

## **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 1998 Annual Report. This report is structured according to the unique organization of the School of Education. The School of Education is considered a core campus school that spans the two primary campuses of the University—Bloomington and Indianapolis. When the faculty meet 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 program differences. It will be evident in this document that each campus has, in consultation with the other, developed diverse programs for preparing undergraduate teachers. 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 more 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 seamless. Graduate curricula in areas like school administration and school psychology are identical. Graduate program faculty use distance education facilities or drive between the two campuses to provide high quality advanced programs.

This administrative and programmatic arrangement has been in place since 1974. There are many advantages to this organization since 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 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 Joint 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. Section III presents the narrative report for IUPUI.

# **NCATE Standards Categories & Weaknesses**

Any weaknesses cited at the last NCATE review appear under the correlating standards category.

## **Category I - Design of Professional Education (*Standards I.A through I.I*)**

Conceptual Framework(s), General Studies for Initial Teacher Preparation, Content Studies for Initial Teacher Preparation, Professional and Pedagogical Studies for Initial Teacher Preparation, Integrative Studies for Initial Teacher Preparation, Advanced Professional Studies, Quality of Instruction, Quality of Field Experiences, Professional Community

### **Evaluations and Changes, 1997 - 1998**

The reforms initiated three years ago continue with the final approval of two revised elementary programs, a new middle childhood option, and a totally revised early childhood program and preliminary approval of the secondary anchor program. Each of these programs is based upon the unit's Conceptual Framework and the INTASC Principles. All other initial programs are still in the program design phase. Approval is expected for all remaining programs during 1998 - 1999. Additionally, major efforts have gone into the development of a model assessment program for the unit. In the Spring, a draft position paper was circulated to faculty, staff and other stakeholders by the Evaluation and Assessment Committee with the intent of seeking feedback and critical review.

### **Weaknesses cited under Category I:**

*The evaluation design of the model has not been fully articulated.*

#### **1998 Update**

During the past year, much effort has gone into the development of a philosophy for evaluation and the outline for a set of assessment practices. The unit's assessment system has been adopted by the Teacher Education Council. The Evaluation and Assessment Committee scheduled an assessment retreat to bring together representatives from each program area for the purpose of collaboration, consultation and planning. 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 various system components for individual student assessment, a management scheme for the system, and a program evaluation component based on the individual student assessments and other data.

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

#### **1998 Update**

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 students throughout the secondary curriculum. We realized that this effort was not as productive as we originally thought.

The Special Education faculty has developed a course specifically 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. Presently, the course is listed on the remonstrance list for regional campus review. Once approved by the system-wide Education Council, the course will become available for secondary education majors. It is expected that approval will occur during early in the Fall 1998 semester.

## **Category II - Candidates in Professional Education (*Standards II.A through II.D*)**

Candidate Qualifications, Candidate Composition, Monitoring and Assessing Progress, Ensuring Competence

### **Evaluations and Changes, 1997 - 1998**

During the past year, a number of studies were conducted to review the quality of students enrolled in the IUB teacher education program. Initially, we reviewed the performance of all 1997 graduates in terms of their GPA, SAT/ACT scores on entry, Praxis II Core Battery and Specialty Exam scores, and the PPST exam used for admission to the Program. The study revealed, in particular, that the mean performance of our students on the SAT was impressive. The study was conducted by a student working under the direction of a research design and statistics specialist.

Another study was conducted to determine the level of performance of freshmen students with declared education majors as compared to all freshmen at IUB. This study likewise found that we are recruiting an academically talented student body in the School.

During the year, we raised the grade point average for all students entering the School as of the Fall 1998 semester from 2.3 to 2.5. While this action risks a reduction of the number of students certifying from the University Division to the School of Education, we expect that the overall academic ability of students will improve as will our already strong retention rate. Despite this change, it appears that we may have the highest enrollment of new students in the history of the School for the Fall semester.

The unit continues to attend to recruiting a more diverse student population. The retreat topic for the faculty and staff in the Fall 1998 focused on issues of diversity and civility among stakeholders. The number of students from diverse backgrounds continues to improve slowly as we work toward implementation of the unit's diversity plan. We requested an increase in the state funded Minority Teacher Recruitment Program for 1998 - 99, and our request was approved. At this time, it appears that all funds will be expended.

In the Fall semester 1998, there were 2,146 full-time undergraduate students admitted to teacher education programs in the unit. Of these students about 25 percent were male and 75 percent were female. There were eight American Indians, 23 Asians, 88 Blacks, 33 Hispanics, and 1,981 white students included in the count. At the graduate level (excluding Graduate School enrollees) there were 659 full-time students and included about 33 percent male and 66 percent female. Eighteen graduate students were Asian, 41 were Black, 17 were Hispanic, 136 were nonresident aliens, and 447 were white. These numbers do not vary appreciably from the 1997 enrollment information.

As mentioned above, the unit is working toward the development of a student assessment system which is performance based. It will take time to design and implement a system which is acceptable to the various

stakeholders interested in this project.

Realizing that we needed to diversify our academic advising staff we submitted a proposal to the Dean of Faculties Office for funding an additional advisor who would be a person of color. Our proposal was accepted, and in the Spring semester a new African-American advisor was appointed.

**Weaknesses cited under Category II:** *None*

### **Category III - Professional Education Faculty (Standards III.A through III.D)**

Faculty Qualifications, Faculty Composition, Professional Assignments, Professional Development

#### **Evaluations and Changes, 1998**

There were 121 full-time faculty using the AACTE/NCATE definition provided with the instructions. Of these 45 were female and 76 were male. There was one American Indian, two Asians, four Blacks, five Hispanics, one Middle Easterner, and 108 White faculty members. These numbers are appreciably the same as reported in the 1997 Annual Report.

The faculty continue to be productive with about \$6,290,000 in external funds from grants, governmental support and special projects being received during this time period. Additionally, scholarly activity remains very high and continues to demonstrate the strong research commitment of the faculty.

Additionally, close to one-third of the faculty have been involved with reform activities underway through the Indiana Professional Standards Board. Faculty have served on committees, advisory groups and participated in focus groups sponsored by the Board.

Service to P-12 schools remains high and seems destined to increase as requests for professional development activities arrive daily in the Office of Professional Development, Summer Sessions and School Services. Through aggressive and professional efforts of the Office of External Affairs, the Unit has received funding for three endowed chairs during the past year. These awards were for a chair in Teacher Education, a chair in Instructional Technology, and a chair in Exceptional Needs (Special Education). Additionally, during the year 22 outstanding Indiana educators were recognized as Armstrong Teacher Educators, who regularly visited campus and participated in teacher education classes, seminars and field experiences. The contributions of this group provide further evidence of the commitment of the unit to develop strong relationships with the professional community.

**Weaknesses cited under Category III:**

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

#### **1998 Update**

The philosophy of the Student Teaching Office staff is that open communication with cooperating teachers is a vital component for exchange of information and problem-solving that is essential for the success of the student teaching experience. Based on this, the following changes have been implemented as the beginning steps toward formalizing professional development activities for cooperating teachers.

1. During the placement process, procedures have been added that involve both written and telephone contact with cooperating teachers. One example is phone conversations with cooperating teachers to clarify the number and type of classes they teach, to ensure the State requirements for a student in any given discipline will be met.
2. A three-day institute has been initiated at IUB for IU Supervisors that includes a significant amount of discussion and instruction about communication with cooperating teachers. One example is a required initial meeting between the IU Supervisor and the cooperating teacher to review IU policies and procedures, and to clarify the roles and responsibilities of the three key players in the student teaching experience.
3. A Pre-Professional Exit Seminar has been instituted at IUB for all student teachers prior to their leaving campus for the student teaching assignment. The purpose of the Seminar is to prepare them for the student teaching experience. Part of the preparation includes discussions about communication with the cooperating teacher, focusing on the fact that the student teacher is a guest in the classroom who must initiate and maintain a professional relationship with the cooperating teacher. Seminar participants are involved in a simulated exercise of meeting with the cooperating teacher to establish the framework for their working relationship, to exchange information, and to verify placement information such as schedules and required texts.
4. Additionally, at IUB the IU Supervisor, the liaison to the public schools, monitors the effectiveness of the communication between the cooperating teacher and the student teacher. If or when a problem exists, the IU Supervisor assists the cooperating teacher in developing and implementing strategies for resolving issues that are hindering the progress of the student teacher. Cooperating teachers are also informed that Student Teaching staff members are available for conversation at any time. And, for those cooperating teachers who are out of the immediate geographic area, the School of Education Helpline, operating through an 800 number and the World Wide Web, is available.

At IUB, strategies for the 1997 - 98 academic year include both short- term and long- term goals. One short-term goal includes redesigning a handbook for cooperating teachers and student teachers that will clarify policies, roles and expectations of all parties during the student teaching assignment. This has now been completed. The long-term goal is to develop a systematic mechanism that incorporates written, phone and personal contact with cooperating teachers on an ongoing basis. Because of the nature of IUB placements, the system must include three networks. The three networks will be (a) those cooperating teachers who are geographically close to the IU Bloomington Campus, (b) those cooperating teachers who are geographically close to and have working relationships with the IU Regional Campuses, and (c) those cooperating teachers who are spread throughout the State of Indiana but are not geographically close to any IU Campus. The networks will each have different procedures while sharing the overall goal of involving cooperating teachers in the planning and implementation of effective teacher preparation experiences for our student teachers.

## **Category IV - The Unit for Professional Education (*Standards IV.A through IV.C*)**

Governance and Accountability, Resources for Teaching and Scholarship, Resources for Operations

### **Evaluations and Changes, 1997 - 1998**

During 1997, the Unit upgraded the computers of all full-time staff members in the School. Each member of the staff received at least a P-133 machine with the latest versions of Microsoft productivity software. The released staff machines were assigned to Graduate Assistants throughout the unit.

Additionally, the Unit continued the program encouraging faculty to submit proposals for upgrades of software and hardware, even though current equipment was state of the art quality. Approximately 20 faculty members received either or both hardware and software as a result of this competition.

Finally, each new faculty member is given the opportunity to specify his/her technology needs at the time of appointment. This program was likewise continued during 1997-98.

In terms of resources for teaching, the Unit upgraded the mobile computer carts that instructors use in classrooms with overhead projection units. Faculty continue to enhance instruction through the use of technology. During the early summer, over 30 free workshops for faculty and staff were offered on such topics as conferencing on the WWW, developing a home page, test preparation and scoring services on the WWW, Web basics, advanced techniques, and graphic applications on the WWW. Faculty and staff participation was very high with many of the workshops closing shortly after announcing their availability.

The general fund budget for 1997 - 98 increased slightly over the previous year. The Unit budgeted funds in the amount of \$15,454,078 for instruction, support and salaries.

### **Weaknesses cited under Category IV:**

*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.*

### **1998 Update**

The update for this weakness is found in the IUPUI section of this Report.

# The Incorporation of the INTASC Principles, the IPSB Standards, and a Plan for Assessment at IUB

## INTRODUCTION

This portion of our annual report outlines both a process and a plan, as well as specific initiatives that are under way, for providing new directions for the teacher education program at Indiana University, Bloomington (IUB). We discuss below our efforts to reconceptualize teacher education, and to create new programs based on that reconceptualization, that the community of teacher educators has been working on for several years. Those efforts have been approved by the IUB Teacher Education Council, the governing body for teacher education on the IUB campus. The Council is composed of 18 members, including seven faculty from the School of Education, three faculty from other units of IUB, three P-12 teachers, one undergraduate student, one graduate student, and three *ex-officio* members. Beyond the work of the members of the Council per se, the constituent groups they represent have been active participants in our planning and implementation activities from the beginning.

In sum, we outline below:

- 1) how we have initiated the incorporation of the principles of the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC);
- 2) how we have initiated the incorporation of the standards for teacher education adopted by the Indiana Professional Standards Board (IPSB); and
- 3) a philosophy of evaluation and an outline for a set of practices that constitute the assessment system at IUB, which has been high on our scholarly and professional agenda for the past few years. The ideas and practices detailed in this section respond to the assessment directions articulated by the IPSB, and to our internal efforts to create and assess new programs.

Any teacher education program necessarily draws upon, and is affected by, the larger institutional context within which it resides. Indeed teacher education programs draw extensively on courses in departments and colleges of arts and science, as well as other professional schools, in preparing future teachers. We disregard those influences at our, and our students', peril. More broadly, the culture, purposes, and values that give shape to a college or university necessarily influence the spirit and direction of programs, as well as the content of programs, as these are developed within its various units. We cannot understand the particular ways in which new teacher education programs are being created at IUB, or the paths we continue to take, if we do not understand something of the larger context within which they are evolving.

There are a number of features of the Indiana University Bloomington campus and of the School of Education that are important to briefly discuss. These features help define the mission, orientation, and significance of teacher education, and how we have undertaken a "new beginning" for our programs and the means of assessing them. The features of IUB that are particularly salient include:

- ★ *Its institutional location.* The fact that teacher education is housed within a distinguished research university, with all the intellectual and cultural attributes that are characteristic of such institutions, is central to our view of teacher education, and its assessment, as forms of inquiry.

- ★ *Its scope and breadth.* Both as the largest producer of new teachers in the state of Indiana and as a collectivity that continues to inform the state and national discourse on teacher education, we have a multi-layered set of responsibilities and opportunities- on this campus, and beyond.
- ★ *Its commitment to generating new forms of knowledge and understanding.* Our obligations to local communities, the state of Indiana, and the nation as a whole cannot be undertaken without the commitment to inquiry that can forge new ideas, policies, and practices on which teacher education depends. That commitment extends as well to engaging in analyses of our programs and public school practices.
- ★ *An awareness that high quality inquiry and high quality teaching are interdependent.* The discovery of new ideas, the generation of new practices, and a commitment to critical analysis are instrumental to the generation and assessment of teacher education programs. Quality teaching requires an investment in inquiry, analysis, and engagement in local and national conversations, as we continue to generate new perspectives on the preparation of teachers.
- ★ *The quality and depth of human and material resources.* Even the best ideas, the most innovative practices, will be ineffectual if they are not capable of being adequately supported, both in their development and implementation. Increasingly over the last eight to ten years, the preparation of teachers has been central to the mission of the School of Education. As a result, we have devoted significant human and material resources to the preparation of future teachers.
- ★ *A sense of dedication.* Teacher education is one of those domains that is perpetually subject to reconsideration. The teacher education community at IUB has seriously and collectively reconsidered teacher education as an entity, and has charted a new direction for our efforts. New program designs continue to be developed as a result of the dedication of faculty members, students, and P-12 teachers and administrators.
- ★ *A collective conviction regarding the centrality of assessment.* Our commitment to assessment has been central to our reform efforts in teacher education from the beginning. Moreover, we have developed an approach to assessment, as well as a plan, that guarantees ongoing conversations about how well we and our students are fulfilling our highest aspirations for ourselves, our students, and our work with P-12 schools.

We are committed to making sure that we continue to include all of the constituencies involved in teacher education as we develop visions and plans for teacher education, and as new IUB programs are implemented and continue. The process of creating, and then adopting, a new conceptual framework at IUB through our internal governance structure and approval process, has served the teacher education community well. Our framework, as analyzed below, dovetails with the ideas that are central to the INTASC Principles, and with the Standards that have been promulgated by the IPSB. Thus, all three of these elements form a cohesive whole that lays a groundwork for the future. Our subsequent efforts have generated new emphases, developed new content areas, and facilitated the creation of new approaches to teaching, curriculum, classroom environments, assessment, and so on. These initiatives will, we believe, improve the quality of our students' preparation, and the quality of learning at IUB and in P-12 classrooms.

As befits a research institution, we are poised to consider a variety of ways of assessing our programs, our

courses, our students, and our faculty. This will require the incorporation of a variety of venues; a wide array of data and forms of argument; a commitment to conversation that is shared, critical, and ongoing; and the articulation of a number of appropriate ways to make judgments about quality. Those efforts dovetail with the commitments to teacher education already made by people and institutions at IUB; they cannot be adequately fulfilled without the breadth of activities outlined in this document.

This portion of our annual report is divided into three parts. First, we detail our ongoing effort to rethink teacher education on the IUB campus, and how the INTASC Principles have been incorporated into our new conceptual framework for teacher education. Next, we discuss concrete example of how new programs will incorporate the INTASC Principles and the IPSB standards and suggested performances. Finally, we articulate an approach to assessment, and the purposes that approach will serve. We explain in that section of the report how the assessment orientation and plan that is being developed responds to the IPSB's criteria for developing and reviewing assessment systems in teacher education.

### RECONCEPTUALIZING TEACHER EDUCATION AT IUB

The contemporary effort to reconceptualize teacher education on the Bloomington campus began in January 1995. Faculty members, graduate students, undergraduates, teachers, and others were encouraged to begin this effort not by asking what should be kept, removed, or modified with respect to current programs, but by answering instead two more fundamental conceptual questions: 1) "What should teacher education at Indiana University, Bloomington be committed to?"; and 2) based on the articulation of that commitment, "What should our programs look like?" These questions, and others that followed from them, were to begin the process of rethinking teacher education at IUB. The process was aimed at maximizing the opportunities for the teacher education community to be thoughtful, to be open to new directions, and to push on the margins of teacher education. We continue to be committed to pushing on and beyond the "conventional wisdom" of teaching and teacher education, as we monitor and assess the development of courses, field experiences, and student activities that will be intellectually engaging, practically efficacious, and high in academic quality.

A series of open forums, School-wide retreats, small group discussions, and other events took place over the last four years that have led to the articulation of a new direction for teacher education, and a new conceptual framework. That framework has been central to the creation of new and innovative programs. The activities leading to these outcomes were initially overseen by our *ad hoc* Teacher Education Steering Committee (TESC). The TESC, in total, included 29 members that represented stakeholders from the entire teacher education community (P-12 teachers and administrators, faculty from Education and other parts of Indiana University, and undergraduate and graduate students). The TESC was guided by several aims:

11. To provide a focus for the initial discussions concerning a new vision and direction for teacher education;
12. To ensure that the process of creating a new conceptual framework for teacher education was open, principled, inclusive, and democratic;
13. To look expansively at the possibilities for creating a vision for the future of teacher education at IUB, and to challenge the status quo of the field;
14. To help rejuvenate a sense of community;

5. To outline a cohesive vision and set of parameters for all teacher education programs; and
6. To assume that every component and phase of our current teacher education program might be changed, that nothing is sacred, and that together we can forge a new beginning.

As conversations within the TESC and in other forums continued, a consensus gradually emerged around the major commitments, ideas, and values that would undergird teacher education at IUB. These are embodied in six principles and their implications (see Appendices I and II, below). Ideas regarding what our conceptual framework might entail were widely shared and discussed (and coordinated through the Teacher Education Steering Committee) during the spring of 1995, the fall of 1995, and the spring of 1996. During a School-wide retreat in February 1996, we began the more specific work of outlining subsequent steps to be taken to continue the process or creating new programs, and a timetable for that undertaking.

At its meeting of February 13, 1996, the Teacher Education Council discussed the activities that had transpired at the retreat and reviewed the six principles. After a relatively brief discussion, the Council unanimously voted to adopt the six principles as the conceptual framework for teacher education. That group also circulated two sets of guidelines, for interim and final reports, that included, among other things, how the six principles would be embedded in, and provide a grounding for, each program. The members of the Council also included a stipulation that involved a central commitment of IUB, and one that had been advocated in an earlier School of Education task force report that was circulated in March 1991. That stipulation directed that all our programs be inquiry-driven, with examples of how this would be undertaken within specific program components. Individual program areas were also asked to provide feedback to the Teacher Education Council regarding any institutional constraints that might compromise their reform efforts, so that the Council might find ways to help eliminate or lessen those constraints.

Following the development of our new conceptual framework, and its formal adoption by the Teacher Education Council, the process of designing new programs became somewhat more decentralized, though each program was required to demonstrate to the Teacher Education Council how our license area groups incorporated our six principles. By the summer of 1997, all license areas had submitted documents that contained designs for new program offerings. During the 1997-98 academic year, additional work was undertaken by the teacher education community to create new programs. We anticipate that all program designs will be completed and approved by the Teacher Education Council by the spring semester of 1999.

As the process of outlining new directions for teacher education programs evolved, one realization gradually surfaced that, once apparent, revealed an obvious truth. Through our discussions of desirable directions, aims, purposes, and outcomes for teacher education, we realized that high quality educational experiences— effective forms of teaching, robust and challenging curricula, active learning engagements, meaningful student interaction patterns, and so forth— frequently if not always apply to education at all levels. As we realized that we have at least an implicit vision for P-12 pupils that is not unlike the vision we have for students in IUB classes, we affirmed the commonality of high quality educational experiences across institutions and age ranges even as we put forward a set of unifying themes.

As noted already, our new conceptual framework for teacher education was not only formally approved, but provided a central thrust for all new program designs. This is not to suggest that all of our new

programs are identical, even within the same license area. Rather, the ideas and commitments that are embedded in our six principles articulate a set of aims that the teacher education community has agreed upon. Our six principles, like all complex ideas and purposes, can be interpreted in a range of legitimate ways, just as the array of individual principles can be differentially emphasized, given the prerogatives of the members of individual program teams. Still, these principles outline a set of common understandings and commitments, and thus help provide cohesion to teacher education at IUB. Thus in outlining how we incorporate the INTASC principles, it is appropriate that we begin with an analysis of how our new conceptual framework incorporates those principles. Subsequently we further illustrate the centrality of the INTASC principles, and the IPSB standards, in one internally approved Middle Childhood program, Democracy, Diversity, and Social Justice (DDSJ). We also outline how that Middle Childhood program will provide opportunities for students to engage in specific performances related to the IPSB Standard for curriculum. The discussion of the guiding commitments of DDSJ and how they incorporate INTASC and IPSB ideas and stipulations, will serve as an exemplar for all of our programs as they continue to be developed. All of those programs will be approved by our Teacher Education Council as well as other governing bodies within the Indiana University system, during the current academic year.

### The INTASC Principles and the IUB Conceptual Framework

We provide here a description of how we have incorporated the individual INTASC Principles into the conceptual framework adopted at IUB.

INTASC Principle #1: The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.

As noted above, the new conceptual framework for teacher education at IUB adopted by the Teacher Education Council, along with the program guidelines created and put into effect by the Council for the internal approval process, stipulates that all programs on the Bloomington campus must be driven by an inquiry process. In addition, our collective commitment to requiring that all prospective teachers possess both Knowledge and Multiple Forms of Understanding (principle five of the IUB conceptual framework), ensures that they will understand the structure of the disciplines they teach. Furthermore, the teacher education community, as reflected in that same principle, is committed to the notion that “effective teachers possess a well-grounded knowledge of the content areas that are central to their teaching. They also have an in-depth comprehension of the forms of knowledge embodied in the traditional disciplines, of the interdisciplinary nature of inquiry, and of the multiple forms of understanding that individual students bring to the classroom. **Consequently, all our teacher education programs will help students acquire a ‘practical wisdom’ that integrates forms of understanding, skilled action in and outside classrooms, and a particular sensitivity to the diversity of students.**”

Finally, among the implications of our principle dealing with Intellectual, Personal, and Professional Growth (IUB principle three) is a commitment that our students must “seek, evaluate, and create new knowledge.” This involves a more complex undertaking than “simply” understanding “the structure of the disciplines.” It requires that our students integrate disciplinary knowledge with an understanding of the ways in which pedagogy, inquiry, and subject matter are mutually reinforcing and dependent. The kinds of awareness and understanding we expect of our students will, though, require even more than integrating knowledge and pedagogy. Our expectations require, as well, that prospective teachers at IUB understand, as well as take part in, the intellectual and political debates that continue to rage in “the

disciplines.” The outcome of those debates has, for many, already led to a serious and sustained critique of the very assumption that there are anything like self-contained structures that generate disciplinary knowledge that is authoritative, or that particular methodologies exist that can generate and sustain over time forms of knowledge that are objective, certain, and beyond reproach. Such understandings are fundamentally important for the serious study of educational issues and the assessment of teaching performances.

INTASC Principle #2: The teacher understands how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support their intellectual, social, and personal development.

We recognize the range of opportunities that pupils must have in order to fully develop all of their human potentials. This is emphasized especially in IUB principle three, having to do with Intellectual, Personal, and Professional Growth. Because teachers are not technicians or simply “purveyors of information,” our students “must be committed to lifelong intellectual, personal, and professional growth.” This is beneficial both for prospective teachers and the students they will teach in the future. Teacher education faculty and students must continually develop these habits of mind, requiring that our programs “stimulate the exploration and development of the full range of human capabilities. **Consequently, all our teacher education programs must foster intellectual curiosity and encourage an appreciation of learning through intuition, imagination, and aesthetic experience.**”

INTASC Principle #3: The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

Creating new approaches to teaching and learning, and new ways of thinking about and demonstrating how to reach a diverse array of pupils, requires a depth of intellectual sophistication and an interpersonal sensitivity that must be nurtured throughout a prospective teacher’s preparation. As we say in our discussion of the implications of our principle dealing with Critical Reflection (IUB principle two), our students must “develop a sensitivity to race, culture, class, gender, and related issues” if they are to be effective and successful teachers. This sensitivity applies equally to P-12 pupils, their parents, future teaching colleagues, and the communities served by P-12 schools.

Good teachers build on their students’ interests, learning styles, and goals, as we note in IUB principle six, Personalized Learning. Similarly, teacher education program faculty must offer students opportunities to individualize and personalize their preparation as teachers. **“Consequently, all our teacher education programs must give students a significant measure of control over how, when, and where their learning takes place, thus enabling their interests and values to shape major portions of their work.”** If prospective teachers experience this sort of control in their own education, they will experience first hand the benefits of such forms of control, and through that existential awareness understand and emphasize the need to develop similar opportunities for their own pupils--now and in the future.

INTASC Principle #4: The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students’ development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

There are no more central components to our conceptual framework than those dealing with the importance of critical reflection on and in schools, and the associated commitment to thinking about school practices in reflective ways. As we say in IUB principle two (Critical Reflection), “all our teacher education programs must encourage students to develop their own social and educational visions that are

connected to critically reflective practice.” As we encourage undergraduate students to think deeply and creatively about a variety of approaches to curriculum and pedagogy-- in our undergraduate classrooms and in the field experiences in which they are involved-- we assist our students in thinking about and implementing those approaches in P-12 classrooms.

INTASC Principle #5: The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

Our commitment to generating various types of communal activity, outlined in IUB principle one (Community), emphasizes the importance of cooperative efforts at a number of levels. Such efforts provide an important grounding for educational experiences generally, as well as for teaching and learning in P-12 classrooms. The necessity for active learning is also outlined in our discussion of Personalized Learning (IUB principle six), which encourages students to themselves articulate significant new directions for their learning, thus promoting self motivation and active engagement in the classroom. Those critically important pedagogical practices are equally valuable for college and P-12 classrooms. Thus, our students will be expected to use their own experiences at IUB as one way to think about, and act on, the development of a positive environment in which all learners are actively engaged.

INTASC Principle #6: The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

The importance of community (IUB principle one) within our new conceptual framework is clear. Establishing and supporting forms of communal engagement and dialogical understanding in the classroom is a prerequisite for active collaboration (among pupils and between pupils and teachers). The commitment to emphasizing with students the central importance of Intellectual, Personal, and Professional Growth (IUB principle three) also furthers a variety of forms of communication in the classroom. The fact that our programs are inquiry driven, and that our undergraduate students will be themselves actively engaged in inquiry projects on an ongoing basis, further testifies to our basic commitments. We are dedicated, as a community of teacher educators, to a set of intellectual and pedagogical aims that are central not only to P-12 classrooms, but to college classrooms as well.

INTASC Principle #7: The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

IUB principle five (Knowledge and Multiple Forms of Understanding) underlines the importance of disciplinary, and interdisciplinary, forms of knowledge as these are central to teaching. Buttressing that conviction is the idea, central to IUB principle six (Personalized Learning) that teachers utilize students' "interests, learning styles, and goals" in planning classroom activities. One of the implications of our commitment to Intellectual, Personal, and Professional Growth (IUB principle three) as well, has to do with the expectation that our students/prospective teachers will foster pupils' "participation in the development of curriculum," a process that must include an understanding of subject matter, the students, the wider community, and curriculum ideas and aims.

INTASC Principle #8: The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.

In IUB principle three, Intellectual, Personal, and Professional Growth, we outline our commitment to professional growth for teachers. In identifying this central commitment to lifelong learning, we emphasize the full range of human capabilities. We also suggest that one implication of this perspective is that teachers must “seek, evaluate, and create new knowledge”—a process that entails the articulation of assessment practices that will help them evaluate the level of development exhibited by their own students. Further, in discussing the value of Meaningful Experiences (IUB principle four), we stipulate that our programs, “must maintain or create experiences in schools and on campus that will assist in the development of their expertise in those settings,” and that we will “include early and continuous engagement with the multiple realities of children, teaching, and schools.” Formal and informal ways of meaningfully utilizing diverse assessment practices are thus entailed in our commitment to providing college- and classroom-based inquiries and practices that will facilitate the complete development of students.

INTASC Principle #9: The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.

The commitment of faculty and students to reflection is central to our conceptual framework. Indeed, it should be clear that the creation of a new conceptual framework at IUB would itself have been impossible without the commitment to reflection, critique and the consideration of a broad range of theoretical and practical options. As we say in IUB principle two (Critical Reflection), “effective teachers reflect critically on the moral, political, social, and economic dimensions of education. This requires an understanding of the multiple contexts in which schools function, an appreciation of diverse perspectives on educational issues, and a commitment to democratic forms of interaction. **Consequently, all our teacher education programs must encourage students to develop their own social and educational visions that are connected to critically reflective practice.**” Our commitment to life-long professional development is also clear in IUB principle three (Intellectual, Personal, and Professional Growth), since reflective practitioners “must be committed to lifelong intellectual, personal, and professional growth.” Additionally, as we discuss in IUB principle four (Meaningful Experience), we are committed to creating school-based experiences within which our students will “be expected to act as thoughtful, reflective, caring practitioners,” and that we are committed to assessing “their abilities in such settings.”

INTASC Principle #10: The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students’ learning and well-being.

The value of community is clear in several dimensions of our new programs, and in our new conceptual framework. Developing a wide range of community relationships strengthens not only our programs, but our relationship with P-12 schools and the communities they serve. As we outline in IUB principle one (Community), “effective teacher preparation requires that participants develop a sense of community. . . . It brings a coherence to programs, fosters an appreciation of the power of cooperative effort, and encourages a dialogue that promotes the continual rejuvenation of teacher education. **Consequently, all our teacher education programs must foster a sense of community among students, among faculty members, between faculty members and students, and between the university and the schools.**” The ideas and commitments contained in the INTASC principles are embraced by the direction that teacher education reform has taken at IUB. Not only are the INTASC principles aligned with our new conceptual framework, those principles are further encoded in the new program designs that are coming to

fruition--in large part because of the foundational nature of our new framework. Below we analyze the INTASC Principles as they are embedded in one of our new, internally approved programs.

### The INTASC Principles, IPSB Standards and Performances, and Program Implementation

All of our new and revised teacher education programs, scheduled to be completed by the end of the 1998-99 academic year, will incorporate the standards that have been adopted by the IPSB. These programs will, of course, also incorporate the INTASC Principles, in part through their alignment with the IUB conceptual framework, analyzed above, and in part through an analysis of the new courses, field experience, and assessment activities that these programs will include. Oversight of that process will take place through our Teacher Education Council.

In this section we outline how IPSB standards, as well as the INTASC Principles, have been incorporated into a new, internally approved, Middle Childhood program. The obvious effort at aligning IPSB standards and INTASC principles provides an opportunity to integrate our responses in this portion of our report. Thus, in discussing this program, we provide evidence that address both the INTASC Principles and the corresponding IPSB Standards. We also discuss the ways in which this program has incorporated specific performance measures as outlined by the IPSB. The analysis of this program in relation to INTASC Principles, and the discussions of how the IPSB Standards and suggested performances have been adopted in this program, will be used as exemplars of how our other new teacher education programs, once their development is complete and they have been approved by the Teacher Education Council, will address the INTASC principles and the standards and performances outlined by the IPSB.

An overview of the courses and other requirements for this program includes:

#### A. The general education component

1. Language Arts	12 credits
2. Fine Arts	6 credits
3. Mathematics	7-8 credits
4. Science	9 credits
5. Social Studies	12 credits
6. Computer Technology	2-3 credits
7. Inquiry project	15 credits
Total:	63 credits

#### B. The professional education component (courses that include a field experience are indicated with an asterisk)

1. F205 "The Study of Education and the Practice of Teaching"; 3 credits
2. E210, "Learning in Social Context"; 9 credits
3. E215, "Curriculum and Pedagogy"; 3 credits
4. E305, "The Infusion of Technology," 3 credits over 2 semesters
5. E320, "Envisioning, Exploring and Creating Our Social Worlds Through Multiple Literacies in the Elementary School"; 9 credits
6. E322, "Diversity and Social Justice I"; 3 credits
7. E324, "Teaching Mathematics and Science For All Students"; 9 credits

8. E326, "Diversity and Social Justice II"; 3 credits
  9. E350, "Personal and Professional Growth Groups"; 1 credit
  10. E420, "Student Teaching"; 15 credits
  11. E425, "Senior Seminar in Teaching and Schooling"; 3 credits
- Total: 61 credits

In total, then, DDSJ includes 61 credits in professional education, and 63 credits in general education, for a total of 124 credit hours.

Since this program has met the program approval criteria established by our Teacher Education Council, including the incorporation of our conceptual framework, it incorporates the INTASC Principles, given the analysis provided above. In addition, DDSJ incorporates the INTASC Principles, and the corresponding Standards of the IPSB, in specific ways.

### DDSJ and the Incorporation of INTASC Principles and corresponding IPSB Standards

INTASC Principle #1: The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students; and IPSB Standard #2: The teacher creates, modifies, and implements integrated, meaningful curricula appropriate for children ages 7-12.

A focus on inquiry begins with the first professional education course DDSJ students take: F205, The Study of Education and the Practice of Teaching. In that course students actively study inquiry-oriented readings and develop their own scholarly investigations. The final assignment for this course is the generation of an inquiry project by each student, on a topic related to the issues discussed in F205 and that is approved by the instructor. In addition, students develop multiple understandings of the importance of the disciplines as they complete the general education requirement, following the outline included above. The inclusion of a general education inquiry project totaling 15 credits provides further evidence of the centrality of inquiry to DDSJ. Those courses, and the F205 emphasis on inquiry and intellectual engagement, require that students deeply explore a topic that will further develop their sensitivity to the importance of inquiry activities.

The creation of learning experiences that will make subject matter meaningful for middle childhood students will begin in E210, Learning in Social Context, and will be further developed in E215, Curriculum and Pedagogy, both of which require extensive and intensive field experiences in a local elementary school where a partnership relationship has been created. As students continue to take courses in DDSJ (e.g., E320, E322, E324, and E326), they will be involved in creating more expansive classroom activities and curriculum materials that will be implemented in more intensive field experiences, culminating in student teaching (E420).

INTASC Principle #2: The teacher understands how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support their intellectual, social and personal development; and IPSB Standard #1: The teacher understands that the developmental changes that occur in children ages 7-12 are more radical than those for any other age group.

An emphasis on development, in all of its complex manifestations, is central to the readings and activities (including field experiences) that will take place in E210, Learning in Social Context. That course, and

student assignments in the field, will examine learning from social, psychological, and cultural perspectives through which students will gain an understanding of the complex nature of schooling and the influences on students' learning. Among the themes to be examined in E210 include: the nature of knowledge and learning; student motivation; the developing child; the affective lives of children; the process of teaching; and the relationships among teaching, schooling, and the community. The course will be team taught by instructors with backgrounds in the social foundations, multicultural education, special education, and educational psychology.

INTASC Principle #3: The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners; and IPSB Standard #6: The teacher understands the complexity of how children ages 7-12 learn and creates a learning environment that supports all children and their development.

The nature of differences among children will be discussed initially in E210, Learning in Social Context. In addition, those differences will also be observed by students in the school in which the field experience will take place. The creation of curriculum materials and teaching activities that can be used to respond to those differences will be incorporated into E322 and E326, Diversity and Social Justice I and II, respectively. Those courses will operate as seminars during which our students will learn to explore a range of approaches to teaching and curriculum for different kinds of children and divergent subject matters. The field experience in which they will be involved will focus on the implementation of curricula and teaching activities that are responsive to the differences— racial, ethnic, linguistic, learning style, disability, etc.-- that students possess in the classrooms in which they will be implementing materials and activities.

INTASC Principle #4: The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students' development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills; and IPSB Standard #3, The teacher plans and implements instruction based upon knowledge of students, learning theory, pedagogy, information technology, subject matter, curricular goals, and community.

The need to consider a wide range of instructional strategies for students will be initially considered in E210, Learning in Social Context, as well as E215, Curriculum and Pedagogy. Field experiences included in both courses will emphasize observation and analysis of classroom situations, followed by a focus on how other kinds of instructional strategies could be created that would benefit specific children and groups. As DDSJ students continue in our subsequent courses, especially E320, Envisioning, Exploring and Creating Our Social Worlds Through Multiple Literacies in the Elementary School; E324, Teaching Mathematics and Science For All Students; and the diversity and social justice seminars (E322 and E326, Diversity and Social Justice I and II) that are taken in the same semester, their readings and observations will deepen their awareness of the need for a wide range of approaches and classroom performances. Faculty observation of our students' work in these areas will provide students with important feedback concerning their actual ability to implement instructional strategies that provide evidence of their critical thinking abilities and their ability to implement problem solving activities with middle childhood students. INTASC Principle #5: The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation; and IPSB Standard #3, The teacher plans and implements instruction based upon knowledge of students, learning theory, pedagogy, information technology, subject matter, curricular goals, and community.

Ways to construct appropriate learning environments will be carefully explored in E210, Learning in Social Context. Observations of actual learning environments will also take place during that course, from which we expect students to draw at least provisional conclusions related to their own prospective teaching activities. Active learning will be a central idea not only in our discussions about public school classrooms, but in our students' own activities in the program. Similarly, the centrality of a collectively created, changing, communal learning environment will not only be addressed through observations of field experience sites, but created within the confines of the DDSJ program itself, thereby helping clarify the meaning of these abstractions for our students' learning, and for the development of young children.

INTASC Principle #6: The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom; and IPSB Standard #3: The teacher plans and implements instruction based upon knowledge of students, learning theory, pedagogy, information technology, subject matter, curricular goals, and community.

Our course E305, The Infusion of Technology, will deal with a range of technological opportunities that enable our students not only to communicate effectively with and among students, but also to undertake inquiry projects that broaden the nature of classroom projects. Since inquiry and collaboration are core elements of DDSJ, as already discussed, the incorporation of alternative and innovative forms of communication, whether through new technologies or more conventional modes, will be valuable as ways to enhance our work with students and teachers in the construction of curriculum projects and approaches to teaching that are framed within an inquiry orientation.

IPSB Principle #7: The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals; and IPSB Standard #7: The teacher develops and maintains positive working relationships with families, school colleagues, support services and community members at-large to support children in their learning.

Knowledge of subject matter within this program will take place in both general education and professional education coursework at IUB, and perhaps most meaningfully in the inquiry projects which we require of all DDSJ students. Those projects not only allow students to explore a topic using a multitude of disciplinary lenses, but also aid them in seeing how a range of disciplines and interdisciplinary initiatives can be brought to bear on a single topic. Knowledge of the diversity of students will be acquired both in readings that students will do in our classes, and in the field experience assignments they will undertake as a part of the program. A broad discussion of curriculum goals, likewise, will be central to our course dealing with curriculum and pedagogy (E215), and will be central to the curriculum analyses that students will construct as a part of the accompanying field experiences. Since DDSJ is based on a cohort model, with each student completing both field experiences and a student teaching assignment in the same partnership school, he/she will be heavily involved in the school and the community which it serves. Thus, input from teachers, students, parents, and the larger community will be solicited as our students take part in school-based and community activities.

INTASC Principle #8: The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner; and IPSB Standard #4, Assessment: The teacher understands the importance of multiple assessment and uses a variety of developmentally appropriate assessments to improve student learning.

While some of the ideas contained in this Principle and Standard have already been discussed in this and previous sections of this report, a more complete discussion of the IUB assessment orientation and practices is found below. That orientation and framework will not only govern our judgment of programs, faculty, and undergraduates, but will also be useful as one guide for evaluative practices in P-12 classrooms as well. Asking public school students for examples or instances of activities and assignments they have completed that warrant a positive judgment regarding the quality of their work is not different from asking faculty and undergraduates about the quality of their involvement with students in teacher education. In that sense, the core of our evaluation philosophy has salience for the development and implementation of assessment strategies for middle level children.

More concretely, in E320, *Envisioning, Exploring and Creating Our Social Worlds Through Multiple Literacies in the Elementary School*, students will create a framework that can support their future students' inquiry projects using reading and writing as tools. Prospective teachers in this program will develop both criterion-based and normative assessment strategies for monitoring their pupils' growth, and their unmet challenges, in order to better focus teaching and learning activities. DDSJ students will develop approaches for adapting and individualizing instruction for students of diverse prior language experience, learning style, and ability. They will also learn to interpret standardized assessment instruments, and to develop an understanding of what they do and do not measure, and how social factors may undermine their usefulness.

The student teaching seminar that is a vital part of our students' school-based experiences will focus, in part, on how students can observe and reflect upon their teaching through written analyses, discussions with other IUB students, faculty from IUB, and the classroom teacher. All student teachers will meet regularly with cooperating teachers in a structured exploration of the student teaching experience, during which students will be guided to construct, discover, and investigate varieties of assessment strategies that are appropriate for their particular group of students.

INTASC Principle #9: The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally; and IPSB Standard #8: The teacher utilizes research and resources to construct a professional development plan, constructs and implements a continuing self-development plan, and chronicles achievement as evidenced in a portfolio or other holistic assessment instrument.

Just as our conceptual framework makes reflection central to all programs at IUB, the DDSJ program incorporates critique, thoughtful reconsideration, an exploration of options, and new approaches to classroom activities, in virtually all of the courses and field experiences. Indeed, DDSJ is founded on four interconnected principles:

- 1) the centrality of inquiry to teaching and education at all levels;
- 2) the necessity of creating communities within which democratic ideas and practices can be created;
- 3) the need to reflect critically on experiences, ideas, and actions so that we can examine their consequences and consider alternatives; and
- 4) the idea that educational and other institutions, as well as individuals and groups, must ground their efforts in a comprehensive understanding of social justice.

While these ideas have been embraced by a number of people and groups over the years, the understandings and experiences we hope to further through DDSJ require that they saturate everything that faculty and students do. Moreover, we realize that the process of student and teacher development can never reach closure. For that reason, DDSJ incorporates E425, Senior Seminar in Teaching and Schooling, in part to make clear that even though students are nearing the completion of their undergraduate studies, a commitment to further inquiry, additional forms of reflection, new ways of thinking and doing, and so on, must continue once they graduate. E425 will be used to help seniors integrate what they have learned during the previous four years, and look ahead to the professional development initiatives in which they want to take part once they receive a teaching license.

INTASC Principle #10: The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well-being; and IPSB Standard #5: the teacher demonstrates professionalism through collegiality, peer support, and professional self-assessment, and actively engages in professional growth and development in order to revitalize both the professional role of teachers and student learning.

Since DDSJ includes student cohort groups and a partnership relation with schools, ongoing conversations with our students, elementary school teachers, parents, and community members have been central both to the design and implementation of this program. This process continues, in the discussions that have evolved with the school principal and teachers with whom we will be working. As faculty and students continue to develop those relationships, we will be working more closely as well with parents and community agencies. It is partly because of our commitment in this regard that DDSJ will include one field experience (accompanying E326, Diversity and Social Justice II) in a community setting or agency rather than in our partnership school.

### DDSJ and IPSB Performance Standards

Below we outline how we have incorporated specific performance standards related to curriculum (IPSB Standard 2) within the DDSJ program, and how it proposes to gauge the performance of our students.

#### 1. *Communicates meaningful purpose for the curriculum plan*

The purpose and meaning of curriculum will initially be studied by DDSJ students in E215, Curriculum and Pedagogy. This course is aimed at highlighting the political, moral, and social nature of educational ideas and school practices, within the context of addressing the nature of the public school curriculum, its historical antecedents, a variety of associated theoretical issues, and a similar range of issues concerning pedagogy. Questions to be explored include: what constitutes a curriculum; what have been the influential models or paradigms, metaphors, and ideas for curriculum; what effect does an emphasis on teaching all students have on the nature of the school curriculum and how it is created; what is the range of pedagogical approaches, both historically and currently; and, on what basis can pedagogical decisions be made. Students will develop the intellectual undergirding to curriculum and teaching that is essential for the more specific activities associated with curriculum making and classroom teaching. They will undertake such activities and classroom performances as their program proceeds, particularly in E320, Envisioning, Exploring and Creating Our Social Worlds Through Multiple Literacies in the Elementary School; E324, Teaching Mathematics and Science For All Students; E322, Diversity and Social Justice I; and E326, Diversity and Social Justice II.

2. *Demonstrates enthusiasm for the curricula and engages children in active learning experiences*

The demonstration of enthusiasm for curricular ideas and issues will begin in the E215, Curriculum and Pedagogy. It will be furthered in the field experience that is included with that offering, and in subsequent courses. All field experiences in this program will take place within cohort groups, interacting with teachers in a partnership school. The field experiences that accompany E320, E324, and the two courses involved with Diversity and Social Justice (E322 and E326), will be developed so that students can demonstrate their curricular enthusiasm and engage children in active learning experiences.

3. *Encourages students to understand, question, and interpret ideas from diverse perspectives*

The first course in this program (and in many others that are being developed as well), is F205, The Study of Education and the Practice of Teaching. The course generally is committed to a critical examination of education, schooling, and teaching, and with a creative approach to examining alternative possibilities. Students read a number of original sources on the nature and aims of education and teaching, and consider possible outlines for an ideal education, as well as a system of schooling and teacher preparation consistent with those ideals.

The consideration of diverse ideas and perspectives will also be central to E210, Learning in Social Context, which incorporates issues from educational psychology, the social foundations of education, and special education. By examining the learning process from social, psychological, and cultural perspectives, students will gain an understanding of the complex nature of schooling and the role of the multiple influences on middle childhood students' learning. It is also designed as a course that will introduce students to the theoretical and practical foundations of issues related to student diversity. Students will develop an understanding how student differences related to culture, socio-economic status, gender, and disability can impact their school performance.

4. *Pursues on-going professional development opportunities that will impact student learning*

The notion that teacher education begins when an undergraduate takes his or her first university course, and concludes when that person retires from the teaching profession, permeates this program. The emphases on inquiry, openness to new ideas and ways of looking at and thinking about schooling and teaching, and the focus on inquiry, all support this notion. More formally, the DDSJ program concludes with a required course taken after student teaching has been completed--E425, Senior Seminar in Teaching and Schooling. This seminar will enable students to complete an in depth exploration of an educational issue, addressing its philosophical, social or ethical dimensions, as well as its significance for classroom practice; to synthesize their ideas and experiences on a broad range of topics into a presentation for a professional portfolio; and to reflect with seminar peers on values and orientations to teaching, and what it means to teach in a democratic society.

5. *Demonstrates the ability to collaborate and reflect with colleagues and others*

Such demonstrations are built into every course, and every school-based experience, in which DDSJ students will be involved. Collaboration will take place within the classes taught by faculty, as well as in the public school classrooms in which they will be working with teachers. Reflection will occur with respect to readings and assignments included in coursework at IUB as well as in the elementary school

classroom activities which students undertake. Ongoing feedback will be offered by both university and public school teachers, and by other students enrolled in DDSJ. “Collaboration” and “reflection” are the virtual watchwords of this new undergraduate program. It will offer its first required course in Education (beyond F205) in the spring of the 1999-2000 academic year.

### **AN OVERVIEW, AND SPECIFIC DETAILS, REGARDING HOW WE WILL APPROACH ASSESSMENT IN TEACHER EDUCATION AT IUB**

In March 1997 an ad hoc committee in the School of Education was constituted and charged with recommending an evaluation and assessment policy (and a plan of action for implementing that policy) for our teacher education programs, as well for our graduate programs. The Evaluation and Assessment Committee (EAC) met ten times and sponsored three forums on evaluation and assessment issues to solicit ideas and suggestions from faculty, students, staff, and administrators. On September 22, 1998, the Teacher Education Council approved the “white paper” on evaluation and assessment created by the EAC. Thus, the ideas in this section have been discussed and adopted by the teacher education community at IUB.

While this discussion of our orientation to assessment and the development of specific activities will be devoted solely to their centrality for teacher education, it is worth noting that the EAC consciously sought to develop a comprehensive approach to evaluation, for both teacher education and graduate offerings, that takes up issues involving the evaluation of programs, faculty, and students at both undergraduate and graduate levels. The committee decided it was unwise to decouple an approach for evaluating teaching and for judging the quality of faculty from the discussion of evaluating programs and students. From the outset of its work, the EAC defined its agenda for teacher education against the backdrop of (1) the reconceptualization and redesign of our teacher education program, discussed above, that has been under way for almost four years and that will conclude by the end of the 1998-99 academic year; and, (2) the recommendations coming from the August 1997 School of Education faculty retreat in which working groups of faculty, staff, and students explored ways to enhance intellectual engagement and academic quality throughout the School. In addition, the EAC’s deliberations leading to the development of an evaluation and assessment policy have been informed by the current scholarly discussions over content-based and developmental standards, performance outcomes, public concerns about the quality of undergraduate education, national discussions of student assessment, and the requirements for teacher education programs and student assessments being developed by the Indiana Professional Standards Board.

The EAC consistently interpreted its mission as developing an alternative to conventional practices that tend to reduce evaluation and assessment activities to simplistic mechanisms for accountability. Instead, the committee was concerned with “raising the bar” for what constitutes educational excellence in teacher education programs at IUB. Our intent in this regard is to utilize assessment ideas and practices as a way to complement related efforts to reinvigorate a culture of inquiry across the School. This culture must be one in which teacher-scholars at IUB, undergraduate and graduate students, and P-12 teachers are engaged in critical scrutiny of our practices; it must evince our ability to make warranted arguments about the quality of our programs and our students.

The Evaluation and Assessment Committee adopted, and the Teacher Education Council endorsed, an open-ended, scholarly approach to matters of student assessment and program evaluation. This approach was justified on the grounds that IUB ought to capitalize on the considerable expertise of its faculty in

evaluation and assessment, and thus continue its leading role in state and national conversations about the appropriate purposes and means of evaluating programs and students.

Below we outline and discuss our Evaluation Philosophy and Principles, Foci for Evaluative Efforts, Methodology for Evaluation as Critical Conversation, Management and Reporting, and Institutional Commitment.

We are committed to the view that the way we think about evaluation and the way we think about intellectual engagement, academic quality, and student performance, are inseparable. Intellectual engagement means thoughtful, careful scrutiny, criticism, and appraisal of educational concepts and practices. The outcome of such activity forms the basis for judgments of quality.

### Evaluation Philosophy and Principles

The evaluation philosophy adopted by the Teacher Education Council that informs the purpose and means of determining the quality of teacher education at IUB is consistent with our principles for teacher education reform, as well as the principles created by INTASC. Our approach to evaluation also reflects a commitment on the part of faculty and students to engage questions concerning the appropriate ends and means of education, in intellectually responsible and rigorous ways. To make this possible, our evaluation and assessment activities must form a central part of an ensemble of educative practices. These educative practices are premised on a method of democratic and critical conversation concerning the aims of education and the means necessary to achieve those aims. Evaluation activities must be structured in such a way that they contribute to this conversation by enabling and encouraging the ongoing scrutiny of values, beliefs, perspectives, and performances that guide the community of teacher-scholars at IUB and the P-12 schools and teachers with whom we collaborate. And, of course, evaluation activities themselves must be subject to similar scrutiny. In sum, we have construed evaluation as an engagement with ideas and performances that result in judgments of value. Such judgments require the development of reflective, critical, educative conversations about what, how, and why we teach, how well our students engage in careful and critical inquiry, and how that inquiry is reflected in classroom practices--at IUB and in P-12 classrooms.

We are committed to evaluating student performances that are continuous with education for professional judgment or practical wisdom (see Principle five of our conceptual framework, Knowledge and Multiple Forms of Understanding, below). This involves creating assessment activities that enable teachers, students, and other stakeholders to engage in a dialogue in which the participants examine critically their educational assumptions and commitments and how they are instantiated in practice. These dialogues will yield warranted judgments about the quality of our programs, the capabilities and performances of teachers and students, and the kinds of changes that we believe will improve teaching and learning as well as inquiry into teaching and learning.

The kind of practice we seek to foster through this approach to assessment is grounded in the following principles:

*Evaluation is inquiry-based*

Judgments of the appropriate ends and means of education are informed by the ongoing critical investigation and evaluation of traditions of education that inform our practice of teaching and

scholarship, coupled with careful attention to the fine-grained particularities of everyday teaching performances. Evaluation is a continual reinterpretation of theory and practice.

*Evaluation is evidential and not merely rhetorical*

Our interpretations of the quality of programs, students, and faculty should not be rhetorical statements of prejudices, beliefs, or commitments. Of course, we seek to persuade one another of the correctness or goodness of our views, but such views cannot simply be statements of personal preference. Rather, judgments or interpretations of value must be grounded in reasons and evidence. Evaluative judgments are constituted by arguments in support of conclusions.

*Evaluation is central to teaching and learning*

Our evaluative practices should be structured so as to enable and encourage the ongoing scrutiny of values, beliefs, perspectives, and performances that guide the community of teacher-scholars at IUB. Evaluation should be more than a technology to track program implementation and to measure products. Our evaluative practices revolve around productive conversations among teacher-scholars, that is, a critical dialogue about whether we are doing the right thing and doing it well. Those conversations must be open, moving, resistant to closure, and sensitive to revision in judgment.

*Evaluation is the responsibility of professionals*

Our professional community of university- and school-based teacher-scholars should take responsibility for the process and outcomes of evaluation. As professionals charged with preparing educators, we are responsible and accountable for judgments of program, faculty, and student quality.

*Evaluation has a public character*

Our evaluation and assessment practices can avoid becoming parochial and unreflective through disclosure of the results of evaluation and assessment and through commitments to include public scrutiny by all stakeholders. To raise our sensitivities and to invigorate discussions, we will invite stakeholders (professional societies, state agencies, P-12 teachers, colleagues from other institutions) into our conversations about quality.

## *Evaluation is firmly grounded in an institutional commitment*

The School of Education at IUB is accountable for generating high quality programs and high quality graduates. We can best address the need for accountability by making a clearly stated public commitment to inquiry-based evaluation, by wisely expending resources to support such evaluation, and by maintaining an infrastructure of policies and procedures that encourages an ongoing critical evaluation of practice.

### Foci for Evaluative Efforts

Conversations about the quality of teacher education programs often display a tension between the distinctiveness and commonality of such programs. A pragmatic assumption is that the distinctiveness of programs at IUB makes it difficult to specify common indicators of quality. We do not aspire to a view of education as the standardized production of a uniform educational product.

This does not mean, however, that a sensitivity to multiple approaches to teaching and learning can be removed from common and agreed upon foci for evaluation efforts. We share a common purpose and vision for teacher education, as represented in our commitments to an inquiry-driven approach to education, our collective embrace of six core principles, and our decision—through the Teacher Education Council—to adopt the philosophy of evaluation outlined in this section and the practices to which that philosophy leads. These shared purposes, these common foci, comprise a heuristic framework—that is, a set of analytic concepts to direct a conversation that will yield compelling arguments and data regarding program quality. In addition, four specific dimensions of teaching and learning direct our evaluation activities:

#### Curriculum:

Because of its primacy to education, discussions concerning curriculum matters are vital to judgments of the quality of our programs. If what is taught is not worth learning, it makes little difference how well it is taught, evaluated, or supported. Questions that enable critical examination of the quality of curriculum include the following:

- ★ What curriculum theory and set of values help determine which knowledge is of most worth in teacher education? What evidence is there that this theory and set of values are appropriate and beneficial to our students?
- ★ What evidence is there that our curriculum challenges our students to raise their intellectual and professional aspirations?
- ★ What demands does the content taught make on students' needs to reflect, doubt, interpret, and evaluate?
- ★ What evidence exists regarding how the curriculum addresses both scholarly and professional concerns? How is a creative tension and balance maintained?
- ★ What evidence is there that the curriculum is less a collection of teaching recipes and techniques or a series of courses and more like an ecology of ideas?
- ★ What perspectives about subject matter are conveyed at a tacit or implicit level in the curriculum?
- ★ What evidence is there that curriculum explicitly deals with normative as well as technical matters?

## Pedagogy:

IUB is concerned with how we as teachers mediate the content that we teach. We seek to examine issues of quality entailed in our choice and use of various means of teaching. Professional preparation at IUB unfolds within the larger context of a major research institution and thus reflects, among other things, the institution's broad commitment to scholarship. Hence, as a faculty we are responsible for bringing research to bear on decisions about pedagogy and content. Questions to guide the investigation of pedagogy include:

- ★ What are the qualifications of faculty (including associate instructors) to teach in our programs?
- ★ What evidence is there that faculty (including associate instructors) set high expectations for students?
- ★ What evidence is there that program faculty offer multiple points of view on subject matter, thereby encouraging critical reflection and debate?
- ★ What evidence is there that choice of instructional approach(es) is based on research and sound reasoning?
- ★ What evidence is there that program faculty engage in regular, disciplined examination of their teaching practices?

## Student assessment:

We are responsible for determining whether our students meet criteria for what we consider to be scholarly accomplishment and professional competence during, and on completion of, their programs of study. Since our teacher education programs prepare students to become teachers in P-12 schools, deliberations about what constitutes scholarship and professional capability and whether these twin aims have been met must be undertaken in light of the following considerations:

- ★ On the basis of what evidence do faculty determine that, during their program of study, students are developing as responsible, competent, and critical teachers, scholars, professionals, and so on?
- ★ On the basis of what evidence do faculty determine that, on completion of their program of study, students have acquired the practical skills, intellectual dispositions, and habits of mind to be responsible, competent, and critical teachers, scholars, professionals, and so on?
- ★ What evidence is there that multiple measures are used to judge scholarship and professional competence?

## Professional Practice Contexts:

Teacher education programs unfold in university classrooms as well as in field placements, student teaching assignments, and other venues. We do not view school sites as simply places where students are taught "real-world lessons." Rather, these professional practice contexts--and the norms and values they reflect, the performances they sustain, and the relationships they promote--should themselves be subject to scrutiny and analysis. A central function of university education is to improve the world of educational practice and individual performance, not simply to adapt to it. Judging the quality of student preparation and performance entails providing evidence of how a program examines and critically engages this world

of professional practice. The following questions can help guide inquiry into the relationships between our teacher education programs and their professional practice contexts:

- ★ What forms of interaction with the contexts of practice will enhance our students' understandings of what it means to be a member of a practice of a particular kind?
- ★ What forms of inquiry and analysis will facilitate students' understanding and critique of the ideologies, norms, values, and power relationships that structure and sustain professional practice contexts in P-12 schools?
- ★ What evidence is there that teacher education curricula carefully explore different understandings of the relationship between theory and practice?

### Methodology for Evaluation as Critical Conversation

The means by which we evaluate are consistent with the notion that evaluation is inquiry-driven and should promote faculty and student discussion as to whether they are doing the right thing and doing it well. Evaluation methodology must make the scrutiny of teaching and learning visible, as it opens up the debate about quality. Procedures should enable the making of warranted judgments about the significance, importance, and value of what we teach and learn. Simultaneously, those procedures must provide evidence for how our students and our graduates incorporate the orientations, practices, values, and perspectives that are central to the way we have articulated our vision for teacher education. **The most critical consideration in doing evaluation is developing arguments based on evidence and reasoning for the conclusions we reach about quality. Evidence of quality based on some empirical measure is often necessary for an argument but does not itself constitute an argument.**

Developing and sustaining on-going, open, critical, evaluative discussions about teaching and learning--involving university classrooms, P-12 schools, and community sites in which our students are placed for field experiences-- takes time. As questions and claims come into view, participants in evaluative discussions need to consider the following principles to guide the process:

- ★ Questions, claims, hypotheses, and so forth that guide the evaluation conversation should be clearly and explicitly described and justified in terms of importance and relevance.
- ★ Means used to generate evidence upon which evaluative judgments are made are specifically described and justified with respect to evaluation questions and purposes.
- ★ Means for generating evidence are not limited to a single approach but include internal discussion among program area faculty; formally scheduled conversations or forums with faculty, students, P-12 teachers and administrators, and other stakeholders; observations of teaching; interviews with students; student surveys; student assignments, and so forth.
- ★ The process(es) whereby evidence is interpreted and analyzed to reach evaluative judgments are described.

### Management and Reporting

The locus for evaluation activity is both the individual program and the broader aims and purposes of teacher education as outlined in our six principles. Each program will be responsible for delivering annually a brief interpretive memorandum of its evaluation activity and findings to the Associate Dean for Teacher Education. These memoranda should be the outcome of faculty discussions at the program level. In addition, the Office of Teacher Education will be responsible for sponsoring an annual School-wide

forum on program quality. At these annual discussions, public stakeholders will be invited to participate, since part of our responsibility here is to provide all stakeholders with opportunities to provide input into, engage with, and learn from the results of inquiry-based evaluation. We will also assist stakeholders in their efforts to interpret evidence of program quality according to their information needs and categories.

The activities associated with sharing our inquiry-based investigations and reporting our findings, however, must be supplemented with descriptive reports that include data on admissions, enrollments, graduation rates, grade point averages, and so on. These kinds of institutional reporting and monitoring activities must be seen as supplements to our on-going, inquiry-based evaluation practice.

### Institutional Commitment

The School of Education generally, and specifically through the Teacher Education Council and the Office of Teacher Education, constitute the unit responsible for sustaining this process of evaluation. These units and offices acknowledge and demonstrate that responsibility through their commitment to the evaluation process described here. This commitment includes not simply funding and faculty compensation, but also support in the form of institutional and programmatic arrangements that facilitate the faculty's participation in the evaluation process. As evaluative activities unfold, questions will need to be addressed concerning:

- ★ Whether current policies for allocating faculty time and evaluating faculty performance are consistent with an inquiry-driven approach to evaluating teaching and learning.
- ★ Whether existing School structures, procedures, and budgetary commitments are adequate to demonstrate the school's commitment to inquiry-based evaluation.
- ★ Whether policies are in place to ensure that faculty recruitment strategies reflect a commitment to inquiry-based evaluation.

### **CLOSING COMMENTS AND SUMMARY**

The ideas and activities discussed in this report should make it abundantly clear that the discussion of teacher education at IUB has been robust, spirited, intellectually engaging, and aimed at significantly raising our expectations for ourselves, our students, and the profession of teaching. Not simply working on marginal or incremental changes, the teacher education community, and the IUB School of Education in particular, has invested significant human and material resources so that we have been able to:

1. fundamentally reconceptualize teacher education as an entity;
2. design new, innovative, high quality programs; and
3. design assessment perspectives and ideas that are fundamental to gauging where we are and where we are going in teacher education.

In undertaking this quality and breadth of work in successful if not exemplary ways, we demonstrate the commitment to inquiry that is central to university life, and to high quality teaching.

We take seriously not only the work described in this report and the progress we have made, but also our responsibility to local, state, national, and international constituencies and audiences. Working in tandem with all elements of the teacher education community— from our Teacher Education Steering Committee that served as a catalyst for the reconceptualization of teacher education; to the P-12 teachers and

university faculty involved in efforts to create new programs; to the Teacher Education Council members who adopted new policies and guidelines for program development; to the School-wide committee that developed the assessment framework outlined in the final section of this report-- it should be clear that much has changed on the IUB campus in the last few years. None of the changes that are unfolding could have taken place without the hard work, even devotion, of all segments of the population that have a stake in the preparation of teachers.

Given the scope, nature, and inclusivity of our undertakings, we conclude that:

1. The development of our assessment system has resulted in exemplary progress in the inclusion of stakeholders.
2. The IUB conceptual framework reflects the exemplary progress that has been made to systematically incorporate the INTASC Principles; such programs as Democracy, Diversity, and Social Justice reflect in greater detail that exemplary progress.
3. We have made exemplary progress in developing an assessment plan that has allowed us to initiate conversations and stipulate requirements within which INTASC Principles and IPSB Standards will be effectively communicated to all stakeholders, and to sponsor annual conversations on those, as well as our own, principles and commitments for teacher education.
4. A range of opportunities exists-- in college classrooms, student assignments, early field placements, and student teaching assignments--to assess the performances we expect from our students. Further, the creation of public forums within which judgments of quality will be forwarded and discussed with the teacher education community, insures continued development and reconsideration of current and future IUB and School of Education policies, educational practices, and student performances.

## Appendix I

### Principles for Reconceptualizing Teacher Education at Indiana University- Bloomington

#### 1. Community

Effective teacher preparation requires that participants develop a sense of community. The longevity of relationships required to establish community has several advantages for all its members. It brings a coherence to programs, fosters an appreciation of the power of cooperative effort, and encourages a dialogue that promotes the continual rejuvenation of teacher education. **Consequently, all our teacher education programs must foster a sense of community among their students, among faculty members, between faculty members and students, and between the university and the schools.**

#### 2. Critical Reflection

Effective teachers reflect critically on the moral, political, social, and economic dimensions of education. This requires an understanding of the multiple contexts in which schools function, an appreciation of diverse perspectives on educational issues, and a commitment to democratic forms of interaction. **Consequently, all our teacher education programs must encourage students to develop their own social and educational visions that are connected to critically reflective practice.**

#### 3. Intellectual, Personal, and Professional Growth

Teachers who are more than technicians or mere purveyors of information must be committed to lifelong intellectual, personal, and professional growth. Both faculty and students must continually develop these habits of mind, requiring that our programs stimulate the exploration and development of the full range of human capabilities. **Consequently, all our teacher education programs must foster intellectual curiosity and encourage an appreciation of learning through intuition, imagination, and aesthetic experience.**

#### 4. Meaningful Experience

Teachers must be effective in actual educational settings. Accordingly, our teacher education program must maintain or create experiences in schools and on campus that will assist in the development of their expertise in those settings. Students should be expected to act as thoughtful, reflective, caring practitioners as part of those experiences, and instructors must be able to assess their abilities in such settings. **Consequently, all our teacher education programs must include early and continuous engagement-- through direct immersion or simulation-- with the multiple realities of children, teaching, and schools.**

#### 5. Knowledge and Multiple Forms of Understanding

Effective teachers possess a well-grounded knowledge of the content areas that are central to their teaching. They also have an in-depth comprehension of the forms of knowledge embodied in the traditional disciplines, of the interdisciplinary nature of inquiry, and of the multiple forms of understanding which individual students bring to the classroom. **Consequently, all our teacher education programs must help students acquire a "practical wisdom" that integrates forms of**

**understanding, skilled action in and outside classrooms, and a particular sensitivity to the diversity of students.**

## **6. Personalized Learning**

Good teachers build on their students' interests, learning styles, and goals. Similarly, teacher education should offer its students opportunities to individualize and personalize their preparation as teachers.

**Consequently, all our teacher education programs must give students a significant measure of control over how, when, and where their learning takes place, thus enabling their interests and values to shape major portions of their work.**

## **Appendix II**

### **Some Implications of Our Six Principles**

#### **I Community**

1. Foster continuing relationships between students and faculty, such as cohort groups, that go beyond the semester.
2. Faculty members need to be involved in more than one course within a program.
3. All participants in a program must periodically review the program as a way of building community over time. This includes collaborative efforts with other IUB schools and other School of Education programs.

#### **II Critical Reflection**

1. Develop students' social vision--what is a good society and what is the role of schools in the creation of that society.
2. Encourage the examination and debate of past, present, and future aims of schooling in a democratic society.
3. Develop sensitivity to race, culture, class, gender, and related issues.
4. Encourage critical reflection by students on their own role as teachers and the development of their professional and political beliefs.

#### **III Intellectual, Personal, and Professional Growth**

1. Foster student participation in the development of curriculum, professional commitments, and philosophies.
2. Foster normative engagement, discussion, and development of values. Develop and defend commitments.
3. Engage students as curriculum developers as a process of continued professional development.
4. Seek, evaluate, and create new knowledge.
5. Create opportunities to attend professional conferences.

#### **IV Meaningful Experience**

1. Classroom teachers must have a larger role in planning field experiences.
2. Classroom teachers must be partners in the teacher education program and must be compensated appropriately.
3. Faculty must be involved in the supervision of students in field experiences, including supervision.
4. All field experiences must be accompanied by a seminar.

#### **V Knowledge and Multiple Forms of Understanding**

1. Teacher education courses and programs must be more multi-disciplinary.
2. Content knowledge must be integrated into the teacher education curriculum.
3. The faculty needs to represent and be sensitive to diverse socio-cultural groups.
4. Develop “shadow courses” to help students see the interconnections between content and pedagogy.

#### **VI Personalized Learning**

1. Foster individualization of instruction and other alternatives to group instruction such as individual research projects.
2. Encourage portfolios as a possible avenue towards individual reflection, and to document personal growth.
3. Provide the opportunity for student input into field experiences.

# NCATE Standards Categories & Weaknesses

## Category I - Design of Professional Education

### Background

The October 1997 report outlined the work of IUPUI's standing Evaluation Committee, identifying a primary focus, guiding questions, and key activities for each of the next three years. These annual foci and guiding questions have been modified as result of progress made and problems encountered during 1997-98, and a revised list is included as Attachment A. Both accomplishments and planned activities are discussed in relation to the 1997 plan. Activities carried forward from 1997-98 are so noted.

### Evaluation and Changes (1997-98)

#### Accomplishments

At IUPUI, 1997-98 was the 4<sup>th</sup> year of offering, in effect, two programs: an integrated, cohort-based program for students able to enroll on a full time basis (Learning to Teach/Teaching to Learn [LT/TL]) and a traditional program defined simply by component courses (enrolling some full time students and all those attending less than full time). Substantial effort during the year focused on the re-design of the teacher education program for students who enroll part-time. Our goal is to offer a single program in two different formats—full time [4 semesters] or part-time [7 semesters]. Education faculty are committed to providing *all* teacher education candidates a program with the salient features of LT/TL: an integrated and carefully articulated curriculum, a cohort experience, grounding in a professional development school, and extensive mentoring. The result is a more formal blocking and sequencing of courses to enhance program coherence improve linkages between course work and field experience and to facilitate monitoring of student progress

With leadership by the Evaluation Committee, we continue to collect, summarize, analyze, distribute and discuss evaluation data from LT/TL Cohorts 3-5 at the same time the unit assessment system is being refined. The reports of the most recent LT/TL cohort is included as Attachment B. Rather than expanding the evaluation to include students in the traditional program, we feel it is more valuable to complete the curriculum revision for the part-time program and to finalize the overall evaluation design for teacher education candidates. As a consequence, we do not provide 1997-98 data for teacher education students outside LT/TL.

In addition to its own regular meetings, the Evaluation Committee also held monthly faculty work sessions to discuss performance assessment and conducted a school-wide "evaluation week" [March 31-April 3] devoted to both curriculum refinement and instrument development. The fall '97 meeting of the Professional Development School Coordinating Council also addressed performance assessment with a focused discussion of student work and student teachers' comments about that work. While the

evaluation design remains a work in progress, a current snapshot of the planned program evaluation scheme is presented in Attachment C.

Faculty continued (a) to examine LT/TL syllabi to determine fidelity of the original mapping of semester blocks to INTASC principles and (b) to revise syllabi as appropriate. We have set expectations for each block of the elementary and secondary programs and begun to identify core content and assessment questions for each. The working draft of this material for the elementary program is included as Attachment D.

The work that began in 1995 as an instrument for the “Final Evaluation of Student Teaching Experience” in the LT/TL program has evolved into the “IUPUI Framework for Beginning Teacher Practice” [see Attachment E]. Like its predecessor, the “IUPUI Framework” is built around the INTASC principles.

We have taken the important step of beginning to involve part-time instructors outside LT/TL in discussions of assessment and curriculum articulation across semesters and blocks. Meetings in June and August served to introduce or re-introduce part-time instructors to INTASC principles and to revise syllabi to support both the standards and more authentic approaches to student assessment.

We initiated meetings with faculty groups in the School of Liberal Arts [Fall] and the School of Science [Spring]. Faculty secured three small interdisciplinary planning grants to continue work across campus to develop activities related to the IUPUI “principles of undergraduate learning” and to design concentrations for elementary education majors [in communication and theater, engineering, and anthropology].

Education Student Services has revised the format of its recruitment and orientation sessions and begun to highlight the standards-based program framework and the commitment to performance assessment. Students receive a handout of the INTASC principles at information sessions.

While we did not implement a new formal application process for entry to Teacher Education, we did field test a modified application process for students entering Cohort 5.

Although we had planned to begin to focus on graduate programs, we made limited progress. The Counseling/Counselor Education program completed a self-study and visitation by a team comprising both campus colleagues and external professionals. C/CE faculty are in the process of developing a response to review team’s report.

### **Plans for AY 1998-99**

#### **Unit Assessment System**

Finalize all questions we want the evaluation to address

Draft a master calendar of what data is collected when and by whom and how it is summarized and reported back to faculty.

Extend use of the “IUPUI Framework” to all student teachers, supervising teachers and university supervisors.

Plan and conduct sessions to orient stakeholders to portfolio tasks and scoring rubrics for the “IUPUI Framework...”

Collaborate with colleagues in the Schools of Liberal Arts and Science to establish criteria for admission to Teacher Education that ties to the campus “Principles of Undergraduate Learning” [PULs]

Design tracking, summary, and reporting systems to monitor individual candidates [e.g, a Teacher Education server with an electronic file for each candidate]

Implement a formal process of application and admission to Teacher Education for all candidates that includes a required orientation session, written statement, and induction event. [carry over from 1997-98]

Draft and field test a protocol for an “initial portfolio review” that would constitute a primary component of a revised “application for student teaching”

Conduct focus groups with graduates of Cohorts 1 & 2 [carry over from 1997-98]

### **Curriculum Design and Development**

Conduct initial deliberations about program adjustments in response to Indiana content and development standards promulgated by IPSB

Continue curriculum articulation meetings with part-time instructors and full time faculty. [December, April, June and August]

Align Counseling/Counselor Education program with CACREP standards and adjust syllabi to support performance assessment. [carry over from AY 1997-98]

Align master’s and certification programs in Educational Leadership programs with draft professional framework and adjust syllabi to support performance assessment. [carry over from AY 1997-98]

Recruit and select additional “professional development school” sites to support implementation of a restructured program for part-time students.

### **Weaknesses cited [in 1997 review] under Category I:**

*The evaluation design of the model has not been fully articulated.* At IUPUI, this weakness is being addressed as the Evaluation Committee, faculty, and other stakeholders continue to develop the unit assessment system. A general draft of the design is available [see Attachment D] but the evidence and standards are still under development.

*Candidates in secondary education programs are not adequately prepared to teach exceptional*

*populations in the classrooms.* As of Fall 1998, all secondary education candidates at IUPUI are required to complete K205: Introduction to Exceptionality. Candidate preparation for teaching in more inclusive schools will be enhanced with the implementation of more carefully sequenced program that combines K205 with M300: Teaching in a Pluralistic Society in a block that also includes field experience. Since this block occurs early in the program, there will be opportunity to infuse additional attention to students with exceptionalities in subsequent semesters and blocks.

## **Category II - Candidates in Professional Education**

### **Evaluation and Changes (1997-98) INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENT SYSTEM**

The working draft of the “IUPUI Framework for Beginning Teacher Professional Practice” is included as Attachment E. The students in Cohort 3 and their cooperating professionals had significant involvement in developing rubrics for the Framework, in designing the accompanying “log” to record feedback, and in using the material during Sp 98 student teaching. Naturally, a number of other activities relevant to the individual assessment system are embedded in the design of the overall unit assessment system mentioned above.

#### **Plans for 1998-99**

Use the “IUPUI Framework for Beginning Teacher Professional Practice” for *all* student teaching assignments

Introduce the “Framework” to incoming teacher education candidates

Convene discussions of “Framework” with cooperating professionals at PDS sites

Establish what evidence should accompany the completed “Framework” in a candidate’s portfolio

Formulate initial design of mechanism to provide support to students identified by block faculty and/or PDS faculty as performing below program expectations

**Weaknesses cited [in 1997 review] under Category II:** *None cited*

## **Category III - Professional Education Faculty**

### **Evaluation and Changes (1997-98)**

Of the full time academic appointments in the School of Education at IUPUI, 53% are women and 17% are from traditionally under represented groups. During 1997-98, three individuals were hired on tenure lines (Jeff Anderson [special education], Anastasia Morrone [educational psychology], and José Rosario [curriculum studies, foundations] while two faculty members on tenure lines departed [Sherry Basile, Ken Hay]. Three visiting appointments were made.

In addition to the appointments at IUPUI, search and screen activities resulted in two full time tenure-

line appointments at Columbus (Dr. Carole Anne Hossler and Dr. Deborah Winnekates).

### **Plans for 1998 - 99**

At IUPUI, we are examining the feasibility of individuals holding split appointments in P-12 and university settings. Dr. Jay Hill (formerly curriculum director for NCHS in Washington Township) splits his time between IUPUI and NCHS. He teaches several periods of high school social studies and is also responsible for coordinating field experience and student teaching placements at North Central and for teaching a methods class on-site at the high school. Vicki Walker splits her time between IUPUI (where she teaches in mathematics education) and IPS (where she provides professional development and classroom support to elementary teachers implementing standards-based math).

The experience of Hill and Walker should inform our future use of joint appointments to strengthen school/university collaboration for educator preparation.

**Weaknesses cited [in 1997 review] under Category III:** *None cited at IUPUI*

### **Category IV - The Unit for Professional Education Evaluation and Changes (1997-98)**

In April, the SOE faculty at IUPUI passed a proposal that would permit the appointment of "clinical faculty." Individuals with clinical appointments would have an increased responsibility for teaching and limited expectations for research. Though not tenure eligible, clinical faculty would be regularly reviewed, could receive extended contracts, and have the opportunity to advance in rank. The process of making a clinical rank appointment is identical to that required to establish a tenure line position. Beginning with search and screen activities initiated Fall 1998, faculty at IUPUI will have the option of designating positions at the outset as either clinical or tenure-track.

During AY 1997-98, the Trustees established a set of "peer institutions" for IUPUI. The group includes University of Cincinnati, University of Houston, University of Illinois-Chicago, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, and Wayne State University. During the coming year, we intend to undertake careful analysis of the productivity, available resources, and organization of the Schools and Colleges of Education in these peer institutions as part of on-going effort to expand the resources available to the School of Education at IUPUI.

**Weaknesses cited [in 1997 review] under Category IV:**

*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.*

During 1997-98, Dr. Carol-Anne Hossler was hired as acting Director of Elementary Education for School of Education programs in Columbus. Hossler was a regular participant in both School and Teacher Education program meetings at IUPUI, and communicated regularly with the Chair of Teacher

Education. In addition, she initiated meetings with Liberal Arts and Science faculty at Columbus and began meetings with area administrators concerning the development of “professional development school” sites for students in Columbus. IUPUI faculty decisions about GPA requirements, course sequences and prerequisites are now being implemented at Columbus.

A Search and Screen Committee comprising three Education faculty from IUPUI and two faculty from Columbus recommended two tenure line appointments: Dr. Carol-Anne Hossler [assistant professor and program coordinator] and Dr. Deborah Winnekates [assistant professor, literacy education]. Both Hossler and Winnekates attend School and Teacher Education meetings at IUPUI. These appointments should result in considerable improvement of the articulation of the elementary education program between IUPUI and IUPUC.

## **Attachments**

- A. Annual Foci/Guiding Questions for Implementation of Performance Assessment  
*Revised Fall 1998*
- B. Evaluation of LT/TL Cohort 3
- C. Assessment Schematic
- D. IUPUI Elementary Teacher Education Sequence [working draft]
- E. IUPUI Framework for Beginning Teacher Professional Practice [working draft]