

School of Education at IUPUI Plan for Institutional Assessment System

Background

The changes underway in teacher assessment and licensure have been likened to the difference between a snapshot and a movie. Under Indiana's present system, teacher candidates are evaluated by a one-time snapshot that compares the candidate's transcript and standardized test scores to an established checklist. Under the reforms promulgated by the IPSB, the assessment of teacher candidates will be on-going and will incorporate more and more dynamic measures of teacher development.

If we borrow the assessment-as-movie simile, then this report begins well into the showing of the main feature: since 1990, the faculty of the Indiana University School of Education at IUPUI has been systematically engaged in the assessment and redesign of the basic teacher education program. The first students were admitted to the new "Learning to Teach/Teaching to Learn" (LT/TL) program in Fall 1994. Several features of LT/TL anticipated the current work on performance assessment and program evaluation. These features are briefly reviewed below to set the stage for the present discussion of a unit assessment system.

The LT/TL program is delivered by a teaching team of 3-5 faculty who jointly plan and deliver a block of program content. Students enroll for the equivalent of a full time load (12-15 cr hrs); however, courses and field experiences are scheduled in an integrated block so that students devote only 2 full days to university work thereby preserving some flexibility of schedule associated with part-time enrollment.

Cohorts of 20-25 students are based in a professional development school (PDS) site and complete the four semesters of professional education course work together; most students also complete student teaching at the PDS site.

The design of LT/TL includes provision for an "evaluation week" at the end of each semester. During evaluation week, all faculty on the teaching team meet together to review the work and status of students in the cohort. This "evaluation week" takes place during the traditional finals week; the semester schedule for LT/TL is moved up a week to create the time for the teaching team to engage in extended dialogue about cohort students and review student work.

Since its inception, program evaluation has been part of the teacher education reform at IUPUI. In 1994, the Executive Associate Dean appointed an Evaluation Committee to be responsible for the evaluation of the LT/TL cohort program. The initial membership of the Committee included the campus Vice Chancellor for Planning and Institutional Improvement and faculty with expertise in assessment and/or direct involvement with teacher education. While there has been some fluctuation in membership (as function of sabbatical leaves, competing

professional commitments, and the like), the Evaluation Committee has remained remarkably stable. It continues to meet monthly .

In 1994, members of the Evaluation Committee developed an instrument to assess performance during Student Teaching that was grounded in the INTASC standards. That instrument has been used by faculty, clinical faculty, and cooperating professionals in the LT/TL as well as by a sample university supervisors in the traditional program. The instrument will be revised and introduced to a larger group of stakeholders.

In addition to instrument development and field testing, the Evaluation Committee has gathered, summarized, interpreted, and presented three years of data from the LT/TL program (Cohort 1 for the 1994-1996 and Cohort 2 for 1995-96) including comparative data from a sample of peers in the traditional teacher education program. This report is included as Attachment A. A complete summary of data from Cohort 2 (1995-97) is in progress.

About 25% of IUPUI's teacher education candidates enroll in LT/TL. Though IUPUI faculty and P-12 colleagues continue to refine LT/TL, this fall they will begin concentrated work on restructuring the "traditional program" to emulate the cohort experience, improve content and sequencing, and more closely integrate course work with field experience in a new group of PDS sites.

The establishment of a Professional Development Coordinating Council (PDS/CC) in 1995 institutionalized IUPUI's commitment to share responsibility for the preparation of future educators with our P-12 colleagues. The primary agenda of PDS/CC meetings during the past two years have been to orient representatives to INTASC standards, to the changes underway in state licensure, to reconceptualize the assessment of student teaching by orienting to INTASC framework, and to begin to build consensus around performance assessment and other best practices in curriculum, instruction, and assessment.

In the summer of 1996, IUPUI offered a formal 3-credit hour course for cooperating teachers to introduce them to the conceptual framework for our teacher education program as well as to a range of best practices in curriculum, instruction, and assessment. The elective course complements the 3 hour orientation that is required all cooperating teachers.

Since Fall 1996, the Chair of the Evaluation Committee has met with each LT/TL cohort at the start of each semester to orient them to INTASC standards and the instrument that will be used to assess performance during student teaching .

The present plan for the development of a comprehensive unit assessment system is anchored in this on-going commitment to program reform and improvement, and will draw upon instruments and protocols that have been developed as part of the LT/TL evaluation work.

Plan to Develop the Unit Assessment System

In June 1997, membership of the Evaluation Committee was expanded to include the Directors of Student Services and Student Teaching/Field Experience, and its mission extended to include planning for comprehensive evaluation of all Education degree programs offered at IUPUI including the development of the unit assessment system for programs that lead to licensure. As a result of these changes, 1997-98 will be a year of transition for the Evaluation Committee. The Committee's original focus on formative assessment of a *new teacher education program* (with particular attention to its acceptability to various stakeholders) gives way to concern for the assessment of individual students who complete *various degree or licensure programs*.

The Committee's work for the next three years is outlined below. For each year, a primary focus, guiding questions, and key activities are identified. We expect the Evaluation Committee to elaborate these activities adding detail about time lines and assigning responsibilities to particular faculty/staff.

[Please note that we expect to collect, summarize, analyze, distribute and discuss evaluation data from LT/TL Cohorts 3-5 at the same time the unit assessment system is expanded; however, for the sake of simplicity, the particulars of that continuing work are not included below. The pattern of this activity will follow the current time lines, e.g., present Cohort 2 summary this Fall & Cohort 3 summary next Fall.]

AY 1997-98

Focus:

Complete the planning for performance-based assessment and extend consensus-building activities around the Indiana content/developmental standards, the programs' conceptual frameworks, and the university's general education principles to stakeholders beyond those involved with LT/TL.

Guiding questions:

- What is the complete list of questions we want our institutional assessment/program evaluation to address? In addition to performance assessment, what other forms of evaluation/what other information (e.g., cost, satisfaction, self-efficacy) is important to the School of Education at IUPUI?
- When and how will work on the assessment plan be completed? Who will be responsible for the unit assessment system and on-going program evaluation? What resources are necessary and how will they be identified? How will responsibilities for various component activities be assigned and monitored?

- How will we build consensus among all stakeholders? Who will represent various stakeholder groups?
- How will we expand from a focus on LT/TL to include all teacher education candidates? How and when will we expand the assessment to include all students in advanced programs?
- How will we coordinate work on the unit assessment system with the work of the Program Review & Assessment Committee (PRAC) at IUPUI? How will we incorporate assessment of the general education principles adopted by IUPUI?
- How do we orient potential Education majors to changes in program expectations and in the larger profession?
- What are our expectations of teacher education applicants? What information do we want to gather from applicants? Who will evaluate these materials? when? against what criteria? What, if any, exceptions will we make for applicants from traditionally under represented groups? for candidates with disabilities? How can applicants appeal admissions decisions? How will we handle upper division transfer students?
- Does the application process result in a diverse and qualified pool of teacher education candidates? What changes in the application process seem appropriate after pilot implementation during 1997-98?

1997-98 Activities

Continue regular meetings of Evaluation Committee

Continue meetings of the Professional Development Coordinating Council (3 x year)

Schedule extended time when all faculty are available to collaborate on program development and assessment activities (September 26, March 30-April 3, & May 11-12)

Draft description of portfolio tasks

Revise evaluation plan and time lines

Plan and conduct sessions to orient stakeholders (beyond those involved with LT/TL) to the standards-based program framework & performance assessment. Relevant stakeholder groups include at least:

Academic advisors in University College

Academic advisors in Education Student Services

SOE faculty

SOE part-time instructors
Liberal Arts & Science faculty
University supervisors
Principals and building administrators in PDS sites
Cooperating teachers

- Plan and conduct sessions to orient students to standards-based program framework & performance assessment
- Promulgate new requirement for formal application to teacher education
- Field test new application process during 1997-98 for Fall 1998 matriculants
- Review LT/TL syllabi to determine accuracy/fidelity of original mapping of semester blocks to INTASC standards (Who=Teaching Teams for Cohort 3 & 4)
- Review part-time/traditional program syllabi to determine congruence with INTASC standards (Who=TE faculty, part-time instructors)
- Align Counseling/Counselor Education program with CACREP standards (Who=C/CE faculty, part-time instructors, field-based colleagues)
- Align master's & certification programs in Ed Leadership programs with draft professional framework (Who=Ed Leadership faculty, part-time instructors)
- Draft protocol for application to/recommendation for student teaching
- Conduct focus groups with graduates of Cohorts 1 & 2
- Review membership on Evaluation Committee and make adjustments as necessary

AY 1998-99

Focus:

Refine and pilot performance assessment instruments

Guiding Questions:

What evidence about students' knowledge/dispositions/skills do we want to collect as vis-a-vis each INTASC standard? In light of the INTASC framework, what are our priorities for beginning teachers & for educators in advanced programs?

What evidence comes directly from teacher candidates themselves? from IUPUI faculty? from cooperating professionals? from P-12 students and their parents/families?

When will we collect this evidence? How will we keep track of student evidence/work over time?

How will we aggregate performance data across students to inform decisions about programs & program quality? How will we aggregate data for individuals to make judgments about each student in our programs?

When and how will we develop rubrics/scoring systems to evaluate the evidence? Who will evaluate which pieces of evidence? How do we balance considerations of progress with expectations for a particular level of performance? What, if any, accommodations will we make for candidates from traditionally under represented groups? for candidates with disabilities?

How and when is the performance assessment data organized and made available to students? to program faculty? to university supervisors? to cooperating professionals?

What will we do with students who are not up to expectations? How will individual student problems be identified and handled?

What evidence do we expect from candidates to qualify them for a student teaching placement? When will this evidence be collected and evaluated? by whom? How will we handle applicants to are not up to expectations?

What other opportunities will students have to provide direct feedback to our programs?

What opportunities will employers have to provide direct feedback to our programs?

How will we provide faculty development related to the assessment plan and its implementation?

1998-99 Activities

Plan and conduct sessions to orient continuing stakeholders to portfolio tasks and scoring rubrics

Plan and conduct sessions to orient newcomers (new faculty, new part-time faculty, new PDS staff, etc.) to the standards-based program framework & performance assessment.

Design data, tracking, summary and reporting systems

Field test protocol for application to/recommendation for student teaching with applicants from traditional program

Review Indiana content and developmental standards and adjust curriculum and assessment instruments as necessary/appropriate

Draft evaluation design, including a master calendar of what data is collected when, and how it is summarized and reported back to programs

Review membership on Evaluation Committee and make adjustments as necessary

AY 1999-00

Focus:

Extend field testing and finalize evaluation design and implementation plan

Guiding Questions:

- What supports do unit faculty need in order to enable their participation in the unit assessment system? How will their contributions and participation be recognized?
- What do part-time faculty need in order to support their full participation in the unit assessment plan? Do all current part-time instructors have the knowledge, dispositions, & skills consistent with program framework? How do we provide professional development to effect change and what do we do if there is not adequate change?
- How will we inform faculty, P-12 collaborators, and other stakeholders about the new Indiana content and developmental standards as they become available?
- How will we support the continued professional development of P-12 colleagues?
- How will we inform others (faculty in Liberal Arts and Science; potential teacher education applicants; University College advisors; campus administrators) about changes in program organization and state licensure?
- How will we ensure that a shared vision is maintained over time and across inevitable changes in personnel at IUPUI, in the SOE, and in P-12 sites?
- How will we ensure that program revisions are sensitive to other relevant information (beyond performance assessment data; e.g. graduates' satisfaction, manpower statistics)?

1999-2000 Activities

- . Plan and conduct sessions to orient newcomers (new faculty, new part-time faculty, new PDS staff, etc.) to the standards-based program framework & performance assessment and to portfolio tasks and scoring rubrics
- . Revise timelines
- . Revise instruments and scoring protocols
- . Review and reappoint all part-time faculty in light of conceptual framework and program expectations
- . Review membership on Evaluation Committee and make adjustments as necessary

AY 2000-01

Focus:

Guiding Questions:

2000-01 Activities