

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 1999 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 professional educators. Both campuses have large traditional programs for elementary and secondary teachers. Both campuses also have developed and are still in the process of creating innovative teacher education programs. The foci of these programs are intentionally 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 Educational Leadership 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 Annual Report for IUB and provides a detailed report on the way in which IUB's revised programs reflect the principles, standards, and assessment requirements of the IPSB. Section III presents the narrative report for IUPUI.

SECTION II.

ANNUAL REPORT - IU BLOOMINGTON

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

1999 ANNUAL REPORT

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, 1998 - 1999

The reforms initiated four years ago continue with the final approval of three revised elementary programs and a 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. Additionally, major efforts have gone into the development of a model assessment program for the unit.

Weaknesses cited under Category I:

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

1999 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 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.

A detailed description of advances in the evaluation design is included following this section of the report.

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

1999 Update

In 1998, after reviewing secondary students evaluations and comments, we took immediate steps to design a specific course offering for secondary students. In the past, an effort was made to infuse work on exceptional needs students throughout the secondary curriculum. We realized that this effort was not as productive as we originally thought.

The Special Education faculty 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. The course was offer for the first time in the Summer 1999 session and will be offered each semester thereafter. Additionally, the Teacher Education Council approved add a requirement that all new secondary majors be required to complete this course. The effective date for this policy is Fall semester, 1999.

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, 1998 - 1999

During the past year, several studies were conducted to review the quality of students enrolled in the IUB teacher education program. With the change in state mandated testing requirements, it was important for us to study the impact of the change on our students. As a result of the study, an experimental developmental program for assisting students who might encounter difficulty with the new exams was created and will be offered for the first time during the Fall 1999 semester.

The unit continues to attend to recruiting a more diverse student population. The retreat topic for the faculty and staff in the Fall 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. The additional funds were expended as expected.

In the Fall semester 1998, there were 2,158 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, 39 Hispanics, and 1,987 white students included in the count. At the graduate level (excluding Graduate School enrollees) there were 619 full-time students and included about 33 percent male and 66 percent female in terms of gender. Twenty graduate students were Asian, 36 were Black, 15 were

Hispanic, 122 were nonresident aliens, and 413 were white. These numbers do not vary appreciably from the 1998 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. At this point, progress has been steady and ongoing.

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. She began her duties in the Fall 98 semester.

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, 1999

There were 124 full-time faculty using the AACTE/NCATE definition provided with the instructions. Of these 56 were female and 68 were male. There was one American Indian, two Asians, six Blacks, four Hispanics, and 111 White faculty members. These numbers are appreciably the same as reported in the 1998 Annual Report.

The faculty continue to be productive with about \$10,388,978 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. Additionally, during the year 10 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 provides 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.

1999 Update

Beginning early in the spring semester of 2000, we will be creating "Field Teams" that will include the faculty coordinators of our revised teacher education programs, staff from the student teaching and early field experiences offices, supervisors of student teachers, and faculty and doctoral students with expertise in assessment. This plan has been made possible, in part, by the redesign of our field experience office and by the revision in the duties of the prospective head of that office. We have re-described that position so that the new head will carry the title of Assistant Dean. One of his or her primary duties will be to coordinate and take part in the work of the Field Teams. The activities of those teams will be multi-faceted, and will include:

- ★ meeting with P-12 teachers and administrators (initially, at the local and regional levels, and subsequently statewide) to provide written materials about our revised teacher education programs, and to continue conversations about our programs, and the implications they have for schools and teachers;
- ★ meeting with teachers and administrators to discuss our Unit Assessment System and to solicit feedback about the UAS;
- ★ meeting with student teaching and early field experience supervisors to discuss our assessment system, and to clarify the new roles supervisors will play in helping assess our students, as one way to generate evidence and data concerning the incorporation of content and developmental standards, and the INTASC Principles.

These conversations will continue through at least the 2001-2002 academic year, as we continue to implement our revised programs and describe how our UAS is designed to assess those programs. Throughout those conversations, we will encourage teachers, administrators, alumni, supervisors, and others, to suggest alternative ideas and strategies, ask questions, in an environment within which communication can be candid, ongoing, and consistent with our responsibilities to current and future educators and the State of Indiana.

Once those conversations and interactions have clarified our Unit Assessment System (including changes that are made to the UAS as a result of those conversations), we will begin to sponsor regular, public assessment activities. The locus for those activities will be both our individual programs, faculty, and students, and the collectivity that is the Teacher Education Program at IUB. Each program will be responsible for delivering annually an interpretive report of its evaluation activities and findings to the Associate Dean for Teacher Education. That report will reflect discussions at the program level, as they provide evidence that program commitments have been met or exceeded (fundamentally related to the six principles that constitute our conceptual framework, our central commitment to inquiry, the content and developmental standards of the IPSB, and the "internal" commitments of each program).

In addition, the Associate Dean for Teacher Education will be responsible for sponsoring an annual public forum on program quality. These forums will include all teacher education stakeholders, including alumni, P-12 teachers and administrators, faculty from within the School of Education and from other units of IUB, and supervisors of our field experiences. These annual discussions will provide stakeholders with opportunities to provide input into, engage with, and learn from the results of our inquiry-based evaluation efforts. We will also assist stakeholders in their efforts to interpret our evidence of program quality according to their information needs and categories.

We will continue to reach out to the teacher education community (broadly defined) so that we can benefit from engaging, collegial, critical dialogues about our courses and programs, our conceptual framework and its meaning, and the quality of our courses, programs, instructors, and students.

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 steps have been implemented as we continue our efforts toward formalizing professional development activities for cooperating teachers.

1. During the placement process, procedures have been added that involve both written and phone 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, exchanging information, and verifying 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 to them.

At IUB, a handbook for cooperating teachers and student teachers has been developed that clarifies policies, roles and expectations of all parties during the student teaching assignment. 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, 1998 - 1999

During 1998-99, the unit submitted a proposal to the University Information Technology Services as part of a University-wide effort to provide up-to-date computing equipment to all faculty, staff, and associate instructors. The proposal provides for the replacement of 300 pieces of equipment-including desktops, laptops, printers, and servers-throughout the School of Education in the subsequent academic year. Furthermore, the proposal includes lifecycle replacement of the entire stock of computer equipment in the School every three years thereafter. This proposal has been approved by the University, and implementation is expected beginning in 1999-2000.

In addition, 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 1998-99.

In terms of resources for teaching, the Unit continues to maintain mobile computer carts that instructors use in classrooms with overhead projection units and mobile televisions sets and VCRs for loan to instructors. Faculty and associate instructors continue to enhance instruction through the use of technology. During the year, many 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 and the WWW. Faculty, associate instructor, and staff participation was very high with many of the workshops closing shortly after announcing their availability. In addition, the Office of Instructional Services in the School of Education provides instructional consulting to individual faculty members and associate instructors, including assistance in the design of Web-based courses.

The general fund budget for 1998 - 99 increased significantly over the previous year. The Unit budgeted funds in the amount of \$16,372,550 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.

1999 Update

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

The Unit Assessment System
for Teacher Education at
Indiana University, Bloomington

Introduction

The development of a Unit Assessment System at Indiana University, Bloomington (IUB) has been among our highest priorities, as we continue to create revised programs that are consistent with our conceptual framework, the INTASC principles, and the Indiana Professional Standards Board (IPSB) standards. Since we have been involved in a large-scale effort to reconceptualize teacher education and to create revised programs since 1995; and because that effort has been expansive, including all teacher education stakeholders, our program development process continues to be based on a phased-in implementation schedule. We discuss, therefore, both the nature of our Unit Assessment System (UAS) and how it will be incorporated into our programs. Since our current (“continuing”) programs will be phased out as our revised programs are begun, we will not include our continuing programs in the UAS. In future reports to the Board, we will indicate how our Unit Assessment System will be incorporated into all our revised programs.

The nature of our revised programs and the nature of our assessment practices at IUB are necessarily interconnected. Both undertakings developed over a significant amount of time, and both have been approved by the IUB Teacher Education Council, the governing body for teacher education on our campus. The Council is composed of 18 members, including seven faculty members from the School of Education, three faculty members 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 stakeholder groups they represent have been active participants in our planning and implementation activities from the beginning (see Appendix I, below).

We outline in this report:

- 1) how our Unit Assessment System incorporates stakeholders' involvement in its development and management.
- 2) how our conceptual framework for teacher education incorporates the INTASC principles and IPSB Standards;
- 3) how the UAS constitutes a coherent, sequential assessment system for candidates that is performance-based.
- 4) how we plan to use student assessment practices to document the quality of our programs, as they meet or exceed IPSB Standards.
- 5) how we plan to utilize assessment practices that may lead to a reconsideration and revision of our conceptual framework.
- 6) how we propose to ensure that the UAS is continuously managed.
- 7) how we propose to review and consider revisions of the UAS.

The IUB Unit Assessment System: Process and Criteria

We are fully supportive of the emphasis placed on performance and content and developmental standards by the IPSB. Teacher educators involved in high quality programs have always been concerned with the quality of the activities in which our students and graduates take part, and with finding appropriately demanding ways to assess their work in university and P-12 classrooms. Those concerns have been especially prevalent at IUB. We eagerly look forward to the day when our first students enroll in our revised programs, and we can begin assessing their progress in a public, inclusive fashion.

We understand “performance” as a complex, multi-dimensional concept and set of initiatives that include but go beyond an isolated set of specific actions in classrooms. Teachers’ actions and performances are not only constituted by physical movements, actions, or exchanges. They are also generated when, and only when, teachers develop a) ways of thinking that generate intellectual activity for themselves and their students; b) an ability to contemplate a variety of educational, ethical, and social realities and ideals; c) a commitment to reflecting on scholarly and ethical commitments, and classroom practices; and d) a deep understanding of the relevant literatures on educational studies, teaching, curriculum, assessment, the contexts of schooling, and so on. For actions and performances to be deliberate, thoughtful, and beneficial to P-12 students– in short, for performance to be meaningfully developed and assessed-- they must be guided by the most valuable research, inquiry, and reflective practices that are available. What this commitment to exemplary activities entails at IUB is a commitment to integrating intellectually rigorous undergraduate classes and experiences with the generation of practices in P-12 classrooms, as these create a seamless whole.

Moreover, no list of standards that have been formally met, no list of performances thought desirable, regardless how extensive, can provide a complete direction for teaching and teacher education that resolves all the situations with which our students and graduates will be faced. Teaching is, simply, neither a technical nor a completely predictable undertaking. While standards and performances provide a necessary and important “skeleton” for constructing courses, programs, and experiences at the university level, and for generating classroom activities at the precollege level, they are not in and of themselves sufficient in terms of constructing a direction for performances in schools. The culture, purposes, and values that give shape to a college or university, and the particular qualities and culture of specific P-12 schools and classrooms, necessarily influence the spirit and direction of teacher education programs. In addition, all teacher education communities must create a set of commitments that generate a vision for what teacher education and teaching should be, and a set of grounding ideas that instantiate that vision. At IUB, that vision, and its instantiation, are based on our collective commitment to inquiry, as well as to six principles (along with some of their possible implications) that have been approved by the teacher education community (see Appendices II and III, below).

The Unit Assessment System at IUB

We provide here a set of explanations regarding our UAS, and how it meets or exceeds the requirements of the IPSB, as described in the Memorandum to Profession Education Unit Heads from the Teacher Education Committee of the IPSB dated August 16, 1999. Following the criteria listed in that memorandum, we present below the development of our UAS and how we plan to implement it.

1) how the IUB Unit Assessment System incorporates stakeholders' involvement in its development and management.

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 undergraduates, and our colleagues in 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 revised 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.

An ad hoc Evaluation and Assessment Committee (EAC) drafted the initial outline and plan for assessment in March 1997. That committee was comprised of faculty, staff, and undergraduate and graduate student representatives. It was charged with articulating an evaluation and assessment policy (and a plan of action for implementing that policy) for our teacher education programs. The EAC plan was submitted to the Teacher Education Council for their review and consideration; it was approved by the TEC in September 1998.

The EAC white paper that contained that plan included a comprehensive approach to evaluation that would take up issues involving the evaluation of programs, as well as faculty and students involved in teacher education. The committee thought it unwise to decouple an approach for evaluating teaching and for judging the quality of faculty from the discussion of evaluating programs and students. The EAC's deliberations leading to the development of an evaluation and assessment policy were informed by the current scholarly and political debate over content-based and developmental standards, public concerns about the quality of undergraduate education, national discussions of student assessment, and the requirements for teacher education program and student assessment that were being developed by the Indiana Professional Standards Board.

For the longer term, but still in advance of the implementation of our revised programs, wider discussions will continue to take place so that alterations in our UAS can be made before it is inaugurated in practice. To guarantee that possibility, during 1998-99 we developed additional

strategies that will guarantee an enhanced commitment to the dissemination of our UAS and opportunities for significant feedback. Beginning early in the spring semester of 2000, we will be creating "Field Teams" that will include the faculty coordinators of our revised teacher education programs, staff from the student teaching and early field experiences offices, supervisors of student teachers, and faculty and doctoral students with expertise in assessment. This plan has been made possible, in part, by the redesign of our field experience office and by the revision in the duties of the prospective head of that office. We have re-described that position so that the new head will carry the title of Assistant Dean. One of his or her primary duties will be to coordinate and take part in the work of the Field Teams. The activities of those teams will be multi-faceted, and will include:

- ★ meeting with P-12 teachers and administrators (initially, at the local and regional levels, and subsequently statewide) to provide written materials about our revised teacher education programs, and to continue conversations about our programs, and the implications they have for schools and teachers;
- ★ meeting with teachers and administrators to discuss our Unit Assessment System and to solicit feedback about the UAS;
- ★ meeting with student teaching and early field experience supervisors to discuss our assessment system, and to clarify the new roles supervisors will play in helping assess our students, as one way to generate evidence and data concerning the incorporation of content and developmental standards, and the INTASC Principles.

These conversations will continue through at least the 2001-2002 academic year, as we continue to implement our revised programs and describe how our UAS is designed to assess those programs. Throughout those conversations, we will encourage teachers, administrators, alumni, supervisors, and others, to suggest alternative ideas and strategies, ask questions, in an environment within which communication can be candid, ongoing, and consistent with our responsibilities to current and future educators and the State of Indiana.

Once those conversations and interactions have clarified our Unit Assessment System (including changes that are made to the UAS as a result of those conversations), we will begin to sponsor regular, public assessment activities. The locus for those activities will be both our individual programs, faculty, and students, and the collectivity that is the Teacher Education Program at IUB. Each program will be responsible for delivering annually an interpretive report of its evaluation activities and findings to the Associate Dean for Teacher Education. That report will reflect discussions at the program level, as they provide evidence that program commitments have been met or exceeded (fundamentally related to the six principles that constitute our conceptual framework, our central commitment to inquiry, the content and developmental standards of the IPSB, and the "internal" commitments of each program).

In addition, the Associate Dean for Teacher Education will be responsible for sponsoring an annual public forum on program quality. These forums will include all teacher education stakeholders, including alumni, P-12 teachers and administrators, faculty from within the School of Education and from other units of IUB, and supervisors of our field experiences. These

annual discussions will provide stakeholders with opportunities to provide input into, engage with, and learn from the results of our inquiry-based evaluation efforts. We will also assist stakeholders in their efforts to interpret our evidence of program quality according to their information needs and categories.

We will continue to reach out to the teacher education community (broadly defined) so that we can benefit from engaging, collegial, critical dialogues about our courses and programs, our conceptual framework and its meaning, and the quality of our courses, programs, instructors, and students.

2) *how our conceptual framework for teacher education incorporates the IPSB Standards;*

The contemporary effort to reconceptualize teacher education on the Bloomington campus began in January 1995. Faculty members, graduate students, undergraduates, P-12 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 should instead answer 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.

A series of open forums, School-wide retreats, small group discussions, and other events took place over the last several 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 revised 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).

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 II and III, 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 revised programs, and a timetable for that undertaking. At its meeting of February 13, 1996, the Teacher Education Council discussed the activities that had transpired 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. 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.

Following the development of our new conceptual framework, and its formal adoption by the Teacher Education Council, the process of designing revised programs became somewhat more decentralized, though each program was required to demonstrate to the Teacher Education Council how that license area incorporated our six principles. By the summer of 1997, all license areas had submitted documents that contained an outline for the design of revised program offerings. During the academic years 1997-98, 1998-99, and now 1999-2000, additional work has been undertaken by the teacher education community. We anticipate that all program designs will be completed and approved by the Teacher Education Council by the end of the fall semester of 2000.

Below we outline how the INTASC principles are incorporated into our conceptual framework. We also detail how the IPSB Standards have been incorporated into our first prospective revised program offering, a Middle Childhood program entitled, "Democracy, Diversity, and Social Justice." The first Education courses in that program will be inaugurated in the fall of 2000. The discussion of the guiding commitments of this program (its courses, field experiences, and perspectives), and its incorporation of INTASC principles and IPSB standards, will serve as an exemplar for all of our revised programs as they continue to be developed.

A. The INTASC Principles and the IUB Conceptual Framework

We provide here a description of how we have incorporated the 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 adoption of a new conceptual framework for teacher education at IUB by the Teacher Education Council, along with the program guidelines created and put into effect by the Council for the internal approval process, stipulate 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 which 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.

In addition, among the implications of our principle dealing with Intellectual, Personal, and Professional Growth (IUB principle three) is a requirement that our students 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 demand, 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 exist anything like self-contained structures that generate disciplinary knowledge that is authoritative; or that particular methodologies have generated forms of knowledge that are objective, certain, and beyond reproach. Such understandings are fundamentally important for the serious study of educational issues, curricular and pedagogical initiatives, and the assessment of teaching practices.

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 their students’, futures. 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 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 classes and in the P-12 classrooms in which they are placed-- 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 specifically. The necessity of developing active learning situations is also outlined in our discussion of Personalized Learning (IUB principle six), which encourages students to 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 themselves be 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
commitme
nt to
reflection,
critique,
and the
considerati
on 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
dimension
s 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 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 will be further encoded in the revised program designs that are coming to fruition- in large part because of the foundational nature of our revised framework.

Because our new conceptual framework is of necessity quite general, it provides, on the one hand, for the integration of both the “internal” commitments of teacher education stakeholders, and the INTASC principles. On the other hand, IUB has taken the position that the primary and most meaningful way to incorporate the substance of the IPSB content and developmental standards is through their incorporation into each of our specific, revised programs. The review and deliberations that take place through our Teacher Education Council will provide the initial assurance that those standards are integrated throughout teacher education, as revised programs are proposed and considered by the Council. Subsequent assessment forums, and other discussions with teacher education stakeholders, will provide additional opportunities for review and consideration of the ways in which content and developmental standards are woven into our courses and programs. Our Middle Childhood program, Democracy, Diversity, and Social Justice (DDSJ), provides an example of how we will incorporate IPSB standards content and developmental standards. This program, and the analysis provided below, serves as an exemplar for the other revised programs as they are being designed and ultimately approved.

DDSJ and the Incorporation of IPSB Standards

The courses and other requirements for this program include:

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	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.

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.

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 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).

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 enroll in 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.

IPSB Standard 4: Assessment: The teacher understands the importance of multiple assessments and uses a variety of developmentally appropriate assessments to improve student learning.

Some of the ideas contained in this Standard have already been discussed in this and previous sections of this report. Our assessment ideas and policies will govern our judgment of programs, faculty, and undergraduates, and 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 compromise 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 classroom teachers. 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 a variety of assessment strategies that are appropriate for their particular group of students.

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 (see Appendix I). 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 commitments 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.

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 field experiences 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 exist in elementary school classrooms in which they will be implementing materials and activities.

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 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.

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 critically reflect 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 an initial teaching license.

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 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 multiple influences on elementary 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 of how student differences related to culture, socio-economic status, gender, and disability 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; synthesize their ideas and experiences on a broad range of topics that synthesize the holistic understanding and commitments the student has developed; 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 elementary school 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 revised undergraduate program.

3) how the UAS includes a coherent, sequential assessment system for candidates that is performance-based

The development of a coherent, performance-based assessment practice will begin with the first Education courses in which our students are enrolled. Expectations regarding standards and performances will be conveyed to students in those courses, and will be amplified and made more detailed in their field experiences. The coherence of our Unit Assessment System will be supported by a) the conceptual framework that has been created and adopted at IUB; b) the adoption of the EAC's assessment plan by the Teacher Education Council, as it pertains to all of our programs; and c) the attention to public, critical, regular forums and meetings, at which program quality, student performance, and standards- and principle-based activities are

evaluated.

4) how we plan to use student assessment practices to document the quality of our programs, as they meet or exceed the IPSB Standards

The Unit Assessment System will focus on the activities and performances that our students develop both in their coursework and in the field experience and student teaching activities in which they are engaged. Our commitment to working with teachers, administrators, supervisors, and faculty, as outlined above, will guarantee that our students understand and meet or exceed the IPSB Standards. In addition, the annual assessment activities that will involve all teacher education stakeholders will assist in creating summative judgments about the quality of our students' classroom activities, their incorporation of IPSB Standards, and the commitments of the faculty involved in particular programs.

5) how we plan to incorporate assessments so that our conceptual framework may be reconsidered and revised

Since our conceptual framework has been internally generated (that is, created by the teacher education community), and because we have outlined a rigorous and ongoing assessment system that is aimed at intellectual depth, practical efficacy, and the creation of standards-based activities, the IUB programs will be more open than is typical to the reconsideration of, or changes in, our conceptual framework

6) how we propose to ensure that the UAS is continuously managed

Oversight of the UAS is being undertaken by the Associate Dean for Teacher Education. In addition, the person who is hired for the currently open position of Assistant Dean for Teacher Education will work with the Associate Dean to ensure that the stipulations included in the UAS are both understood and implemented. Issues and concerns that arise in this regard, as well as recommendations for new policies and procedures regarding the UAS, will be submitted initially to the Teacher Education Council. Records related to those issues will be submitted to the Office of Teacher Education, where the UAS will be managed. In conjunction with program coordinators and faculty, that Office (and in particular the Associate Dean and Assistant Dean) will ensure that the appropriate evidence and data are being collected and disseminated to the teacher education community. Those forms of evidence will be communicated to instructors in each of our programs, so that we can make sure that each of our programs, and the Teacher Education unit as a whole, is clear about the requirements for assessment, and so that needed alterations can be made in a timely way. Adjustments to the UAS will be discussed by the Teacher Education Council, and acted on by that group.

7) how we propose to review and consider revisions of the UAS

As indicated above, the review of our UAS will be an ongoing activity, in part because we see

assessment activities and conversations as themselves educative (for faculty, students, P-12 teachers, and other teacher education stakeholders). The Office of Teacher Education, and the Associate Dean for Teacher Education and, prospectively, the Assistant Dean for Teacher Education, will be responsible for discussing assessment data and, working with faculty members, for suggesting revisions in the UAS. Faculty coordinators of our revised programs will schedule regular meetings at which possible changes in our UAS can be made.

The annual assessment event discussed earlier will also provide additional opportunities for the teacher education community to consider revisions in the UAS. Those revisions will be data-driven, and will focus on our conceptual framework, the INTASC principles, and the content and developmental standards approved by the IPSB.

Appendix I

Stakeholder Involvement in Program Development and in the Assessment Process at IUB

The review, discussion, and approval of programs and courses, and of our Unit Assessment System, was initially undertaken by our Teacher Education Council (a representative group including IUB faculty in Education and other units of IUB, students, and P-12 teachers). In addition, the first of our revised programs that were discussed were greatly enhanced by the inclusion of a wide variety of P-12 teachers and administrators, as well as faculty and students. Those program efforts included:

I. Elementary Education: Democracy, Diversity, and Social Justice

The implementation of our Unit Assessment System must be considered within the comprehensive reform of teacher education, including our conceptual framework, that has been undertaken at IU over the last five years, as discussed above. An important component of these sets of standards for teacher education programs concerns the participation of various stakeholders in the development and monitoring of the program. As these programs are currently at differing stages of development it is difficult to offer details about how all programs will incorporate stakeholders' involvement, but we can refer here to work that has occurred in one program, Democracy, Diversity, and Social Justice (DDSJ). The faculty members developing this program have worked closely with P-12 educators and current students in designing the program. Since the assessment system to be used for our programs rests upon the foundation of the teacher education curriculum itself, the deliberations that occurred among IU faculty, P-12 teachers and administrators, and current IU students are relevant to the discussion of our assessment system. The kind and quality of collaboration that has occurred in conjunction with the DDSJ program will serve as a model for our other programs as they work with various stakeholders in developing and implementing a performance-based teacher assessment system.

Democracy, Diversity, and Social Justice is an undergraduate, elementary teacher education program that emphasizes the preparation of teachers for the highly diverse student population found in schools today. The program focuses on the development of inquiry and critical reflection and the capacity to promote democratic values as classroom teachers. Program courses are interdisciplinary, team taught, and offer students opportunities to participate and reflect on classroom practices. In conjunction with the emphasis on reflective practice, DDSJ has engaged in the development of a school partnership with Grandview Elementary School in the Monroe County Community School Corporation. Since the fall of 1997, DDSJ faculty members have met regularly with teachers and administrators at Grandview School to discuss the content of program courses and the field experiences that would accompany those courses. The following is a list of those who have represented IU and Grandview School in those meetings:
IUB:

Terrence Mason, Department of Curriculum and Instruction
James McLeskey, Department of Curriculum and Instruction

Mitzi Lewison, Department of Language Education
Landon Beyer, Associate Dean for Teacher Education
Fritz Lieber, Department of Counseling and Educational Psychology
Mary Lou Morton, Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Judy Lysaker, Department of Language Education

Grandview School:

Janice Combs, Principal
Sandy Bauer, Teacher
LuAnna Carmichael, Teacher
Carol Hill, Teacher
Sandy Lewis, Teacher
Susie Jones, Teacher
Michi McLaine, Teacher
Kathy VanderShans, Teacher
Debbie Wessel, Teacher

On several occasions we were joined in our meetings by IU student teachers who contributed their perspectives on the DDSJ program.

Since DDSJ was in its early stages of development when discussions began between IU faculty and Grandview teachers, the focus began with the nature of the curriculum, its goals and methods, and the roles that IU faculty and Grandview teachers would assume in carrying out the program. Since the intent was to establish a more collaborative approach to teacher education that would involve P-12 educators in the workings of the program, it seemed appropriate and useful to engage in dialogue about what kinds of experiences would be included in the DDSJ curriculum. Such issues as the role of teaching reading and the methods employed to do so, the content of the general education curriculum, and the importance of preparing future teachers to work with special needs students were among the topics covered in our initial discussions. While the Grandview teachers were interested in rethinking how teachers were prepared, they were also concerned about the extent of their involvement in working with pre-service teachers given their primary responsibility, the students in their own classes. They were also concerned about the congruence between the ideas and theories that pre-service teachers would encounter in the IU courses and the practices they would observe in Grandview classrooms. Over the course of our numerous meetings, these and other issues were raised and discussed in order to establish a basis for collaboration.

Within these discussions issues of assessment were also raised. For example, the Grandview teachers were interested in what kinds of checkpoints would be established for students and how they would be evaluated as they progressed through the program. They wanted to know what their role would be in that process of evaluation and what provisions would be made for "weak" students who were not making adequate progress in the program. As we continued to develop the DDSJ program, we incorporated plans for monitoring students through a variety of performance-based tasks associated with the courses and field experiences, and to regularly seek input from teachers in the partnership schools about the performance of our students in their

classrooms. Since the DDSJ program will be implemented in the fall of 2000, we have just begun to engage in a process of on-going, performance-based evaluation in collaboration with our partnership school colleagues as we anticipate the first cohort of students who will enter the program. As the other newly redesigned teacher education programs at IUB are implemented, they will have ongoing consultations with P-12 colleagues and former students in the ways that have been described here for the DDSJ program regarding their assessment practices.

II. Early Childhood Education

The Early Childhood Education program design process involved a variety of stakeholders. The ECE faculty strongly believed that the inclusion of members from a number of constituencies was crucial for the success of the revision process. These constituencies included teachers in local public schools and child care programs, current students and alumni of the program, and faculty members from both inside and outside the School of Education. Given our commitment to inclusiveness, the following individuals, along with the Early Childhood Education faculty (Cary Buzzelli, Judith Chafel, and Mary McMullen), formed the Early Childhood Curriculum Revision Committee, which included the following individuals:

Landon Beyer: Associate Dean for Teacher Education, IUB

Lisa Cutter: doctoral student in Curriculum Studies, and Associate Instructor, IUB

Amy Harsh: undergraduate student in Early Childhood Education Program, IUB

Jayne Jones: teacher in Brown County Schools and a graduate of the Early Childhood Education Program,

Kim Metcalf: Director of the Teacher Education Laboratory at IUB

Judith Olmsted, Teacher (multi age class, 6-9 year-olds) Monroe County Community School Corporation,

Ray Smith: Assistant Dean of Faculties and Director of Instructional Support Services at Indiana University.

The committee held its first meeting in September of 1995. The committee met regularly every four to six weeks during the 1995-1996 academic year. Minutes of selected meetings are attached. By May of 1996, the committee had prepared its Interim Report as requested by the Teacher Education Council (TEC) of the School of Education. The Interim Report was reviewed by members of the TEC who then sent comments to the Early Childhood Revision Committee. Based upon comments from the TEC, the Early Childhood Revision continued revision of the undergraduate program. The final report containing the revised curriculum was sent to the TEC for its approval in March of 1997. The first group of Early Childhood Education students to enroll in the new program will be sophomores, who will register for courses that will begin in the fall of 2000.

Appendix II

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 III

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.

SECTION III.
ANNUAL REPORT - IUPUI
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION