

School of Education

2001 IPSB Annual Report

**Indiana University
at
Bloomington/Indianapolis**

September 2001

School of Education

2001 IPSB Annual Report

**Indiana University
at**

Bloomington/Indianapolis

Index

Section I Introduction

Section II Bloomington Campus

Section III Indianapolis Campus

September 2001

School of Education
2001 IPSB Annual Report

Indiana University
at
Bloomington/Indianapolis

Section I.

Introduction

September 2001

Introduction

Overview:

This report responds to the requirements established by the Indiana Professional Standards Board (IPSB) in conjunction with the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) for the 2001 Annual Report. This report is structured according to the unique organization of the School of Education. The Indiana University School of Education is considered a core campus school with the two primary campuses at Indiana University–Bloomington (IUB) and Indianapolis (IUPUI). When the faculty meets for policy deliberation, both campuses are represented. Organizationally, there is one University Dean for the School of Education and one Executive Associate Dean for each of the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses.

Because of the shared mission and goals of the two campuses of the School of Education there are many commonalities between our professional programs. However, as a result of being located in different settings and having different histories, there are also numerous program differences. It will be evident in this document that each campus has, in consultation with the other, developed diverse programs for preparing professional educators. Both campuses have large traditional programs for elementary and secondary teachers. Both campuses also have developed and are still in the process of creating innovative teacher education programs. The foci of these programs are intentionally independent. We want to capitalize on the unique strengths of the faculty, our students, access to schools, and our facilities. At the advanced program level, our programs are generally seamless. Graduate curricula in areas like educational leadership and school counseling are in general structurally identical. Graduate program faculty use distance education facilities or drive between the two campuses to provide high quality advanced programs.

The Core Campus administrative and programmatic arrangement has been in place since 1974. There are many advantages to this organization since the faculty may teach on either campus (even though their tenure is campus specific) and both campuses operate under one accreditation and one faculty governance body (the IU School of Education Policy Council).

Report Organization:

Section I includes an introduction to the Core Campus and details accreditation for both the IUB and IUPUI campuses. Section II presents the narrative portion of the Annual Report for IUB and provides a detailed report on the way in which IUB's revised programs reflect the principles, standards, and assessment requirements of the IPSB. Additionally, a description of activities designed to rectify the weaknesses identified in the 1997 visit is provided. Section III presents the narrative report for IUPUI and follows the same outline as noted earlier.

School of Education
2001 IPSB Annual Report

Indiana University
at
Bloomington/Indianapolis

Section II
Bloomington Campus

September 2001

PART I: IUB RESPONSES TO WEAKNESSES 2001 REPORT

Weakness 1: The evaluation design of the model has not been fully articulated.

2001 Update

During the past year, much effort, planning and collaboration has gone into the development of a philosophy for evaluation and the outline for a set of assessment practices. A conceptual model for the unit's assessment system has been approved by the Teacher Education Council. The guidelines of the Indiana Professional Standards Board are being utilized to develop plans and strategies for our continuous assessment plan. The system being planned incorporates components for individual student assessment, a management scheme, and a program evaluation component based on the individual student assessments and other data such as testing information, success in field experiences and student teaching as examples.

A description of advances in the evaluation design and plans for this academic year will be discussed in detail in the following section of the report. During the past year, much progress has been made in the continued development and refinement of the IUB unit assessment system. Faculty members have contributed in many positive and constructive ways to help the unit meet the June 30, 2002 goal. We will submit a quality document on or before the deadline.

Weakness 2: Candidates in secondary education programs are not adequately prepared to teach exceptional populations in the classrooms.

2001 Update

As stated in last year's update, a course specific to working with special populations of students in the secondary school was developed and approved for inclusion in the secondary education programs. The Teacher Education Council approved inclusion of this course, K306, *Teaching Students with Special Needs in Secondary Classrooms*, into existing secondary programs beginning with freshmen in Fall 1999. These students began their initial professional education courses in the 2000-2001 academic year.

Since Fall 1999, the course has been offered every semester except for one. Secondary students are being advised of this program addition, and plans have been made to offer an increasing number of sections of this course each semester.

The secondary program presently is under revision, and the course, K306, has been incorporated in the new program design. Thus, with this new program, all secondary education majors will be required to complete a course addressing work with students

with special needs.

In 1998 - 99, after reviewing secondary students evaluations and comments, we took immediate steps to design a specific course offering for secondary students. In the past, an effort was made to infuse work on exceptional needs students throughout the secondary curriculum. Based on the site team feedback and data from graduate surveys, we realized that this effort was not as effective as we originally intended.

The Special Education faculty developed a course designed for working with special populations of students in the secondary school. The course was approved by the faculty, by the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, the Teacher Education Council and finally by the unit's governance group, the Policy Council. The course, Educ K206, was offered during the Summer 1999 session and has been offered each semester thereafter. Additionally, the Teacher Education Council approved the addition of a requirement that all new secondary majors be required to complete this course or an equivalent. The effective date of the policy requiring the enrollment of all new secondary majors was Fall semester, 1999.

Weakness 3: At the Bloomington campus, there is no systematic faculty development plan for cooperating teachers.

2001 Update

Our communication efforts and meetings with those teachers who work with our early field experience and student teaching placements referenced in our 2000 report have continued through the 2000-2001 academic year. Efforts have been made over the course of the past year to enrich the information shared with cooperating teachers involved with early field experiences. To further the efforts cited in the 2000 update, the field experience faculty coordinators have revised the materials shared with the cooperating teachers as to the expectations of the respective field experiences and their integration with the courses offered on campus. The faculty and associate instructors continued their active recruitment of cooperating teachers working with specific field experiences, and through their recruitment provided information as to the teaching strategies and skills being addressed in the associated courses on campus. The work with the cooperating teachers has been a collaborative effort to develop the teaching skills of teacher candidates and to enhance the learning of the classroom students, through the involvement of the candidates in the classrooms.

In addition to continuing the efforts with supervising teachers who work with the student teachers as described last year, a special project has been initiated to develop a structured development session for supervising teachers. Funded by the University Dean, a task force of supervising teachers, university supervisors and Education staff is developing materials for the orientation and training of supervising teachers. This task force already has met three times, and plans to prepare materials for piloting with the

Spring 2002 supervising teachers. This effort will be evaluated and the results analyzed, such that the materials are available for wide implementation among the Fall 2002 supervising teachers.

During 2000, concerted efforts have been made to provide systematic information to cooperating teachers working in the Early Field Experiences and to supervising teachers working with Student Teachers. These efforts will be shared by program.

Early Field Experiences

Information about the various early field experiences required have been incorporated into the Office's Website. The Website provides the mission/purpose of early field experiences, and course descriptions and expectations of each experience. Specifically for cooperating teachers, ideas are posted for integrating students into the classroom, as well as information about the Tuition Credit Bank, a reward system developed to compensate teachers for working with early field experience students. Teachers are advised of the Website on all the correspondence that is distributed from the Early Field Experiences Office.

In addition to this Web posting, cooperating teachers, each semester, receive the following materials once students have been placed in their classrooms:

- a description of the field experience including scheduling information, and specific activities that can be completed in the classroom, such as one-on-one work with pupils, work in small groups, test assistance, and/or co-design and delivery of lesson(s);
- a flyer including suggestions for integrating students into the classroom at the beginning, middle and end of the field experiences; and
- student letters of introduction from each individual placed in their classroom covering the students' experiences with children, the students' expectations of the field experience, and the students' hobbies. This letter is required of students in response to feedback received from cooperating teachers.

Responsible for most of the field experiences are faculty and/or associate instructors who recruit cooperating teachers, explain the expectations of the teacher education program, and explain the experience(s) requirements. These instructors visit the classrooms regularly and not only observe and/or work with the students, but also they provide suggestions and support for the teachers working with the students. Relatedly, these instructors conduct weekly seminars with the students. Cooperating teachers often attend and participate in these seminars, presenting pertinent information for the teacher education students. Finally, cooperating teachers provide evaluations of the students placed in their classroom and of the field experience itself. These evaluative data are summarized following each semester and reviewed by the respective instructors and Office staff to work on the continuing improvement of the Early Field

Experiences.

Student Teaching

During the past year, a major effort was made to improve the student teaching information on the Office Web site. The site includes the *Student Application Handbook* and information in response to the most frequently questions about student teaching. A specific link is provided for supervising teachers addressing the requirements of them. A priority for this academic year is to place the *Student Teaching Handbook* on-line, that includes more detailed information about the role and expectations of supervising teachers.

Continuing efforts are being made to improve the information provided supervising teachers at the start of each student teaching experience. The *Student Teaching Handbook* was revised over the past year to address issues that have been raised and particularly to elaborate on the role of the supervising teacher in the ongoing evaluation of the student teacher. Also, the instructions for completion of the mid-term and final evaluations were revised to clarify the supervising teachers responsibilities.

Three meetings are held with university supervisors and the Assistant Dean for Teacher Education each semester to discuss policies and issues associated with student teaching. Each meeting has included significant discussion about the supervisors' collaborative role with supervising teachers. Suggestions/improvements about information for supervising teachers are discussed and incorporated into materials and/or processes for the next year. The University supervisors also make a concerted effort to work with supervising teachers on their skills in facilitating student teachers' growth.

During the coming year, initial discussions, among faculty, teachers and supervisors, will be held over the evaluation forms and processes used in student teaching. Also, discussions will be held with local school corporations about the provision of sessions on observational and facilitative skills to assist supervising teachers in working with student teachers.

PART: Indiana University School of Education
Bloomington

Unit Assessment System 2001 REPORT

Criterion 1: The UAS incorporates stakeholders' involvement in its development and management. Minimally, stakeholders should include program faculty, content faculty, P-12 faculty and administrators, candidates in the program, and program alumni.

Since 1995, the School of Education faculty has taken the initiative to re-design the teacher education programs in alignment with the School's Six Guiding Principles, INTASC principles and respective IPSB standards. Throughout the design process, the faculty has worked closely with colleagues across campus and in public schools. Thus, the individual program faculty teams have collaborated with various stakeholders throughout their deliberations.

In addition to these faculty initiatives, there have been three more encompassing collaborative efforts in the design both of the teacher education programs and their ongoing assessments. First, the Joint Advisory Review Board (JARB), a long standing partnership between Indiana University School of Education and the Monroe County Community School Corporation, has involved K-12 faculty and administrators in discussions with Education faculty and staff over the administration of early field experience and student teaching components of the teacher education programs. Issues associated with the assessment of these components, all a part of the School's Unit Assessment System, have been brought to this group over the course of the years, and will continue to be.

Second, the 21st Century Teachers Project, an initiative of Indiana University's President Myles Brand begun in 2000, has brought together the faculties of the School of Education, the College of Arts and Sciences, and K-12 schools to discuss the courses required in the preparation of teachers. At present, there are six collaborative faculty groups (science, literature and speech, mathematics, visual and performing arts, civics, and globalization), which include faculty from both university units and K-12 faculty, working on the re-design and assessment of courses. Initial changes and recommendations of these working groups have been implemented in the Fall 2001 semester. This project is committed to maintaining this collaborative exchange among university and K-12 faculty to assess and strengthen various facets of the teacher education programs and their quality assessment.

Third, the Teacher Education Council (TEC) is the School's primary teacher education policy-making body and has been assigned responsibility for the management of the School's Unit Assessment System. This Council is made up of 20 members, representing Education faculty, faculty from across the campus, K-12 faculty and administrators, as well as students and Education staff. The TEC has been instrumental in the approval of the School's new teacher education programs and has facilitated the integration of performance-based assessments into each of the programs, as well as the development of the School-wide assessment system. The active

involvement of this collaborative body is a strength of the School's assessment system.

Lastly, a new entity will be assigned and begin meeting during the 2001-2002 academic year. The Field Placement Advisory Council will bring together representatives of Education faculty and staff and K-12 faculty and administrators from the six local school corporations most heavily involved in clinical components of the teacher education programs. The goal of this new Council will be to address collaboratively the academic and administrative issues surrounding field experience placements of pre-service candidates in the public schools, not only from the perspective of the School's academic programs, but also from the perspectives of the public schools as issues relate to students' learning and to staff professional development. This new Council will be instrumental in working together to facilitate quality design, assessment and administration of the field experience components of the teacher education programs.

Items in Evidence:

- ▶ original teacher education program proposals
- ▶ 21st Century Teachers Project documentation
- ▶ Teacher Education Council membership and minutes
- ▶ Field Placement Advisory Council membership and minutes

Criterion 2: The UAS includes evidence that the conceptual framework(s) for the unit's programs incorporates (incorporate) all Indiana Professional Standards Board (IPSB) standards. IPSB standards include the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) principles and the IPSB content and developmental standards for each licensure area.

In 1996, the Teacher Education Council adopted the School's Six Guiding Principles as the conceptual framework for teacher education. The 1999 UAS Annual Report included a detailed description of how the INTASC principles are incorporated in these Six Guiding Principles.

In its approval of all the revised preparation programs, the Teacher Education Council has required the faculty to address these six principles and to document how they are reflected as the foundation of each program. Over the course of the past year, each of the teacher education programs' faculty has prepared tables specifically documenting where the INTASC and School's principles are addressed, as well as where the respective IPSB developmental level and content standards are addressed. During the 2001-2002 academic year, each program faculty will be refining these tables and identifying the performance assessments and criteria to be used to determine candidates' understanding of the principles.

Items in Evidence:

- ▶ *Principles for Reconceptualizing Teacher Education*
- ▶ 1999 UAS Annual Report
- ▶ original teacher education program proposals
- ▶ Teacher Education Council minutes
- ▶ teacher education program assessment tables

Criterion 3: The UAS includes a coherent, sequential, assessment system for individual candidates that includes performance assessments.

Performance standards are shared with candidates. The UAS utilizes for both formative and summative purposes, a range of performance-based assessment strategies throughout the program. The UAS has multiple decision points.

As described in previous reports, the UAS at Indiana University School of Education Bloomington incorporates two systems; individual program assessment systems and a School-wide assessment system. Significant progress has been made in both components over the course of the previous academic year.

Individual program assessment systems. The new teacher education programs are in various stages of implementation, with the majority of them in just their second year of delivery in the 2001-2002 academic year. Thus, the program faculty have only one year of course delivery and/or individual assessments experience to date. None of the programs have offered the full complement of professional education courses to date.

Over the course of the past year, the program faculty have worked to document how each program addresses and assesses, using both formative and summative instruments and processes, all the relevant principles and standards. A sample of these tables that address the INTASC and School's Six Guiding Principles, along with technology, is in Appendix A. During the course of the 2001-2002 academic year, the faculty will be completing their work on these tables. Similar programmatic tables addressing the respective IPSB developmental and content standards have been prepared and will be refined over the course of this year.

In addition to these efforts, each of the program faculty's has begun to delineate programmatic benchmarks, systematic points within the program where the students' learning and progress to date will be assessed and communicated to the students. These benchmarks are integrated with the four School-wide benchmarks identified. The data relative to these four School benchmarks will be collected systematically for the first time during the 2001-2002 academic year and analyzed by the Teacher Education Council as part of its ongoing management of the UAS.

School-wide unit assessment system. The design and specific elements of the School-wide assessment system have been defined over the course of the past year and approved by the Teacher Education Council, that, as mentioned above, has been designated as responsible for the School's unit assessment system. There are several important components of the system that have been identified.

- ▶ Five different sets of information have been identified about which the TEC will review annual reports and discuss as the data reflect the quality of the candidates and/or the teacher education programs. These include:
 - 1) teacher education admissions profile,
 - 2) Professional Standards Committee activities,
 - 3) individual program assessment plan reports,
 - 4) student teaching and graduation success, and
 - 5) graduate feedback.

- ▶ Four School-wide benchmarks have been identified to be monitored by the Office of Teacher Education. This Office will provide annual reports to the TEC. The benchmarks include:

- 1) admission into teacher education;
 - 2) retention in teacher education, monitored each semester;
 - 3) eligibility to student teach; and
 - 4) eligibility to graduate.
- ▶ One School-wide assessment instrument will administered to candidates four different times. The *Teaching Abilities Self-Assessment Instrument* will be required for candidates' completion at the following points:
- 1) Student Teaching Application. Students apply 12-15 months prior to student teaching and typically before the start of the professional education course work.
 - 2) Start of Student Teaching. Immediately before students begin their student teaching and following the completion of all their professional education course work.
 - 3) End of Student Teaching.
 - 4) End of First Year of Professional Teaching.

This self-assessment instrument (A copy is in Appendix B.) incorporates both the INTASC and School of Education's Six Guiding Principles and represents one consistent measurement of all candidates' self-reported growth at three benchmark points in the teacher education programs and following their first year of teaching.

To further coherence in the assessment of candidates, the self-assessment instrument has been used as the foundation for the field Bloomington. For each field experience, a common set of five questions will be incorporated in the evaluation of students. Along with these common questions, each program will include questions specific to the program and/or level of field experience. The student teaching assessment, completed by the supervising teachers includes categories, drawn from the self-assessment instrument, representing the INTASC and School's Six Guiding Principles. These evaluations completed by teachers with whom candidates work represent comparative performance assessments to the self-reported ones completed throughout the course of a preparation program. (A draft of the student teaching assessment is in Appendix C.) These instruments will be piloted during the course of the 2001-2002 academic year.

During the course of the 2001-2002, the annual reports listed above will be prepared and analyzed by the Teacher Education Council to provide the Council with a foundation of knowledge and to allow for refinement of the reports. The self-assessment instrument is being required of all student teaching applicants this academic year, and thus represents the first class for which the School eventually will have data from all four designated points.

Items in Evidence:

- ▶ teacher education program assessment tables
- ▶ individual teacher education program benchmarks
- ▶ Teacher Education Council management of UAS
- ▶ School-wide benchmarks
- ▶ *Teaching Abilities Self-Assessment Instrument* data

- ▶ field assessment data
- ▶ annual reports described above

Criterion 4: The UAS uses the collective presentation of candidate assessments and related data to document the quality of programs to prepare candidates to meet the IPSB standards.

As noted above, the School of Education's UAS incorporates three different sets of collective data about candidates' assessments and the quality of programs. First, each teacher education program will have collective data as to its candidates' growth at each of designated benchmark in the program. Programs will be required to provide the Teacher Education Council an annual report of the results of their program assessment system and of the success of the candidates at each benchmark within the program. Included in the reports, will be reference to any modifications that the faculty plan in the programs, as a result of the analysis of the assessment data. The Teacher Education Council will monitor the results of the individual program assessments, identifying trends across programs and ensuring faculty response in the form of program refinement as the assessment analyses might suggest.

Second, the Teacher Education Council will review annually the data noted above in response to criterion three; data that represents aggregate information of *all* teacher education candidates in the School. With the analyses of these data, the Teacher Education Council will monitor the quality of the teacher education programs and the candidates' success in meeting all the IPSB standards.

Third, the collection of candidate data from the *Teaching Abilities Self-Assessment Instrument* at four different times, as described above, will provide the Teacher Education Council with yet another aggregate analysis over time of the quality of the teacher education programs.

Items in Evidence:

- ▶ individual teacher education program annual reports
- ▶ data referenced under criterion three

Criterion 5: The UAS uses aggregated assessments from individual candidates and other sources to refine and revise the conceptual framework and programs.

The Teacher Education Council is responsible for the overall management of the School of Education's unit assessment system. As described above in response to criterion three, the Council will receive annual reports from individual program assessment plans and the Office of Teacher Education, as well as data from the School-wide assessment, the *Teaching Abilities Self-Assessment Instrument*. As appropriate, the Teacher Education Council will recommend the refinement and revision of the conceptual framework and/or individual programs.

Items in Evidence:

- ▶ data referenced under criterion three

Criterion 6: The unit ensures that its assessment system is continuously managed.

The School of Education has identified two entities to ensure the continuous management of the unit assessment system. First, the Teacher Education Council has as its main function oversight of the unit assessment system, and assessment of data collected annually at various points throughout the programs. Second, the School has incorporated into the responsibilities of the Assistant Dean for Teacher Education oversight of the UAS. As the manager of the ongoing functions of the Office of Teacher Education, the Assistant Dean is in the position to ensure that data and reports are collected and prepared in a timely fashion to facilitate the Council's ongoing review of the quality of the teacher education programs.

The data are managed at two different levels. Data relative to the candidates' progress through the respective program benchmarks are maintained by the faculty within the program. Data regarding the candidates' success at the School-wide benchmarks are managed within the existing Web-based student database, *Omnibase*. The School-wide self-assessment instrument is being piloted this Fall 2001 semester as a Web-based instrument. The data will be available for statistical analysis and integration with data from the School-wide benchmarks, using the candidates' identification number, for comparative analysis.

Items in Evidence:

- ▶ Teacher Education Council management of the UAS
- ▶ *Omnibase*

Criterion 7: The UAS provides for review and revision of the assessment system.

It is not the case that once the School of Education's UAS is fully functional that it will be considered as "finished." A central element in the Indiana University - Bloomington School of Education mission is a commitment to advance scholarship through research. That commitment extends to revisions and applications of all professional preparation programs. Hence, elements of the UAS and the UAS process are subject to scrutiny.

As an example, the instrumentation to be applied to field and clinical experiences parallels instrumentation intended to assess candidate self-rating of teaching abilities. The self-rating instrument underwent multiple revisions as a function of data-based assessments of psychometric integrity (Ingersoll and Kinman). Likewise, the decision to shift from an anonymous self-rating to a longitudinal self-rating occurred only after the unit was satisfied with the instrument's reliability and validity. Those same standards will be applied to the newer measures, and the results will be subject to peer review.

The field assessment instruments will be piloted in the Fall 2001 semester. Psychometric data, along with proposed modifications, will be presented to the Teacher Education Council for review and approval. In addition, rated performance will be related to candidate self-ratings.

Ultimately, data drawn from pre-service assessments will be statistically linked to data drawn from Indiana's induction assessment. These data will serve as a formative feedback loop for the UAS. The central monitoring function for evaluating the efficacy of

the UAS is the province and responsibility of the Teacher Education Council and the Associate Dean of Teacher Education.

Items in evidence:

- Ingersoll, G. M. and Kinman, D. ***Development of a Teacher Candidate Performance Self-Assessment Instrument***
- Indiana University *Teaching Abilities Self-Assessment Instrument* (early and current versions)

School of Education
2001 IPSB Annual Report

Indiana University
at
Bloomington/Indianapolis

Section III

Indianapolis Campus

September 2001

PART I: IUPUI RESPONSES TO WEAKNESSES 2001 REPORT

Weaknesses 1: The governance structure does not ensure that the offerings provided at the Columbus campus of Indiana University/Purdue University at Indianapolis (IUPUI) are consistent with the conceptual framework and performance assessment of the IUPUI campus.

2001 Update

Dr. Earlene Holland (Language Arts), Dr. Meryl Englander (Educational Psychology) and Henry Wakhungu (Multicultural Education) have been added to the IUPUC faculty to provide support in the continued and ongoing development and delivery of the elementary education program..

The two tenure-line appointments at IUPUC continue to work with P-12 schools in Bartholomew County, with Arts and Sciences faculty on the IUPUC campus, and with colleagues in Education at IUPUI. With the addition of Dr. Julie Saam (hired as a full-time visiting assistant professor on a two year contract) in August 2000, Columbus will have 3 FTE in Education. Saam's responsibilities include science and math methods classes. All three faculty attend Teacher Education meetings in Indianapolis and participate in the curriculum/assessment work.

In addition, Dr. Gerald Preusz has been assigned full-time to Columbus. He teaches sections of the first year seminar and provides administrative support to the program.

PART II: Indiana University School of Education
Indianapolis

Unit Assessment System 2001 Report

- Criterion 1:** The unit assessment system incorporates stakeholders' involvement in its development and management. Minimally, stakeholders should include education faculty, content faculty, P-12 faculty and administrators, candidates in the programs, and program alumni.
- Over time, different individuals representing different stakeholders have been involved in program development and assessment. Several different formats and forums have been used to organize and support that involvement.
 - Within the School of Education, the Evaluation Committee has had sustained responsibility for developing the UAS.
 - During 1999-2000, there was considerable effort to increase the informed involvement of colleagues in the Schools of Liberal Arts and Science in teacher education. Two factors in particular focused attention on the general education of future teachers: (1) the Standards-based Teacher Education Project "STEP" which operates under the aegis of ACE and AACTE; and (2) IU President Myles Brand's "21st Century Teachers" initiative. STEP provided modest funding to support collaboration around several topics related to the UAS (e.g., admission to Teacher Education, university attention to P-12 standards, alignment of secondary majors to the new IPSB license framework, Liberal Arts and Science faculty involvement in student teaching and scoring Block IV Portfolio). The core campus "21st Century Teachers" initiative explored both the content and pedagogy of courses offered by Arts and Science faculty that would prepare future teachers to support diverse learners to meet high standards. Teams representing IUPUI attended both the STEP conference in Washington D.C. in June and the Regional Conference on Teacher Quality sponsored by the USDOE in Denver in July.
 - During 1999-2001 IUPUI appointed a broad-based "Council Teacher Education" to serve as a forum for collaboration of education, arts and science, and P-12 practitioners in teacher education. The Council will provide a broader audience for the reports of the UAS and serve as a vehicle to coordinate the various campus and university initiatives that involve teacher education.
 - During 2000-2001, the Council on Teacher Education continued to meet on a bi-monthly basis. A subcommittee on internal communications was formed to strengthen the lines of communications between the School of Education other schools across the campus and to provide a forum for addressing procedural and logistical issues originating in other schools.

- During the Fall 2002 visit, the BOE will find a general history of stakeholder involvement and a more detailed record of dissemination/outreach for each academic year. They will also find (a) files and artifacts of the Evaluation Committee, (b) agendas, artifacts, and list of participants for curriculum/assessment workdays, and (c) meeting records of a newly constituted Teacher Education Council.

Criterion 2: The unit assessment system includes evidence of the conceptual framework(s) for the unit's programs incorporate all Indiana Professional Standards Board (IPSB) standards. IPSB standards include the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) principles and the IPSB content and developmental standards for each licensure area.

- We have shown how INTASC principles relate to the campus Principles of Undergraduate Learning.
- We have developed the IUPUI "Principles of Teacher Education" (PTE) which provide the working framework for the Learning to Teach/Teaching to Learn program.
- We continue to devote time at faculty retreats & faculty meetings, and convene regular curriculum/assessment workdays (3-5 per year) to address content and developmental standards for programs offered at IUPUI.
- We are still in the process of mapping the linkages between the IPSB developmental (setting) and content standards to our Principles of Teacher Education and course blocks. During their next visit, BOE will find for each license area, a matrix showing the relationship between course blocks, content and developmental (setting) standards, and assessment.

Criterion 3: The unit assessment system includes a coherent, sequential, assessment system for individual candidates that includes performance assessments. The standards are shared with candidates. The UAS utilizes for both formative and summative purposes, a range of performance-based assessment strategies throughout the program. The UAS has multiple decision points.

- A summary of INTASC principles is distributed in "first year seminars" enrolling students who have declared an interest in teaching.
- The summary is also distributed as part of regular orientation/recruitment meetings offered by academic advisors.
- At a formal induction after admission to Teacher Education, an expanded version of the INTASC statements of knowledge, disposition, and skills expected of

beginning teachers and the IUPUI “Principles of Teacher Education” distributed/discussed.

- We have links from the SOE home page to the INTASC principles, and to the IPSB framework & content and developmental standards documents.
- We have working schematics of the UAS at IUPUI identifying decision points, and the type of information used to make decisions related both to individual candidates and to the overall program.
- We have modified the general script for the “induction to teacher education” to introduce the evolving UAS. Students admitted to Teacher Education as of Fall 99 are involved in a pilot of various processes, assessment activities, and rubrics that are under development.
- We have encouraged faculty to incorporate explicit reference to the PTE in syllabi for each course/block of courses. PTE and INTASC principles are posted on a shared drive of the School of Education server so that all faculty/instructors can simply cut-and-paste relevant sections into syllabi.
- Though we have not yet made a comprehensive mapping of the IPSB developmental (setting) and content standards onto curriculum or assessment, we do intend to cross-reference standards with the revised “block descriptions.” The BOE can expect to find clear connections drawn between IPSB/INTASC standards and curriculum described in the LT/TL Program Handbook. Faculty are also referring to the standards in their responses to student work.
- We continue to complete the 2 semester cycle (design & pilot, revise) with Blocks I & II of the curriculum; during spring work days.
- During Spring 2002, we will pilot a revision of the “IUPUI Framework for Beginning Teacher Professional Practice” instrument with a sample of student teachers, mentor teachers, and university supervisors. Several factors underlie the decision to revise/condense the “Framework:” feedback from mentor teachers and university supervisors that the instrument is still a bit unwieldy and recognition that some elements of the Framework are addressed at other decision points or by other means in the UAS.
- During Fall 2001, a representative sample of elementary and secondary student teachers are involved in a student teaching portfolio pilot project. The portfolios will be used to develop rubrics to assess student teaching portfolios in the future.
- Training has occurred as faculty, advisors, supervisors, P-12 teachers/administrators have participated in the development of instruments or protocols during curriculum/assessment workdays.
- An orientation and training in use of the “IUPUI Framework” (1998), which is completed during the student teaching semester, is now incorporated into the standard Student Teaching Orientation sessions.

- During SSII, we once again offered a graduate course for mentor teachers or university supervisors orienting them to the “Framework” and other elements of standards- and performance-based teacher education.
- Faculty from the School of Science and the School of Education meet with high school teachers to review the secondary Block II rubric.
- We debrief with teachers/faculty after the assessment to gather feedback to improve the instrument and/or the assessment process. Over time, some cooperating professionals and some faculty may be involved in entire series of rubrics; other P-12 collaborators (and perhaps other faculty) will be called upon to employ only a subset of the rubrics.
- During fall 2001, we will hold an orientation for mentor teachers at PDS and partner school sites to the Block 1 assessment and the Block II performance tasks. If the interns at a school site will be completing Block I, then cooperating professionals at that site (as well as instructional faculty who teach in Block I) will be introduced to the Block I rubric. If interns are completing Block II, the PDS teachers and faculty teaching in Block II will receive training on the Block II Performance Task.
- We have experience with two rounds of decisions using the updated Admission to Teacher Education process and we have developed a standard report format to summarize that information (e.g., number of applicants, number admitted/denied, reasons for denial, etc.)
- We are experimenting with different formats for providing feedback to students, such as face-to-face meetings with single faculty members, members of a teaching team, or with written summaries. Different formats seem likely for different decision points.
- A compressive student database is being developed to support the UAS, and map the process/logistics of implementation. Data from the elementary Block I assessment was entered into the database at the end of the Spring 2001 semester.
- We are in the process of aggregating data from a group of candidates from the entering class of Fall 1999. Final results are not available at this time.
- Once rubrics are finalized (and the descriptions of course blocks adjusted accordingly), we will conduct small-scale studies to establish the reliability and validity of each rubric. Though these studies have not yet been designed, we anticipate that they will involve independent review of student performance by faculty and mentor teachers who are not familiar with the students (but who are familiar with the program expectations and standards), by faculty from academic departments in Arts and Sciences (for candidates seeking secondary education licensure), as well as by teacher education faculty from other institutions.

Candidates' performance on Praxis II, feedback from building supervisors, and graduates' status on the induction portfolio will also be used.

- At the Fall 2002 visit, BOE will find (a) that performance tasks, rubrics, and the student teaching assessment instrument "IUPUI Framework^{1/4}" have been revised; (b) that rubrics, performance tasks and other elements of the UAS are included in the LT/TL Program Handbook which is distributed to candidates and mentor teachers; (c) standard formats for summarizing data for cohorts of candidates at each decision point in the UAS; (d) a database noting which mentor teachers, university supervisors, part-time instructors have been trained on elements of the UAS and when they have participated in assessment; (e) clear descriptions of how candidates are provided feedback about their performance at each decision point; and (f) plans for validation studies.

Criterion 4: The unit assessment system uses the collective presentation of candidate assessments and related data to document the quality of programs to prepare candidates to meet the IPSB standards.

- Elements of Criterion 4 are being addressed as we work with a contractor to design a comprehensive student data system to support the UAS. (see below 6.B: Description of Implementation"). At this point, our only summary report relates to the initial decision in the UAS "Admit to Teacher Education?"
- At the next visit, the BOE will find summary data from graduates who matriculated in Fall 1999, standard summary report formats for each decision point in the Unit Assessment System, and records of meetings where summaries of candidate performance are shared and discussed.

Criterion 5: The unit assessment system uses aggregated assessments from individual candidates and other sources to refine and revise the conceptual framework and programs

- At a general level, the top half of the UAS schematic in Figure 1 presents how we approach individual student assessment while the lower half of the figure depicts how candidate data and other measures will be used for program level decision-making.

Spring 1999:

- After reviewing IPSB standards and PTE, we decided that we wanted to see a cycle of reflective teaching at the end of Block II. Faculty designed a task that called for each student to (1) plan and teach a series of connected lessons, (2) select one lesson and assess students learning, and (3) self-evaluate the quality of the teaching.

December 1999:

- 25 students in one section of a methods class submitted the task, and their products were 10-15 pages long. Having multiple readers for each submission was extremely time consuming. As we began to develop a rubric for scoring, it became apparent that the task was too complex for students at this point in their program and quite unmanageable for faculty as we anticipated “scaling up” to assess the approximately 175 students who would be ready for the Block II task each semester.

Spring 2000:

- We designed an alternative interview task that required interns to (1) select an activity that would engage a child and facilitate an assessment of his/her understanding of a particular concept, (b) tape record and transcribe their conversation/interview and analyze the child’s conceptual understanding, and (3) suggest appropriate follow up activities , and (4) reflect on the quality of their interaction with the learner. We developed a rubric to score the task.

May 2000:

- Faculty responsible for the math methods component of Block II were responsible for introducing the task to students, and as a consequence, the tasks and interviews all focused on mathematical concepts and understanding. The faculty all read 6 anchor papers and applied the rubric. The resulting conversation was fascinating: the math educators focused on the interns understanding of the math while other faculty addressed other aspects of the interview. After a day’s work with the task we decided: (a) to add another 3 hrs of mathematic education to the program, (b) specifically focus the Block II assessment on mathematics so that we ensure interns have the knowledge to support children’s learning, (c) to build a portfolio task for student teaching that focuses on literacy development so that we ensure that candidates are strong in both numeracy and literacy, and (d) to ensure that (for candidates focusing on early childhood or middle childhood) any/all performance tasks are reviewed by teams comprising faculty with different subject matter expertise.

Fall 2000:

- We revised the task and rubric and piloted it again December 2000.

Fall 2001:

- Results from piloting the Block II assessment has resulted in the addition of a second mathematics method course to the elementary and early childhood program beginning in the fall of 2002.
- A similar assessment task was piloted at the end of Block II of the secondary program during the Spring 2001 semester. The task was scored by School of

Education and content area faculty. Results of the pilot project and student feedback resulted in the modification of the task to better address the secondary program. The revised task will be piloted again during the Fall 2001 semester. We expect to review summaries of candidate data with scoring teams at the end of each semester, and with both the Evaluation Committee and the Teacher Education Council annually.

- At the Fall 2002 visit the BOE will find (a) a revised master calendar delineating the specific tasks necessary to support the UAS, and the date and individual responsible for each task, (b) a written record of decisions to modify elements of the curriculum or UAS, and (c) revisions of relevant documents and supporting materials to reflect those decisions.

Criterion 6: The unit ensures that its assessment system is continuously managed.

- The UAS remains a shared responsibility of the Evaluation Committee (7 faculty and staff) and the Executive Associate Dean.
- We began to introduce elements of the UAS in Spring 1998: students who intended to matriculate Fall 1999 were the first required to complete a formal application for admission on the Worldwide Web.
- These initial experiences lead us (a) to make adjustments to the schedule and management of application materials for students applying for admission Spring 2000 and (b) to develop additional informational materials describing program changes.
- With the Fall 99 matriculants, we began to build new management systems, and to plan for a unified student database to support the UAS.
- Managing data for IUPUI's large and complex Teacher Education program does require a powerful data infrastructure. Assessing the entire program will require tracking multiple decisions for a large group of interns over an extended time period (4-7 semesters depending on full vs part-time enrollment).
- Over the past year, a small design team of faculty/staff from the School of Education has worked with Custom Computer Applications (CCA) to define our needs and outline the parameters of a data management system. In July, we received a detailed proposal to develop a Microsoft Access-based application that would manage data from the UAS and interface with other campus databases. Work with relevant faculty and staff began in September. The goal is to have a prototype of the data system ready by December so that we can begin to determine the logistics of entering data from block assessments of candidates.

- We have experience managing the UAS for an entire “class” as well as multiple experiences with the use of Block 1 and Block 2 procedures and rubrics. In December, we will be in a position to test the logistics of simultaneously applying the Block I and Block II rubrics to students at different points in the program.
- Our work with a formal application/admission to Teacher Education and with CCA identified some inefficiencies and redundancies in the management of data and processes in Student Services. We are completing a rather dramatic reorganization of duties and responsibilities within Students Services in order to better support implementation of the UAS.
- Specifically, we have designated a single staff member to manage the undergraduate data from the point of application to Teacher Education thru recommendation for licensure. A second staff position manages all data for candidates in advanced programs and/or graduate degrees.
- Our initial analysis of the activities necessary to maintain the eventual UAS is presented on a draft “master calendar.” The calendar identifies tasks, the individual/office responsible, and target dates (for instrument distribution, candidate assessment meetings, data entry, data summary, reporting, and faculty review, etc.). That draft master calendar will be modified as it is pilot tested during the 2000-01 year.
- We still anticipate full implementation of the UAS as of Fall 2001 though validation studies will continue well beyond that point.
- Description of how the UAS links to the wider institutional assessment plans:

IUPUI’s Program Review and Assessment Committee (PRAC) which reports to the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Institutional Improvement is the principle vehicle for coordinating assessment initiatives.

The SOE representatives to PRAC are also members of the SOE Evaluation Committee.

The UAS has links to the campus assessment of the Principles of Undergraduate Learning and the graduate program review process.

Criterion 7: The unit assessment system provides for review and revision of the assessment system.

- We have completed a full cycle using the “draft” UAS with Fall 1999 matriculants. This formative evaluation will lead to adjustments and refinements. The Evaluation Committee is building a list of questions that will guide the development of our response. Issues of cost (in both time and effort) and user

satisfaction, as well as the technical adequacy of the process, will be experienced.

ADDENDUM to the 2001 Report:
Planned Licensing Areas

Rules 2001 Standards

The School of Education at IUPUI plans to offer programs leading to licensure in the following areas:

Early Childhood-Generalist Standards for Early Childhood

Early Childhood/Middle Childhood – Generalist Standards for Early and Middle Childhood

Early Childhood/Middle Childhood – Generalist Standards for Early and Middle Childhood – Special Education/Mild Intervention

Middle Childhood/Early Adolescence – Generalist Standard of Middle Childhood and Early Adolescence and two content areas (Language Arts, Mathematics, Science or Social Studies)

Early Childhood/Middle Childhood – Intense Intervention (graduate level)

Early Adolescence/Adolescence-Young Adulthood

- English As a New Language
- Foreign Language
- Language Arts
- Mathematics

Science: Life Sciences; Physical Sciences; and Earth/Space Sciences

Social Studies: (three or more of the following) Economics; Geographical Perspectives; Government and Citizenship; Historical Perspectives; Psychology; Sociology

Exceptional Needs: Mild Intervention

Early Adolescence/Adolescence-Young Adulthood – Intense Intervention (graduate level)

Middle Childhood/Early Adolescence/Adolescence-Young Adulthood

- Physical Education
- Fine Arts
- Visual Arts

District Administrator – All Schools- All School Settings

- One or more of the following:
 - Superintendent
 - Exceptional Needs Director
 - Curriculum and Instruction Director

Building Level Administrator – All Schools –All School Settings

School Services Areas
School Counselor

Attachments

A: Block II Performance Task for Secondary Program

Figure 1: Schematic of IUPUI UAS (revised September 2000)

**ADDENDUM to the 2000 Report:
Planned Licensing Areas
for 2002 Standards**

The School of Education at IUPUI plans to offer programs leading to licensure in the following areas:

Early Childhood-Generalist Standards for Early Childhood

Early Childhood/Middle Childhood – Generalist Standards for Early and Middle Childhood

Early Childhood/Middle Childhood – Generalist Standards for Early and Middle Childhood – Special Education/Mild Intervention

Middle Childhood/Early Adolescence – Generalist Standard of Middle Childhood and Early Adolescence and two content areas (Language Arts, Mathematics, Science or Social Studies)

Early Childhood/Middle Childhood – Intense Intervention (graduate level)

Early Adolescence/Adolescence-Young Adulthood

English As a New Language
Foreign Language
Language Arts
Mathematics
Science: Life Sciences; Physical Sciences; and Earth/Space Sciences
Social Studies: (three or more of the following) Economics; Geographical Perspectives; Government and Citizenship; Historical Perspectives; Psychology; Sociology
Exceptional Needs: Mild Intervention

Early Adolescence/Adolescence-Young Adulthood – Intense Intervention (graduate level)

Middle Childhood/Early Adolescence/Adolescence-Young Adulthood

Physical Education
Fine Arts
Visual Arts

District Administrator – All Schools- All School Settings

One or more of the following:

Superintendent

Exceptional Needs Director

Curriculum and Instruction Director

Building Level Administrator – All Schools –All School Settings

School Services Areas

School Counselor

Attachments

A: Draft of Block II Performance Task

Figure 1: Schematic of IUPUI UAS (revised September 2000)