. Department of Labor's most recent *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, "From 2014 to 2024, a significant number of older teachers will reach retirement age. Their retirement will create job openings for new teachers." The overall increase is projected to be 6%. The same rate of growth is projected for middle school teachers. *The New York Times* reported on August 9, 2015 that the "layoffs of the recession years combined with an improving economy in which fewer people are training to be teachers," have resulted in what the newspaper characterized as a nation-wide teacher shortage. The *Handbook* notes that there "is wide variation of job opportunities by region." Trine University's region of northeastern Indiana, southwestern Michigan and northwestern Ohio are facing particular need.

In March 2015, the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education's *Teacher Shortage Areas 1990-1991 through 2015-2016* indicated that Indiana reported English/Language Arts as a shortage area in 2011-12. In February 2016, a survey of the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) job listings showed 7% of available positions mid-school-year are in English Language Arts (36 of 491 openings). In addition, a 2015 press release by the IDOE, reports that since 2009, "Indiana has seen a more than 30% drop in the number of individuals issued initial teacher licenses each year." In September 2014, the Indiana State Board of Education approved a proposal to allow unlicensed college graduates to teach while earning state certification. In addition, the FSOE dean has received direct phone calls and e-mails from LEAs in southern and northwest Indiana inquiring about current preservice teachers or recent graduates who would be able to teach in the English/Language Arts courses in both middle school and

high school. Anecdotally, at recent career fairs, Trine University's English majors have been recruited aggressively by representatives from LEAs offering to hire them on this emergency-licensure basis.

The states of Michigan and Ohio show similar need. Ohio has reported a shortage of English/Language Arts teachers for grades 7-12 consistently since 2004-2005. The number of English/Language Arts jobs listed on the state department of education's website mid-year was similar to that of Indiana's. A 2009 report from the State of Michigan titled "NCLB Teacher Equity Plan" suggests that of the 12,000 language arts courses, 570 were taught by educators without "highly qualified" credentials. In 2015, the Michigan senate passed Senate Bill 491 which added writing and journalism to the list of subjects that may be taught by non-certified teachers. The bill is currently be reviewed by the Michigan House of Representatives.

It is in the best interest of the region's schools to have a pool of licensed educators well-prepared to meet the diverse needs of 21st Century Learners. Our research shows that that pool of educators in our region has steadily depleted, negatively affecting principals' ability to staff their classrooms with qualified English/Language Arts educators. Trine University's proposed program is a clear step toward meeting that need.

Standard 2: Curriculum

2.1 Matrix: Content Standards for Educators – English/Language Arts

| | | Trine University Courses for the English/Language Arts Educator Preparation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|--------|--------------------------|---------|---------|---------|----------------------------|---------|----------|----------|-------------------------------|----------|---------|---------|----------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------------|
| | | General Education Courses* | | | | | | | | Content Specific Courses | | | | | | | | Professional Education Course | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | Writing & Composition | | | | Lit. Surveys (take 3 of 5) | | | | Focused Electives* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | ENG 103 | ENG 113 | ENG 153 | ENG 233 | ENG 273 | ENG 433 | FLIM 203 | SP 203 | COM 163 | ENG 133 | ENG 363 | ENG 453 | ENG 412 & ENG 411 | COM 183 | ENG 2013 | ENG 2023 | ENG 2113 | ENG 2123 | ENG 253 | ENG 333 | ENG 3303 | ENG 3313 | EDU 232 | EDU 301 | EDU 303 | EDU 331 | EDU 332 | EDU 431 | EDU 442 | EDU 463 | EDU 470 & 471 |
| Indiana Educator Standards | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Foundations of Reading | X | | | | | X | X | | T | T | X | | X | T | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | |
| 2. Reading Informational and Persuasive Texts | X | X | | X | | | | X | | X | X | X | X | T | | | X | X | T | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Reading Literary Texts | X | | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Components of Writing | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | | X | T | X | X | X | X | X | | | X | | T | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Modes of Writing | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | T | X | X | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Listening, Speaking and Interpersonal Communication | X | X | | | T | T | | X | X | X | | | X | X | | | | | | | | | T | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. Visual Literacy and Media Presentation | X | | T | T | X | | X | X | X | X | | | T | T | T | T | | | | | T | T | X | X | | | | | | | | |
| 8. Language Arts Instruction and Assessment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | T | | | | | | | | | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| | | Coding: (X) Assessed (T) Addressed but not assessed. Micro-level documentation provided on the pages th | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | *All courses in this category are included on Trine University's grid of approved General Education courses. Mandating that students take these specific courses as part of their General Education requirements makes it possible for them to complete their degree with only 120 total credit hours. **These represent samples of the focused literature electives offered on a rotating basis. These courses are offered on different topics in order to familiarize students with various genres of literature and provide an opportunity for in-depth analysis. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | ENG 103 | ENG 113 | ENG 153 | ENG 233 | ENG 273 | ENG 433 | FLM 203 | SP 203 | COM 163 | ENG 133 | ENG 363 | ENG 453 | ENG 412 & ENG 411 | COM 183 | ENG 2013 | ENG 2023 | ENG 2113 | ENG 2123 | ENG 253 | ENG 333 | ENG 3303 | ENG 3313 | EDU 232 | EDU 301 | EDU 303 | EDU 331 | EDU 332 | EDU 431 | EDU 442 | EDU 463 | EDU 470 & 471 | | | | | | |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------------------|---------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------|---------|----------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------------|--|--|------|------|---------|---|
| Performance Assessment Coding: (1) Test, (2) Essay, (3) Project, (4) Oral/Visual Presentation, (5) Lesson Plan, (6) Field Experience, (7) Other, (T) addressed but not asse | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Standard 1: Foundations of Reading English language arts teachers have a broad and comprehensive understanding of emergent literacy and word-identification skills, fluency, vocabulary development, and reading comprehension, including: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.1 oral language development and the development of phonological and phonemic awareness | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | 1, 2 | 6 | | |
| 1.2 the development of concepts of print, letter knowledge, and letter–sound correspondence | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | T | 6 | |
| 1.3 the development of phonics and other word-identification skills | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 6 | T | 6 | |
| 1.4 the development of fluency | | | | | | | | | | | | | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 6 | T | 6 | |
| 1.5 word structures and contexts, the denotative and connotative meanings of words, word roots, and words that are derivatives or borrowings | | | | | | T | | | T | T | | | 1, 4, 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 6 | 4 | 6 | |
| 1.6 the historical, social, cultural, regional, and technological influences that have helped shape words and phrases in the English language | | | | | | | 1 | T | | | | | 4, 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 7 | 6 | |
| 1.7 factors that influence vocabulary development and reading comprehension, such as wide reading and reading rate | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1, 3, 7 | 6 |
| 1.8 comprehension strategies to use before, during, and after reading, such as previewing, predicting, and using think-alouds and graphic organizers | | | | | | T | | | | | | | 6 | T | | | | | | | | | T | | | | | | | | | | | | 2, 3 | 6 | |
| 1.9 comprehension strategies for reading across the curriculum, such as using metaphors and analogies to compare and contrast concepts in texts from multiple subject areas | 2 | | | | | | | 2 | | T | | | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 5, 7 | 6 | |

| | ENG 103 | ENG 113 | ENG 153 | ENG 233 | ENG 273 | ENG 433 | FLM 203 | SP 203 | COM 163 | ENG 133 | ENG 363 | ENG 453 | ENG 412 & ENG 411 | COM 183 | ENG 2013 | ENG 2023 | ENG 2113 | ENG 2123 | ENG 253 | ENG 333 | ENG 3303 | ENG 3313 | EDU 232 | EDU 301 | EDU 303 | EDU 331 | EDU 332 | EDU 431 | EDU 442 | EDU 463 | EDU 470 & 471 | |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------------------|---------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------|---------|----------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------------|--|
| Performance Assessment Coding: (1) Test, (2) Essay, (3) Project, (4) Oral/Visual Presentation, (5) Lesson Plan, (6) Field Experience, (7) Other, (T) addressed but not asse | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Standard 2: Reading Informational and Persuasive Texts English language arts teachers have a broad and comprehensive understanding of the analysis and interpretation of informational and persuasive texts, including: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.1 characteristics of various forms of informational and persuasive texts, such as textbooks, newspapers, magazines, maps, atlases, surveys, warranties, print advertisements, propaganda, and multimodal communications from the Internet | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | T | | T | | | | | | | | T | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.2 organizational features, formats, and structures of informational and persuasive texts, such as an index, a sidebar, schematics, and classification—division and problem—solution structures | | | | | | | | | | 1, 3 | | T | 6 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.3 the main idea and purpose of an informational or a persuasive text | 1, 2 | 1, 2 | T | | | | | | | | 4 | | 6 | T | | | | | | | T | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.4 general statements and specific details provided in an informational or a persuasive text | T | T | 4 | | | | | | | | 4 | | 6 | T | | | | | | | T | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.5 facts and opinions provided in an informational or a persuasive text | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | T | | | | | | | T | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.6 relevance, importance, and sufficiency of evidence, examples, and reasons provided as support in an informational or a persuasive text | | 2 | | | | | | 4 | | | | 2 | 6 | T | | | 2 | 2 | | | T | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.7 reliability, objectivity, and credibility of sources used in an informational or a persuasive text | | 2 | | | | | | T | | T | | 2 | 6 | 2 | | | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.8 explicit and implicit instructions, rules, recommendations, suggestions, and explanations provided in an informational or a persuasive text | | | | | | | 2 | | | T | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | T | | | | | | | | | | |

| Trine University Courses for the English/Language Arts Educator Preparation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------|---------|---------|--------------------------|---------|-------------------|---------|----------|----------------------------|----------|----------|---------|---------|--------------------------------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------------|---|---|--|
| General Education Courses* | | | | | | | | | | Content Specific Courses | | | | | | | | | | Professional Education Courses | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | Writing & Composition | | | | | Lit. Surveys (take 3 of 5) | | | | | Focused Electives** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ENG 103 | ENG 113 | ENG 153 | ENG 233 | ENG 273 | ENG 433 | FLM 203 | SP 203 | COM 163 | ENG 133 | ENG 363 | ENG 453 | ENG 412 & ENG 411 | COM 183 | ENG 2013 | ENG 2023 | ENG 2113 | ENG 2123 | ENG 253 | ENG 333 | ENG 3303 | ENG 3313 | EDU 232 | EDU 301 | EDU 303 | EDU 331 | EDU 332 | EDU 431 | EDU 442 | EDU 463 | EDU 470 & 471 | | | |
| Performance Assessment Coding: (1) Test, (2) Essay, (3) Project, (4) Oral/Visual Presentation, (5) Lesson Plan, (6) Field Experience, (7) Other, (T) addressed but not assessed | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Standard 3: Reading Literary Texts English language arts teachers have a broad and comprehensive understanding of the analysis and interpretation of literary texts, such as literary nonfiction, fiction, drama, and poetry, including: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.1 characteristics of various forms of literary texts, such as critical biography, short story, comedy of manners, and English sonnet | T | | 1, 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 1, 2 | 1, 2 | 1 | T | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.2 structural elements of literary texts, such as exposition, denouement, blank verse, and iambic pentameter | | | 2 | 1 | 3 | T | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | T | T | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.3 literary and rhetorical devices and techniques used in literary texts, such as flashback, foreshadowing, imagery, symbolism, soliloquy, and metaphor | 1, 2 | | 1, 2 | T | 3 | 4 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 1, 2 | 1, 2 | T | 2 | T | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.4 points of view, tones, voices, and moods used in literary texts | 1, 2 | | T | T | 3 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | T | T | 2 | 2 | T | T | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.5 diction or choice of words or word combinations used in literary texts | | | T | T | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | T | T | T | T | T | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.6 development of characters, plot, and setting in literary texts | | | T | 1 | 3 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | T | T | 2 | 2 | T | T | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.7 development of central ideas or themes in literary texts | 1, 2 | | | 2 | 2 | 3 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | |
| 3.8 formal, stylistic, and thematic characteristics of major literary works, genres, movements, and periods and of major authors of literary texts | 1, 2 | | | 1 | T | | | T | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | T | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.9 historical, social, cultural, and political contexts and influences of literary texts | | | | T | T | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | T | T | | 1, | 1, | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | |

| Trine University Courses for the English/Language Arts Educator Preparation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--------------------------|---------|---------|----------------------------|---------|---------|---------|--------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------------------|---------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------|---------|----------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------------|
| General Education Courses* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Content Specific Courses | | | | | | | Professional Education Courses | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Writing & Composition | | | Lit. Surveys (take 3 of 5) | | | | Focused Electives** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ENG 103 | ENG 113 | ENG 153 | ENG 233 | ENG 273 | ENG 433 | FLM 203 | SP 203 | COM 163 | ENG 133 | ENG 363 | ENG 453 | ENG 412 & ENG 411 | COM 183 | ENG 2013 | ENG 2023 | ENG 2113 | ENG 2123 | ENG 253 | ENG 333 | ENG 3303 | ENG 3313 | EDU 232 | EDU 301 | EDU 303 | EDU 322 | EDU 331 | EDU 332 | EDU 431 | EDU 442 | EDU 463 | EDU 470 & 471 |

Performance Assessment Coding: (1) Test, (2) Essay, (3) Project, (4) Oral/Visual Presentation, (5) Lesson Plan, (6) Field Experience, (7) Other, (T) addressed but not assessed

Standard 4: Components of Writing English language arts teachers have a broad and comprehensive understanding of writing conventions, writing process, composition, the research process, and electronic communication, including:

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|------|------|---|---|---|---|---------|---------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 4.1 conventions of spelling, capitalization, and punctuation | 1, 2 | 1, 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2, 3 | 3 | 2 | T | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | T | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.2 proper word usage and grammatical sentence structure | 1, 2 | 1, 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2, 3 | 3 | 2 | T | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | T | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.3 forms of writing to use for various purposes, such as entertaining or explaining, and audiences, such as a group of professional colleagues | 2 | 2 | | | 2 | | | 2, 3, 4 | 2, 3, 4 | T | T | | | | | | | | T | | T | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.4 methods of discovering, developing, and shaping ideas for writing, such as freewriting and concept mapping | T | | T | | | | | | | | | T | T | T | T | T | T | T | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.5 methods of drafting, revising, editing, and proofreading texts, such as presenting key points logically, eliminating distracting details, and varying sentence length and structure | 1, 2 | 2 | T | | T | | 4 | T | 3 | 2 | T | T | T | T | T | T | T | T | T | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.6 methods of developing effective introductions and conclusions to texts, such as using an anecdote and suggesting a course of action | 1, 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | | | 4 | T | 3 | 2 | T | T | 2 | 2 | 2 | T | T | T | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.7 methods of developing sentences, paragraphs, and texts that are clear, concise, and coherent, such as maintaining parallelism, using appropriate transitional words and phrases, and establishing and adhering to an organizational structure | 1, 2 | 1, 2 | 2 | 3 | | | | | 3 | 2 | T | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | T | T | T | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.8 methods of finding, selecting, and refining topics for research projects, such as developing an interest inventory; asking specific, open-ended questions; and using Internet search engines effectively | 2 | 2 | 3, T | | | | 4 | T | T | T | T | T | T | T | T | T | T | T | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Trine University Courses for the English/Language Arts Educator Preparation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------------------------|---------|----------|----------------------------|----------|----------|--------------------------------|---------|----------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------------|
| General Education Courses* | | | | | | | | | | | | Content Specific Courses | | | | | | Professional Education Courses | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | Writing & Composition | | | Lit. Surveys (take 3 of 5) | | | Focused Electives** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ENG 103 | ENG 113 | ENG 153 | ENG 233 | ENG 273 | ENG 433 | FLM 203 | SP 203 | COM 163 | ENG 133 | ENG 363 | ENG 453 | ENG 412 & ENG 411 | COM 183 | ENG 2013 | ENG 2023 | ENG 2113 | ENG 2123 | ENG 253 | ENG 333 | ENG 3303 | ENG 3813 | EDU 232 | EDU 301 | EDU 303 | EDU 322 | EDU 381 | EDU 332 | EDU 431 | EDU 442 | EDU 463 | EDU 470 & 471 |
| Performance Assessment Coding: (1) Test, (2) Essay, (3) Project, (4) Oral/Visual Presentation, (5) Lesson Plan, (6) Field Experience, (7) Other, (T) addressed but not assessed | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Standard 4: Components of Writing English language arts teachers have a broad and comprehensive understanding of writing conventions, writing process, composition, the research process, and electronic communication, including: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.9 methods of locating and working with sources and documenting sources during research, such as skimming and then reading sources, assessing the reliability of sources, and deciding on categories into which source information can be divided | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | 2 | | | 2 | 2 | T | T | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.10 methods of paraphrasing, summarizing, and quoting source information and citing and acknowledging sources in a text | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2 | 2 | | | | 2 | | 2 | | | 2 | T | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | T | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | |

2.2 Syllabi for Courses in the English/Language Arts Licensure Program

See attached zipped folder (Appendix A) for each of the course syllabi:

For sequencing of the program over four years, eight semesters, see Appendix B.

Required General Education Courses that Address Content-Area Standards

ENG 103 Composition I
ENG 113 Composition II
ENG 153 Introduction to Literature
ENG 233 Creative Writing
ENG 273 Mythology
ENG 433 Shakespeare and His Times
FLM 203 Film Appreciation
SP 203 Effective Speaking
COM 163 Interpersonal Communication

English Content-Area Courses

ENG 363 The English Language
ENG 133 Technical Communication
ENG 453 Advanced Composition
ENG 412 Writing Center Consulting
ENG 411L Writing Center Consulting Lab (taken twice)
COM 183 Writing for the Media
ENG 2013 British Literature I
ENG 2023 British Literature II
ENG 2113 American Literature I
ENG 2123 American Literature II
ENG 253 Readings in World Literature
ENG 3303 The Bible as Literature
ENG 3313 Graphic Novels

Courses within the FSOE

EDU 232 Educational Psychology—Middle/Secondary
EDU 301 Introduction to Teaching Practicum
EDU 303 Introduction to Teaching
EDU 331 Reading in the Content Area Practicum
EDU 332 Reading in the Content Area
EDU 431 Practicum in Teaching—Secondary Teacher
EDU 442 Special Methods—Secondary Teacher
EDU 463 Educational Media and Technology
EDU 470 Student Teaching

Below, find a table of courses that address each of the following:

- Assessment
- Use of Technology to impact P-12 student learning
- Cultural Competency
- Scientifically Based Reading Instruction

| Topic | Course Syllabus Reference |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Assessment | EDU 301, EDU 303, EDU 331, EDU 332, EDU 431, EDU 442, EDU 463, EDU 470 |
| Technology Integration | EDU 303, EDU 411, EDU 412, EDU 422, EDU 431, EDU 442, EDU 463, EDU 470 |
| Cultural Competency | EDU 322, EDU 470 |
| SBRR/SBRI | EDU 331, EDU 332, EDU 470 |

Standard 3: Clinical and Field Based Experiences

3.1 A student teaching placement of 10 weeks in the appropriate grade-level and subject-area will be arranged by the placement officer in the Franks School of Education. All placements are initiated by the FSOE a year in advance through cooperation with district superintendents' offices.

3.2 All student teaching placements are supervised by a University-employed faculty member, adjunct or full-time, with significant 5-12 classroom experience. Cooperating teachers are recommended by building principals who make those recommendations based on teacher evaluations. Cooperating teachers meet the following requirements:

- hold a regular standard license to teach in the content area and/or grade level where the student teacher will be participating.
- have a minimum of three years of teaching experience at the grade level/content area for which the request is made and be regarded as a master teacher by faculty, staff, and parents with the school district.

3.3 As is currently required by the Franks School of Education in other 5-12 licensure programs, preservice teachers in the English/Language Arts program will continue to complete Analysis of Student Performance (ASP) assessments in each of three different courses. Each ASP is designed to increase the level of difficulty and ensure that the preservice teacher has designed and implemented a course of instruction that is differentiated for all students. In addition, evidence must be provided through artifacts and data collection to determine if the learning outcomes were met. The process of lesson design and assessment tools is explained. Preservice teachers must describe their data collection including results in both pre and posttests. Conclusions are drawn as to how effective the lessons were for the students. These extensive analyses are required in the EDU 303/301, EDU 332/331, and EDU 470.

3.4 Tracking of preservice teachers' field placements will be conducted, in order to be sure that they have exposure to the different grade levels and to schools with recognized diversity in the geographical area within a 50 mile radius of the University. This tracking is done through a data base which is monitored by the FSOE administrative assistant.

All preservice teachers including those in secondary licensure programs have placements throughout their program in a variety of settings starting with the EDU 111 course. The placements are kept in the data base with accessibility to all faculty. This specific tracking system will continue for preservice teachers in the English/Language Arts licensure program.

In addition, the Franks School of Education has a placement coordinator whose main role is to obtain placements for each field experience and track all preservice teachers' placements according to school, grade level, and content area. The coordinator in turn works with the FSOE administrative assistant for expanding the current data base. This placement coordinator has a number of years' experience working with all populations of students in the area school districts. Monitoring preservice teachers in all field experiences is done under the direction of the dean.

Standard 4: Evaluation

4.1 UAS summary is as follows. Documentation is submitted into TASKSTREAM™, the electronic data base. The table here identifies the specific courses, requirements, GPA requirements, observation and evaluation forms, and Benchmark interview scores. Preservice teachers must meet each Benchmark before progressing to the next level of courses.

Standard Based Portfolio – Program Completion – *TASKSTREAM*

Benchmark 1 (Portfolio 1)

- EDU 111 Final Reflection rev F 2015
- EDU 211 Final Reflection rev F 2015
- Professional Dispositions 1
- Course Grade Rqmt. (Four--Course Grade Requirements)
- Program Admittance (Requires FSOE program Admittance from the Dean)
- Interview Dispositions
- Interview Score
- Bnchmk 1 Completion

Benchmark 2 (Portfolio 2)

- EDU 222 or 232 Case Study (EDU 222 or 232 Ed. Psych.)
- EDU 303 Lesson Plan (EDU 303 Lesson Planning)
- EDU 301 ASP 1 (EDU 301 Analysis of Student Performance)
- EDU 322 Cultural Diversity Reflection
- Dispositions 2 rev F 2015
- EDU301CprtgtChr Eval Rev F 2015 (301 Final Evaluation by Cooperating Teacher)
- EDU 301 Observation (EDU 301-1 Observation Evaluation Rubric)
- Interview Dispositions rev F 2015
- Interview Score rev F 2015
- Bnchmk 2 Completion (Benchmark 2 Completion)

Benchmark 3 (Portfolio 3)

- EDU 312 Lesson Plan (EDU 312 Lesson Plan for Special Needs Students)

- EDU 332/EDU445 Article Critique (EDU 333/445 Article Critique)
- EMB/EDU 331 ASP 2 (Analysis of Student Performance 2)
- EMB/EDU 331 Diversity Reflections
- EDU 464 Thematic Unit
- Content Artifacts (Content Artifacts within Student Licensure Area)
- Dispositions 3 rev F 2015
- EMB/EDU 331 Obsvtn (EMB/EDU 333 Observation Evaluation)
- EMB/331 Cprtgtchr Ev rev F15 (EMB/EDU 331 Cooperating Teacher Evaluation)
- Bnchmk 3 Completion (Benchmark 3 Completion)

Benchmark 4 (Portfolio 4)

- EDU 473 Issues (Foundations of American Education)
- EDU 462 Assessment Instrument
- EDU 470/471 ASP 3 (Analysis of Student Performance - ASP 3)
- EDU 470 Coop Tchr Final Ev rev 2015
- EDU 470 Final Observation
- Final Interview Dispositions rev F 2015
- Final Interview Score rev F 2015
- Benchmark 4 Completion

4.2 Evaluation of Student Teaching

All education majors are observed and evaluated on a regular basis when they are in the practicums. As soon after the observation as possible, students meet with their University supervisor to discuss the comments and evaluation made about the teaching. This evaluation is also shared with the cooperating teachers. The evaluation scores for both the cooperating teacher evaluations are entered into the TaskStream database. (Note above, for example, the EDU 333/EMB Observation and the EDU 470 Cooperating Teacher Evaluation and the EDU 470 Final Evaluation.) The posting of these evaluations allows for the FSOE to continuously track students' progress.

The tools and rubrics for evaluating the student teaching experience in the special education setting will follow those used for the current elementary education student teaching experience. Necessary changes will be made to reflect the nature of the specific special education setting along with the specific skill sets that will need to be met by preservice teachers. Attached in APPENDIX C are the current rubrics now used for preservice teachers in the elementary student teaching setting. These are completed by the cooperating teachers and the University supervisor. The scores on each evaluation are entered into the TaskStream™ data base.

They are:

EDU 470 STUDENT TEACHING EVALUATION FORM

These forms are used by the cooperating teacher at both the midterm conference and the final conference. Both meetings are attended by the University supervisor and the preservice student teacher

EDU 470 OBSERVATION GRID

This form is completed by anyone who observes the student teacher during the student teaching experience. This person is usually the University supervisor, however, it may also

be a faculty member from the FSOE.

Standard 5: Governance

Current program leadership in the Franks School of Education is under the dean, Karen S. Hamilton, Ph.D., associate professor. Dr. Hamilton oversees all operations of the FSOE. This includes monitoring of all curricula, serving as the data manager for the UAS, maintaining the advising model implemented by the University, monitoring all field experiences, and hiring of all personnel. She reports directly to the University Vice President of Academic Affairs, Dr. Allen Hersel, Ph.D. Dr. Hamilton was an active member of the NCATE visit in 2011 and has been involved in two other NCATE visits before coming to Trine. She has been serving with schools of education and teacher training programs since 1987.

Senior faculty members in the FSOE are Amy M. Alexander, Ed.D., assistant professor, and Anthony Kline, Ph.D., assistant professor. Dr. Alexander currently oversees the field experiences required of all secondary education major in all content areas. She also teaches the elementary methods block for math and science, and the educational psychology courses for those majors. Dr. Kline teaches the elementary methods block for language arts and social studies and the educational psychology course for the elementary majors. He also holds a masters in special education.

Mrs. Kathy Pollock serves as full time faculty member for the teaching of reading courses, children's literature, and reading in the content area courses. She has 32 years of elementary teaching which includes serving as a reading interventionist, reading support instructor, and special ed district coach.

The Department of Humanities and Communication currently has two faculty members who are qualified to teach English/Language Arts Methods courses. Sarah Young, Ph.D., assistant professor, holds a Master of Science in Language Education from Indiana University. She also has several years of experience as an English/Language Arts teacher in secondary schools in Indiana and Kentucky. Her doctoral dissertation on nineteenth-century American literature was accepted May 4, 2016. Mrs. Amy Nicholls, assistant professor, was a secondary English/Language Arts teacher in the State of Michigan for fourteen years before moving into her current position. She also holds a Master of Arts in English Literature from Western Michigan University.

Standard 6: Schedule

The Board of Trustees at Trine University, along with the President, Vice President, and faculty has approved the move toward the 5-12 licensure program in English/Language Arts. Once the IDOE gives its full approval, the program will be offered to students as early as those entering the University hopefully as early as the Fall of 2016. Currently, the Trine University Admissions Office is waiting for the State approval of this program in order for them to begin marketing this licensure program to prospective students.

Appendix A: Zipped file of Course Syllabi

See separate attachment for all course syllabi in zipped folder labeled "Trine University Course Syllabi Dual Licensure Program"

Appendix B: Four-Year Program Sheet for Licensure Program

| 3/14/2016 | | English/Language Arts Education | | | | Program Total: 120 minimum | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------|-------------------------|--|----------------------------|-------|
| | | 4 year program | | | | | |
| FRESHMAN FALL | | STATUS | notes | FRESHMAN SPRING | | STATUS | notes |
| EDU 111 | Freshman Practicum | | | ENG 113 | English Comp II | | |
| ENG 103 | English Comp I | | | PSY 113 | Principles of Psychology | | |
| ENG 153 | Introduction to Literature | | | MA 113 or higher | Algebra or higher | | |
| COM 163 | Interpersonal Communication | | | | Literature survey/elective | | |
| UE 101 | University Experience | | | | Social Science Elective | | |
| | Science Elective | | hours | | | | hours |
| SOPHOMORE FALL | | | | | | | |
| | | STATUS | notes | SOPHOMORE SPRING | | STATUS | notes |
| EDU 211 | Sophomore Practicum | | | EDU 232 | Educational Psych | | |
| SP 203 | Effective Speaking | | | ENG 233 | Mythology | | |
| FLM 203 | Film Appreciation | | | ENG 273 | Creative Writing | | |
| ENG 133 | Technical Communication | | | COM 183 | Writing for the Media | | |
| ENG 412/411L | Writing Center Consulting & Lab | | | ENG 411L | Writing Center Lab | | |
| | Literature survey/elective | | | | Literature survey/elective | | |
| | Take and Pass CASA Basic Skills Test | | hours | | | | hours |
| JUNIOR FALL | | | | | | | |
| | | STATUS | notes | JUNIOR SPRING | | STATUS | notes |
| *EDU 303 | Intro to Teaching | | | EDU 412 | The Middle School | | |
| *EDU 301 | Practicum for EDU 303 | | | EDU 422 | Middle School Methods | | |
| EDU 312 | Exceptional Children | | | EDU 411 | Middle School Practicum | | |
| EDU 322 | Culturally Responsive Teaching | | | ENG 363 | The English Language | | |
| ENG 433 | Shakespeare & His Times | | | ENG 453/303 | Advanced Comp/Tech Com | | |
| | Literature survey/elective | | | | Literature survey/elective | | |
| | | | hours | | | | hours |
| | | | | | Take and Pass Required Licensure tests | | |
| SENIOR FALL | | | | | | | |
| | | STATUS | notes | SENIOR SPRING | | STATUS | notes |
| EDU 332/ 331 | Content Reading & Practicum | | | EDU 473 | Issues in Am Public Ed | | |
| EDU 431 | Practicum in Teaching - Sec | | | EDU 462 | Ed Measurement | | |
| EDU 442 | Special Methods - ENG | | | EDU 470 | Student Teaching | | |
| EDU 463 | Ed Media and Tech | | | EDU 471 | Student Teaching Seminar | | |
| | Literature survey/elective | | | | | | |
| | | | hours | | | | hours |

Appendix C: Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric & Student Teaching Lesson rubric for individual lessons observed

**Trine University
Franks School of Education
EDU 470 STUDENT TEACHING
EVALUATION**

Same rubric is used
for Mid-term and
Final Assessment

PRACTICUM STUDENT: _____ SUBJECT/GRADE: _____

COOPERATING TEACHER: _____ SCHOOL: _____

Directions: *The following grids are based in the program objectives of the Franks School of Education and the InTASC model of teaching principles which support the mission of the FSOE to prepare knowledgeable, reflective educators. Please use the scale below to check the box that most accurately reflects your observations of the preservice teacher for each area. Consider the level of sophistication that would be expected in the application of knowledge and skills of the preservice teachers in this practicum.*

- 4 = **EXEMPLARY** (MEETS PROGRAM OBJECTIVE AT LEVEL OF ACCOMPLISHED PRESERVICE PRACTITIONER)
- 3 = **MEETS STANDARD** (ADEQUATELY MEETS PROGRAM OBJECTIVE)
- 2 = **DEVELOPING** (BEGINNING EVIDENCE OF MEETING PROGRAM OBJECTIVE)
- 1 = **REMEDiation NEEDED** (DOES NOT MEET MINIMUM EXPECTATIONS)

| Program Objective 1: The practicum student understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences. The practicum student- | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| exhibits knowledge about the intellectual, social, and personal development of the learners for this grade level. | | | | |
| plans and implements developmentally appropriate lessons. | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | |

My overall rating for program objective 1 = 1 2 3 4

| Program Objective 2: The practicum student uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards. The practicum student- | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| is knowledgeable about students with exceptionalities. | | | | |
| plans and adapts lessons to meet the needs of diverse learners. | | | | |
| plans lessons that address multiple intelligences. | | | | |
| plans lessons that address learning styles and modes of learning. | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | |

My overall rating for program objective 2 = 1 2 3 4

| Program Objective 3: The practicum student works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation. The practicum student- | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| exemplifies active and equitable engagement of learners. | | | | |
| creates a positive learning climate of open and mutual respect. | | | | |
| uses allocated lesson time for maintaining learners' attention, including starting lessons on time. | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | |

My overall rating for program objective 3 = 1 2 3 4

| Program Objective 4: The practicum student understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of discipline (s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content. The practicum student- | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| exhibits content knowledge in his/her subject area(s). | | | | |
| adds to class discussion without relying on textbook(s). | | | | |
| plans lessons related to real life situations when appropriate. | | | | |
| uses media, manipulatives, labs, and other materials to clarify content when needed. | | | | |
| Incorporates the use of technology to enhance lessons. | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | |

My overall rating for program objective 4 = 1 2 3 4

| Program Objective 5: The practicum student understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues. The practicum student - | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| uses cooperative learning during instruction. | | | | |
| frames lesson plans within 21 st Century Learning themes | | | | |
| creates lesson plans that encourage participation by all students. | | | | |
| encourages appropriate listening skills. | | | | |
| establishes and consistently enforces classroom rules and procedures. | | | | |
| uses appropriate motivation strategies. | | | | |
| respects students and encourages respectful behavior in class. | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | |

My overall rating for program objective 5 = 1 2 3 4

| Program Objective 6: The practicum student understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making. The practicum student - | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| assesses prior student learning. | | | | |
| gives feedback when necessary as means of monitoring student learning. | | | | |
| uses multiple assessment strategies. | | | | |
| demonstrates for the learners the need for quality work. | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | |

My overall rating for program objective 6 = 1 2 3 4

| Program Objective 7: The practicum student plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context. The practicum student - | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| does necessary planning prior to teaching with needed materials organized and available. | | | | |
| bases lesson plans in the learning outcome(s) and aligned standards. | | | | |
| plans appropriate sequencing of learning experiences. | | | | |
| exemplifies planning based on prior learner knowledge and assessment data. | | | | |
| exemplifies an understanding of learning theory and human development. | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | |

My overall rating for program objective 7 = 1 2 3 4

| Program Objective 8: The practicum student understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students' development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills. The practicum student - | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| uses a variety of instructional strategies. | | | | |
| creates lesson plans that encourage critical thinking. | | | | |
| creates lesson plans that develop performance skills. | | | | |
| asks effective questions to aid in developing higher order thinking in learners. | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | |

My overall rating for program objective 8 = 1 2 3 4

| Program Objective 9: The practicum student is a reflective practitioner who engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner. The practicum student- | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| accepts feedback from cooperating teacher and university supervisor. | | | | |
| reflects upon lessons and evaluates effectiveness. | | | | |
| re-teaches, if necessary, after reflecting on lesson. | | | | |
| Is responsive to needed changes in lesson planning and implementing. | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | |

My overall rating for program objective 9 = 1 2 3 4

| Program Objective 10: The practicum student seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning and development, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth, and to advance the profession. The practicum student - | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| has good rapport with cooperating teacher(s). | | | | |
| establishes a professional relationship with students. | | | | |
| is prepared for class. | | | | |
| maintains a safe classroom environment. | | | | |
| assumes responsibility for student learning. | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | |

My overall rating for program objective 10 = 1 2 3 4

| Professional Dispositions The practicum student - | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| dresses in a professionally appropriate manner. | | | | |
| exhibits maturity in professional situations. | | | | |
| makes eye-contact with students. | | | | |
| smiles. | | | | |
| praises students when appropriate. | | | | |
| dignifies student responses. | | | | |
| has realistic expectations of students. | | | | |
| greet students. | | | | |
| uses appropriate grammar and vocabulary in written materials | | | | |
| uses appropriate grammar and vocabulary when speaking. | | | | |

My overall rating for professional dispositions = 1 2 3 4

MY OVERALL RATING OF THIS PRACTICUM STUDENT = 1 2 3 4

- 4 = **EXEMPLARY** (MEETS PROGRAM OBJECTIVE AT LEVEL OF ACCOMPLISHED PRESERVICE PRACTITIONER)
- 3 = **MEETS STANDARD** (ADEQUATELY MEETS PROGRAM OBJECTIVE)
- 2 = **DEVELOPING** (BEGINNING EVIDENCE OF MEETING PROGRAM OBJECTIVE)
- 1 = **DEVELOPING** (DOES NOT MEET MINIMUM EXPECTATIONS)

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

SIGNATURE OF

COOPERATING TEACHER: _____ **DATE:** _____

TRINE UNIVERSITY FRANKS SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

EDU 470 STUDENT TEACHING

near beginning of student teaching ___
 near middle of student teaching ___
 near end of student teaching ___

TU STUDENT: _____

DATE: _____

SCHOOL: _____

SUBJECT/GRADE: _____

LESSON TOPIC: _____

EVALUATOR: _____

Evaluation Overview This form is completed three times during the student teaching experience. Below is the scale for evaluation. Exemplary is reserved for those items that exceed expectations and a comment should be added to support this rating. Consider the level of sophistication that would be expected in the application of knowledge and skills of the preservice teacher in this practicum.

| CRITERION | 1 REMEDIATION NEEDED | 2 DEVELOPING | 3 MEETS THE STANDARD | 4 EXEMPLARY | SCORE |
|-----------|----------------------|--------------|----------------------|-------------|-------|
|-----------|----------------------|--------------|----------------------|-------------|-------|

PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITIONS

| | 1 Remediation Needed | 2 Developing | 3 Meets Standard | 4 Exemplary | SCORE |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|--------------------|--------------|
| PROFESSIONAL APPEARANCE (PD) | Appearance and/or hygiene is unacceptable | Some modification needed to present a professional image | Appearance is appropriate for a professional position in a school setting | | |
| | 1 Remediation Needed | 2 Developing | 3 Meets Standard | 4 Exemplary | SCORE |
| SELF-CONFIDENCE (PD) | Shows no confidence or poise in the classroom | Some modification needed to exhibit confidence | Candidate is poised and self-confident | | |
| | 1 Remediation Needed | 2 Developing | 3 Meets Standard | 4 Exemplary | SCORE |
| ENERGY AND ENTHUSIASM (PD) | Shows little enthusiasm or energy | | Candidate exhibits enthusiasm and energy | | |

COMMENTS:

COMMUNICATION

| | 1 Remediation Needed | 2 Developing | 3 Meets Standard | 4 Exemplary | SCORE |
|---|---|---|--|--------------------|--------------|
| EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION SKILLS (PD) | Commonly uses ineffective oral/written communication. | Occasionally uses effective oral/written communication. | Consistently uses effective oral/written communication | | |
| | 1 Remediation Needed | 2 Developing | 3 Meets Standard | 4 Exemplary | SCORE |
| ACCURATE ORAL/WRITTEN COMMUNICATION (PD) | Commonly uses substandard oral/written communication | Uses standard oral/written communication most of the time | Consistently uses standard oral/written communication | | |

COMMENTS: Please specify recurring oral and/or written errors

INSTRUCTION

| | 1 Remediation Needed | 2 Developing | 3 Meets Standard | 4 Exemplary | SCORE |
|---|--|--|---|--------------------|--------------|
| LESSON PLAN OUTCOME(S) (PO #7) | Does not have an observable and measureable learning outcome(s) | Outcome is missing one part of an observable and measurable outcome but aligns with content standard within the core curriculum | Outcome is measurable and observable and aligns with content standard within the core curriculum. | | |
| IDENTIFICATION OF TEACHING STRATEGIES (PO #8) | No attempt to identify the teaching strategy on the lesson plan | A teaching strategy is identified but not necessarily aligned with the lesson | A teaching strategy is identified that aligns with the lesson | | |
| TEACHING RESOURCES (PO #4) | Does not use additional resources to teach content even though such resources would enhance the lesson. | | Resources were used, and they aligned with the content of the lesson. | | |
| UNDERSTANDS HOW CHILDREN LEARN AND ADAPTS TO DIVERSE LEARNERS (PO #1, PO #2, PO#3) | No part of the lesson recognizes activities or strategies that are developmentally appropriate for this grade level | Attempts to design a developmentally appropriate lesson for this grade level but lacks the required expertise | Differentiation is evident in the lesson and is appropriate for this grade level. | | |
| CONTENT KNOWLEDGE (PO #4) | Displays serious weakness in content knowledge | Has difficulty with some subject/content knowledge | Generally has strong content knowledge base in the subject area(s) | | |
| PLANNING AND INSTRUCTION (PO #7) (Lesson Planning) | Has no lesson plan or one that is substandard | Has missing parts or inadequate planning gaps in the lesson | Has a thorough and well-developed lesson plan | | |
| PLANNING AND ORGANIZING INSTRUCTION (PO #7) (Transitions) | Transitions create distracting situations and do not move students through the lesson content. Students are unclear about what to do | Transitions are difficult; creating some confusion in moving students through the lesson content. They are somewhat unclear about what to do | Seamless transitions from topic to topic move students through the lesson content. Students know what is expected of them | | |
| PLANNING AND INSTRUCTION (PO #4) (Connections to Real Life Situations) | Briefly mentions a real life connection but does not help learners make any connection between that and lesson content | Mentions a real life situation but does not develop it toward helping learners make logical connection to the lesson content | Provides real life situations and develops them to help learners make logical connections to the lesson content | | |

COMMENTS:

CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

| | 1 Remediation Needed | 2 Developing | 3 Meets Standard | 4 Exemplary | SCORE |
|---|---|---|--|-------------|-------|
| CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT (PO #5) (Classroom control) | Ignores issues of control or attention of learners | Is aware of management , but struggles to control class or sustain attention of learners | Promotes class attention, instruction, and management in a positive way. | | |
| | 1 Remediation Needed | 2 Developing | 3 Meets Standard | 4 Exemplary | SCORE |
| STUDENT INVOLVEMENT (PO #2, PO # 3) | Ignores issues of involvement | Tends to focus on specific learners | Works to involve most learners | | |
| | 1 Remediation Needed | 2 Developing | 3 Meets Standard | 4 Exemplary | SCORE |
| INTERPERSONAL CARING ATTRIBUTES (PO #9) | Does not exhibit caring attributes | Exhibits some interpersonal caring attributes toward some learners | Exhibits continuous interpersonal caring to all learners | | |
| | 1 Remediation Needed | 2 Developing | 3 Meets Standard | 4 Exemplary | SCORE |
| TIME MANAGEMENT (PO #3)_(Keeps students on task) | Does not make an effort to keep learners on task and instructional time is lost | Makes some effort to keep learners on task for much of the instructional time | Makes concerted effort to keep all learners on task effectively using instructional time | | |
| | 1 Remediation Needed | 2 Developing | 3 Meets Standard | 4 Exemplary | SCORE |
| INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES (PO #8) (Higher Order Thinking) | Makes no attempt to encourage higher order thinking or address 21 st Century Learning themes | Makes some attempt to encourage higher order thinking or address 21 st Century Learning themes | Makes attempts to encourage higher order thinking framed in 21 st Century Learning themes | | |

COMMENTS:

ASSESSMENT STRATEGY

| | 1 Remediation Needed | 2 Developing | 3 Meets Standard | 4 Exemplary | SCORE |
|--|---|---|--|-------------|-------|
| ALIGNS ASSESSMENT STRATEGY TO OUTCOME (PO #6) | Assessment strategy is not related to the learning outcome | Uses formative assessment that is somewhat aligned with the learning outcome | Plans and uses formative assessment strategy that is directly related to the learning outcome | | |
| | 1 Remediation Needed | 2 Developing | 3 Meets Standard | 4 Exemplary | SCORE |
| ALIGNS ASSESSMENT STRATEGY TO CONTENT (PO #6) | Lesson is inappropriately structured and implemented for supporting learners in learning the content | Lesson is only minimally structured and implemented for supporting learners in learning the content | Lesson is structured and implemented for guiding learners with the support necessary to learn the content | | |
| | 1 Remediation Needed | 2 Developing | 3 Meets Standard | 4 Exemplary | SCORE |
| ASSESSMENT FEEDBACK (PO #6) | Provides learners with inappropriate or ineffective feedback as support for their learning | Provides learners with some feedback that supports and enhances their learning | Provides learners with appropriate and effective feedback that supports and enhances their learning | | |
| | 1 Remediation Needed | 2 Developing | 3 Meets Standard | 4 Exemplary | SCORE |
| ASSESSMENT MONITORING (PO #6) | Some monitoring of student learning exists but improvement is needed especially related to using effective questioning strategies | Exemplifies occasional monitoring to engage learners and address their needs and includes some effective questioning strategies | Exemplifies ongoing monitoring and support to engage learners and assess and address learner needs, including the use of effective questioning | | |

SIGNATURE OF EVALUATOR: _____
updated 05/2015



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.