

**School of Education**  
**2002 IPSB UAS Report**

**Indiana University**  
**at**  
**Indianapolis**

**June 20, 2002**

PART II: Indiana University School of Education  
Indianapolis

Unit Assessment System 2002 Report

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

- Over time, different individuals representing different stakeholders have been involved in program development and assessment. Several different formats and forums have been used to organize and support that involvement.
- Within the School of Education, the Evaluation Committee has had sustained responsibility for developing the UAS.
- During 1999-2000, there was considerable effort to increase the informed involvement of colleagues in the Schools of Liberal Arts and Science in teacher education. Two factors in particular focused attention on the general education of future teachers: (1) the Standards-based Teacher Education Project "STEP" which operates under the aegis of ACE and AACTE; and (2) IU President Myles Brand's "21<sup>st</sup> Century Teachers" initiative. STEP provided modest funding to support collaboration around several topics related to the UAS (e.g., admission to Teacher Education, university attention to P-12 standards, alignment of secondary majors to the new IPSB license framework, Liberal Arts and Science faculty involvement in student teaching and scoring Block IV Portfolio). The core campus "21<sup>st</sup> Century Teachers" initiative explored both the content and pedagogy of courses offered by Arts and Science faculty that would prepare future teachers to support diverse learners to meet high standards. Teams representing IUPUI attended both the STEP conference in Washington D.C. in June and the Regional Conference on Teacher Quality sponsored by the USDOE in Denver in July.
- During 1999-2001, "Council of Teacher Education" was created to serve as a forum for collaboration of education, arts and science, and P-12 practitioners in teacher education. The Council provides a broader audience for the reports of the UAS and serve as a vehicle to coordinate the various campus and university initiatives that involve teacher education.
- During 2000-2001, the Council on Teacher Education continued to meet on a bi-monthly basis. A subcommittee on internal communications was formed to strengthen the lines of communications between the School of Education and other schools across the campus and to provide a forum for addressing procedural and logistical issues originating in other schools.
- During 2001-2002, the Council on Teacher Education continued to meet. Additional meetings with content area departments were held to develop standard-based programs.

Funding to continue the collaboration during Summer 2002 was provided by the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Teacher Project. Stakeholders from departments throughout the university and from PDS partnership schools participated in Assessment Days at semester end. Student feedback was obtained in the form of surveys and data from Town Meetings.

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

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

· The IUPUI "Principles of Teacher Education" (PTE) provide the conceptual framework for the Learning to Teach/Teaching to Learn programs. We have shown how INTASC principles relate to the Principles of Teacher Education as well as the campus Principles of Undergraduate Learning. Linkages between the IPSB developmental and content standards and our Principles of Teacher Education had been mapped. Content area faculty have worked with the School of Education to map content area courses to the Indiana K-12 Academic Standards.

· We continue to devote time at faculty retreats & faculty meetings, and convene regular curriculum/assessment workdays (3-5 per year) to address content and developmental standards for programs offered at IUPUI. During their next visit, BOE will find matrices showing the relationship between course blocks in our teacher education programs and the Principles of Teacher Education, content and developmental (setting) standards, INTASC standards, K-12 Academic Standards and assessment.

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

· The INTASAC standards are distributed as part of regular orientation/recruitment meetings offered by academic advisors.

· At a formal induction after admission to Teacher Education, an expanded version of the INTASC statements of knowledge, disposition, and skills expected of beginning teachers and the IUPUI "Principles of Teacher Education" distributed/discussed.

- We have links from the SOE home page to the INTASC principles, and to the IPSB framework & content and developmental standards documents.
- A schematic of the UAS at IUPUI identifying decision points, and the type of information used to make decisions related both to individual candidates and to the overall program has been developed. The plan details when each assessment will be piloted and fully implemented. Plans exist for how the data will be used for programmatic change.
- We have modified the general script for the “induction to teacher education” to introduce the evolving UAS. Students admitted to Teacher Education since Fall 99 have been involved in a pilot of various processes, assessment activities, and rubrics that are under development.
- We have encouraged faculty to incorporate explicit reference to the PTE in syllabi for each course/block of courses. PTE and INTASC principles are posted on a shared drive of the School of Education server so that all faculty/instructors can simply cut-and-paste relevant sections into syllabi. Faculty also refer to the standards in their responses to student work.
- During Fall 2001, a representative sample of elementary and secondary student teachers were involved in a student teaching portfolio pilot project. The portfolios will be used to develop rubrics to assess student teaching portfolios in the future.
- Training has occurred as faculty, advisors, supervisors, P-12 teachers/administrators have participated in the development of instruments or protocols during curriculum/assessment workdays.
- An orientation and training in use of the “IUPUI Framework” (1998), which is completed during the student teaching semester, is now incorporated into the standard Student Teaching Orientation sessions.
- Each summer, we offer a graduate course for mentor teachers or university supervisors orienting them to the “Framework” and other elements of standards- and performance-based teacher education.
- Faculty from the School of Science, School of Liberal Arts, and the School of Education meet with high school teachers to review the secondary Block II rubric and student teaching portfolios.
- We debrief with teachers/faculty after the assessment to gather feedback to improve the instrument and/or the assessment process. Over time, some cooperating professionals and some faculty may be involved in entire series of rubrics; other P-12 collaborators (and perhaps other faculty) will be called upon to employ only a subset of the rubrics.
- During fall 2001, we held an orientation for mentor teachers at PDS and partner school sites to the Block I assessment and the Block II performance tasks. If the interns at a school site will be completing Block I, then cooperating professionals at that site (as well

as instructional faculty who teach in Block I) will be introduced to the Block I rubric. If interns are completing Block II, the PDS teachers and faculty teaching in Block II will receive training on the Block II Performance Task.

- We have experience with several rounds of decisions using the updated Admission to Teacher Education process and we have developed a standard report format to summarize that information (e.g., number of applicants, number admitted/denied, reasons for denial, etc.)
- We are experimenting with different formats for providing feedback to students, such as face-to-face meetings with single faculty members, members of a teaching team, or with written summaries. Different formats seem likely for different decision points.
- A compressive student database is being developed to support the UAS, and map the process/logistics of implementation. Data from the elementary Block I assessment was entered into the database at the end of the Spring 2002 semester.
- We are in the process of aggregating data from a group of candidates from entering classes.
- Once rubrics are finalized, we will conduct small-scale studies to establish the reliability and validity of each rubric. Though these studies have not yet been designed, we anticipate that they will involve independent review of student performance by faculty and mentor teachers who are not familiar with the students (but who are familiar with the program expectations and standards), by faculty from academic departments in Arts and Sciences (for candidates seeking secondary education licensure), as well as by teacher education faculty from other institutions. Candidates' performance on Praxis II, feedback from building supervisors, and graduates' status on the induction portfolio will also be used.
- At the Fall 2002 visit, BOE will find (a) that performance tasks, rubrics, and the student teaching assessment instrument "IUPUI Framework" have been revised; (b) standard formats for summarizing data for cohorts of candidates at each decision point in the UAS; (c) clear descriptions of how candidates are provided feedback about their performance at each decision point; and (d) a schematic of how assessment data will be used for programmatic changes and (e) plans for validation studies.

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

- Elements of Criterion 4 are being addressed as we work with a contractor to design a comprehensive student data system to support the UAS. (see below 6.B: Description of Implementation").
- At the next visit, the BOE will find summary data from graduates who matriculated in Fall 1999, standard summary report formats for each decision point in the Unit

Assessment System, and records of meetings where summaries of candidate performance are shared and discussed.

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

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

#### Spring 1999:

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

#### December 1999:

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

#### Spring 2000:

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

#### May 2000:

- Faculty responsible for the math methods component of Block II were responsible for introducing the task to students, and as a consequence, the tasks and interviews all focused on mathematical concepts and understanding. The faculty all read 6 anchor papers and applied the rubric. The resulting conversation was fascinating: the math educators focused on the interns understanding of the math while other faculty addressed other aspects of the interview. After a day’s work with the task we decided: (a) to add another 3 hrs of mathematic education to the program, (b) specifically focus the Block II assessment on mathematics so that we ensure interns have the knowledge to support children’s learning, (c) to build a portfolio task for student teaching that focuses on

literacy development so that we ensure that candidates are strong in both numeracy and literacy, and (d) to ensure that (for candidates focusing on early childhood or middle childhood) any/all performance tasks are reviewed by teams comprising faculty with different subject matter expertise.

Fall 2000:

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

Fall 2001:

- Results from piloting the Block II assessment has resulted in the addition of a second mathematics method course to the elementary and early childhood program beginning in the fall of 2002.
- A similar assessment task was piloted at the end of Block II of the secondary program during the Spring 2001 semester. School of Education and content area faculty scored the task. Results of the pilot project and student feedback resulted in the modification of the task to better address the secondary program. The revised task will be piloted again during the Fall 2001 semester. We expect to review summaries of candidate data with scoring teams at the end of each semester, and with both the Evaluation Committee and the Teacher Education Council annually.
- At the Fall 2002 visit the BOE will find (a) a schematics for how the collective data will be used to make program improvements and (b) a process for reviewing the data and using it for programmatic change.

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

- The UAS remains the responsibility of the Evaluation Committee (7 faculty and staff). The Associate Dean oversees the entire process.
- We began to introduce elements of the UAS in Spring 1998: students who intended to matriculate Fall 1999 were the first required to complete a formal application for admission on the Worldwide Web.
- These initial experiences lead us (a) to make adjustments to the schedule and management of application materials for students applying for admission Spring 2000 and (b) to develop additional informational materials describing program changes.
- With the Fall 99 matriculants, we began to build new management systems, and to plan for a unified student database to support the UAS.
- Managing data for IUPUI's large and complex Teacher Education program does require a powerful data infrastructure. Assessing the entire program will require tracking multiple decisions for a large group of interns over an extended time period (4-7 semesters depending on full vs. part-time enrollment).

- Over the past year, a small design team of faculty/staff from the School of Education has worked with Custom Computer Applications (CCA) to define our needs and outline the parameters of a data management system. In July, we received a detailed proposal to develop a Microsoft Access-based application that would manage data from the UAS and interface with other campus databases. Work with relevant faculty and staff began in September. The goal is to have a prototype of the data system ready by December so that we can begin to determine the logistics of entering data from block assessments of candidates.
- We have experience managing the UAS for an entire “class” as well as multiple experiences with the use of Block 1 and Block 2 procedures and rubrics. In December, we will be in a position to test the logistics of simultaneously applying the Block I and Block II rubrics to students at different points in the program.
- Description of how the UAS links to the wider institutional assessment plans:  
  
IUPUI’s Program Review and Assessment Committee (PRAC) which reports to the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Institutional Improvement is the principle vehicle for coordinating assessment initiatives.

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

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

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

- We have developed a process for assessing the assessment system that incorporated a self-study completed for PRAC as well as the feedback from accreditation visits. The system will be reviewed on a five-year cycle.

ADDENDUM to the Report:  
Planned Licensing Areas

Rules 2001 Standards

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

**Elementary License**

Preparation to teach kindergarten through sixth grade

Developmental Standards: *Early Childhood* and *Middle Childhood*

School Settings: *Elementary: Primary* and *Elementary: Intermediate*

Content Standards: *Generalist: Early & Middle Childhood*

**Elementary/Middle School License (Starting Fall 2003)**

Preparation to teach third grade through eighth grade

Developmental Standards: *Middle Childhood, and Early Adolescence*

School Settings: *Elementary: Intermediate, and Middle School/Junior High School*

Content Standards: *Generalist: Middle Childhood, Generalist: Early Adolescence, and two of the following: Language Arts, Social Studies, Science, Mathematics*

**The Middle School/High School Content Area License**

Preparation to teach sixth through twelfth grades in a particular content area

Developmental Standards: *Early Adolescence* and *Adolescence/Young Adult*

School Setting: *Middle School/ Junior High School* and *High School*

Content Standards: *Language Arts, Social Studies, Science, Mathematics, or Foreign Language*

**All -Grades License**

Preparation to teach kindergarten through twelfth grades

Developmental Standards: *Early Childhood, Middle Childhood, Early Adolescence, and Adolescence/Young Adult*

School Settings: *Elementary: Primary, Elementary: Intermediate, Middle School/ Junior High School, and High School*

Content Standards: *Visual Arts or Physical Education*

**Dual Licensure Programs:**

Students may complete any of the following dual programs in conjunction with one of the licensure programs listed above. The developmental standards and school setting of the license will be the same as the partner license.

**Adaptive Physical Education**

Preparation for Physical Education majors to teach adaptive physical education

Content Standard: *Adaptive Physical Education*

**Computer Education Dual License**

Preparation to teach computer education

Content Standard: *Computer Education*

**English as a New Language (ENL) Dual License**

Preparation to teach children whose first language is not English

Content Standard: *English as a New Language*

**Exceptional Needs Dual License**

Preparation to teach children with special needs

Content Standard: *Exceptional Needs*

**Health Dual License**

Preparation for Physical Education majors to teach health education

Content Standard: *Health Education*

**Reading Dual License**

Provides extra expertise in the teaching of reading

Content Standard: *Reading*

The School of Education at Indianapolis also offers programs at the graduate level that lead to the following licenses:

School Services (Counselor)

Building Level Administrator

District Level Administrator

Attachments

- A: Schematic of Unit Assessment System (UAS)
- B. Plan for Use of Individual Benchmark Data
- C. Plan for Evaluating Unit Assessment Systems
- D. Plan for Programmatic Changes Based on Data
- E. Table of Data for Programmatic Changes
- F. Assessment Plan for Unit Assessment System