

**Report to the
National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education
and the
Indiana Professional Standards Board**

Continuing Accreditation Report

**Indiana University
School of Education
Bloomington/Indianapolis**

April , 1997

Table of Contents

Section I. Overview of the Institution

A. Institutional and Campus Missions.....	1
B. Regional Campuses.....	3
C. Indication of Programs Not Within the Scope of Review	3
D. Other Information	4

Section II. Summary of Changes and New Initiatives

A. Indiana University -- Bloomington	
1. Category I. Design of Professional Education	5
2. Category II. Candidates in Professional Education	12
3. Category III Professional Education Faculty	15
4. Category IV The Unit for Professional Education	17
B. Indiana University Purdue University -- Indianapolis	
1. Category I Design of Professional Education	18
2. Category II Candidates in Professional Education.....	21
3. Category III Professional Education Faculty	23
4. Category IV The Unit for Professional Education	25

Section III. Future Directions

A. Indiana University Purdue University -- Indianapolis.....	26
B. Indiana University -- Bloomington.....	26

Section I. Overview of the Institution

A. Institutional and Campus Missions

This report details the missions, goals, and educational activities of the School of Education at Indiana University. Readers can only understand this report by first understanding the unique organizational context for the School of Education. Within the organizational structure of the eight campuses of Indiana University, the School of Education is a core campus school. The core campus refers to the two main campuses of the University - Bloomington and Indianapolis. When our faculty meet for deliberative purposes it includes faculty from both campuses. Organizationally, there is one University Dean for the School of Education and one executive associate dean for each the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses. The trustees and president of the Indiana University system establish mission and broad overarching goals for all campuses. Within this broad set of goals, the location, attributes of the faculty, characteristics of enrolled students, and campus facilities influence the unique programs and activities of each campus.

In addition, it is difficult to understand the dynamic relationship between Bloomington and Indianapolis without further explanation. The Bloomington campus of the School of Education is part of the original flagship campus of the University. The traditional graduate programs associated with the arts and sciences are located in Bloomington. The city of Bloomington is smaller and less diverse in comparison to the major metropolitan city of Indianapolis. The Indianapolis campus, consistent with its urban location and adjacent to the government offices of the state capital, includes more programs with a strong professional emphasis. Indeed, the name of the Indianapolis campus is Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis (IUPUI) because engineering and technology programs affiliated with Purdue are offered at Indianapolis. The campus, however, is administered by Indiana University. Both campuses are large, complex research institutions, together they enroll more than 55,000 students.

Because of the shared mission and goals of the two campuses of the School of Education there are many commonalities between our initial and advanced programs. However, as a result of being located in different settings and having different histories, there are also differences. It will be evident in this document that each campus has, in consultation with each other, developed diverse programs for preparing undergraduate teachers. Both campuses have large, more 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 curriculum in areas like school administration and school psychology are identical. Graduate program faculty use distance education facilities or drive between the two campuses to provide high quality advanced programs.

Finally, it is also important to note that within the core campus structure, there is a third location for core campus offerings. Indiana University Purdue University Columbus is a location where students may take coursework leading to a Bachelor's Degree from IUPUI. While not all courses can be completed at IUPUC, the vast majority of them are available. The IUPUI School of Education exercises administrative oversight regarding the courses and the employment of faculty who teach professional courses. At this time, a task force is completing a major report regarding quality control issues in the absence of on-site full-time faculty. It is expected that the report will be completed in March, 1997 (IN/IV.A.1). It is within this context that the mission and goals of the University and the School of Education are next examined.

In December 1995, President Myles Brand released a new planning document entitled "The Strategic

Directions Charter,” which was developed over a period of one year by a team of 250 faculty, staff, students, and friends of the university. The “Strategic Directions Charter” notes that for research universities, and the academic units which comprise them, excellence is always in a dynamic state. The document provides the most recent iteration of the mission and vision which will shape Indiana University in the coming years. The foci of the Charter include: **The Community of Learning, The Responsibilities of Excellence, and Accountability and Best Practices.** The full articulation of the mission and goals outlined in the Charter are available (BL/ IV.A.1). The Charter conveys that Indiana University is one university, consisting of multiple campuses (8) with distinctive but complementary missions. We believe that it is only together that the distinctive missions of the varied campuses enable the university to serve effectively the state and the nation.

All planning in the School of Education is based upon the mission, goals and priorities of Indiana University. Planning is an ongoing, iterative process in the School of Education. It includes formal institutionalized planning documents like the long-range plan that a standing committee of the faculty Policy Council regularly updates (BL/ IV.A.2). The core campus School of Education frequently creates task forces to deal with important new concerns and policy issues which could influence the academic programs or fiscal health of the School. Both Bloomington and Indianapolis have other formal and ad hoc committees and groups that develop policy. However, any recommendations that have important long term policy implications must be approved by the Policy Council or other relevant faculty governance mechanisms.

IUPUI is an urban research university created as a partnership between IU and Purdue Universities in 1969. IUPUI offers the most comprehensive range of academic programs of any campus in Indiana and is the state’s principal site for graduate professional education. The campus is distinct in its commitment to interdisciplinary teaching and learning, and to collaboration among academic units and community institutions.

The campus enrolls over 27,000 students who represent the “new majority”-- those students who enter college as adults rather than directly from high school, who postpone college because of family responsibilities, or who return to campus to make a career change. Students at IUPUI are more likely to be first generation college goers, to be minority, to be less affluent, and to attend part-time more than their counterparts at IUB.

The School of Education is one of 18 academic units at IUPUI. In 1996, Education had the largest student headcount of any School; it ranks fifth in total credit hours, reflecting the fact that many students attend part-time. IUPUI ranks fourth in the production of new teachers for the state of Indiana and serves a large population of education professionals for license renewal and professional development work.

Situated on an 1800-acre campus in the rolling, wooded hills of south central Indiana, Indiana University Bloomington enrolled 34,700 students in the fall of 1996 and generated nearly 450,000 credit hours. Founded in 1820, Indiana University Bloomington is the flagship institution for the Indiana University system and offers 13 associate degree programs, 95 bachelor degree programs, and 214 advanced degree programs.

The School of Education at IU Bloomington is located in the Wright Education Building, a facility built in 1992 that offers the latest in technological facilities for instruction, training, and research. All academic programs are housed in this facility, which also includes the Center for Excellence in Education, a model facility for the application of technology to instruction and to educational support services. The School of Education has 105 faculty members and offers undergraduate teacher certification and graduate (M.S., Ed.D., and Ph.D.) programs in five academic departments: Counseling & Educational Psychology, Curriculum & Instruction, Educational Leadership & Policy Studies, Instructional Systems Technology, and Language

Education. Over 1700 undergraduate students and 500 graduate students are enrolled in degree programs offered by the School of Education at IUB.

The School of Education is one of 10 primary academic units on the Bloomington campus and has the third largest operating budget of these units, nearly \$15 million. The School of Education also ranks third in the number of credit hours generated on the Bloomington campus, approximately 29,000, during 1996-97.

B. Regional Campuses

As previously noted, Indiana University is proud to include six regional campuses in its family and among its community of scholars. Each campus has much autonomy in defining its own distinctive approach to serving its population of clients. Each has its own Chancellor and most have a Dean of the school or division of education. In most matters, the campuses are autonomous. There is a coordinating body, the Education Council, which brings together faculty, students, and administrators to discuss educational issues of University-wide interest. This group meets quarterly and rotates its meetings among the campuses. Most recently, distance technologies have been used to link the campuses for some of these meetings.

There is a different and somewhat unique arrangement between the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses. There is one University Dean of Education who provides oversight and leadership for both campuses. Then, at each campus there is an Executive Associate Dean who provides the day-to-day operational leadership and administration. This arrangement has become known as the "Core Campus" School of Education. This administrative and programmatic arrangement has been in place since 1974. There are many advantages to this organizational plan since faculty may teach on either campus (even though their tenure is campus specific), academic programs can be similar if desired (undergraduate programs are mostly campus specific while advanced programs are generally truly core campus and very similar or the same in structure), both campuses operate under one accreditation and one faculty governance body (the Policy Council). Yet, at the same time the two campuses have designed unique approaches in their development of initial programs for teacher preparation. The advanced programs tend to be more common in their structure and in their academic programs of study. For example, the core campus program in school administration, while administered from the Bloomington campus, shares faculty and has a common program. The school counseling program operates in a similar manner. Over the years this administrative arrangement has served a useful and mutually beneficial purpose.

C. Programs Not Within the Scope of this Review.

The unit operates a number of programs which are not within the State/NCATE scope of review since they are not designed for the preparation of school based personnel. These programs include all Ph.D. and Ed.D. programs except those in school administration and school psychology. All Ed.S. programs except School Administration are excluded from the scope of the review. At the Master's level, all degrees in Instructional Systems Technology, Educational Psychology, and non-school based programs in Curriculum and Instruction, Language Education, and Educational Leadership and Policy Studies are excluded from the review. However, the team is welcome to meet with faculty from these areas to discuss any area(s) of research interest or to seek general information about the program in interest. The 1997-99 *Graduate Bulletin* describes these programs in depth. Even though these programs are not within the scope of the accreditation visit, they are housed in the unit and administered by unit department heads and by the Deans of the School of Education.

D. Other Information.

In Section II, the IUB responses are provided for Categories I - IV and then the responses for IUPUI follow. In Section III, the IUPUI responses are listed first followed by the IUB comments.

All document citations in this Report follow the same format. Material that can be placed in hanging files is identified first by campus (BL/IN), then by Category and Standard, and finally by the numerical order in which they are cited. All documents may be found by first determining the Category (the colored boxes) and then by Standard within the Category files. Larger and/or common documents, such as catalogs, are noted by name and will be in an identifiable location and shelved in the Documents Room.

Section II. Summary of Changes and New Initiatives Indiana University Bloomington

CATEGORY I. DESIGN OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

The School of Education has changed significantly since the Joint State/NCATE initial accreditation visit in 1990. At that time, we had just welcomed a new University Dean of Education, we were in the final stages of completing a “new” building for the School at IUB, and we had a teacher education program which had not experienced significant changes in the recent past. As an initial effort at reorganizing teacher education, the University Dean convened Task Forces on Teacher Education Reform on both the IUB and IUPUI campuses. While the final Task Force Reports differed dramatically in their approaches, each of them served to initiate changes. For example, at IUB a revised governance structure was recommended and subsequently implemented as were recommendations to strengthen the Teacher Education Unit itself. Another IUB recommendation suggested that an Associate Dean for Teacher Education position be created, and this has now been accomplished. At IUPUI, the Task Force recommendations initiated immediate program reform activities and discussions. These are just a few of the significant changes which occurred in the core campus School of Education.

Early in the process of the reform discussions at IUB, it became clear that the Knowledge Base Model (Reflective Practitioner) previously adopted by the School should be studied further. Thus, for over 24 months, the School of Education at IUB has been actively and collectively engaged in the process of discussing and articulating a new conceptual framework for teacher education. A preliminary effort to reconsider the conceptual framework for teacher education at IUB was undertaken in the early portion of 1995. A retreat entitled, “Clarifying Current Teacher Education Programs: A Working (On-site) Retreat,” took place on January 20 and 21 of that year (see BL/ I.A.1). That retreat proved valuable in identifying apparent redundancies, overlaps, and gaps in existing courses, programs, and standards; and in beginning the process of considering a new conceptual framework for teacher education.

Coincident with that retreat, a Teacher Education Steering Committee (TESC) was assembled through the Office of Teacher Education that began the conversations necessary to articulate a new conceptual framework (see BL/ I.A.2). The TESC included members who represented the faculty and associate instructors within the School of Education, faculty from other units of IUB, undergraduate students, and public school teachers and administrators. In the end, 28 people constituted the TESC, which met for the first time on the morning of the first day of the January, 1995 retreat.

During the spring semester of 1995, the TESC members read articles, essays, and book chapters dealing with the history of teacher education, alternative models for and approaches to teacher education, and ways of thinking about educational change (see BL/ I.A.3). Members also wrote, individually and collectively, position papers, summaries, and possible outlines for new directions that could be discussed by the entire committee (see BL/ I.A.4, “What Do We Want in Our Teacher Education Programs?”). While there were, of course, different emphases or concerns raised during these discussions, over time a consensus developed that resulted in the articulation of six principles that the members of the TESC thought might provide a new conceptual framework for teacher education. These principles included:

- ① COMMUNITY
- ② C CRITICAL REFLECTION
- ③ INTELLECTUAL, PERSONAL, AND PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

- ④ MEANINGFUL EXPERIENCES
- ⑤ KNOWLEDGE AND MULTIPLE FORMS OF UNDERSTANDING
- ⑥ PERSONALIZED LEARNING

The February 10, 1996 retreat, "Teacher Education: A New Beginning at Indiana University" provided an opportunity to make clear, and collectively discuss, the implications of our new conceptual framework for teacher education. More concretely, the retreat was important because it allowed the participants to outline what that framework meant for making concrete changes in programs. Combining twelve months of hard, sustained work on the part of the members of the TESC, the active collaboration of literally scores of others inside and outside the School of Education, and a process that was and remained open to all, we were at a point to recreate teacher education at IUB.

This retreat represented a major step by all members of the teacher education community to collectively take ownership of its professional identity, and to chart a course of action that would best serve current and future students. Our conceptual framework for teacher education is also one that will help improve the quality of teaching in the public schools who are our partners.

At its meeting of February 13, 1996, the Teacher Education Council discussed the retreat and reviewed the six principles that had been discussed there. After a relatively brief discussion, the Council unanimously voted to adopt the six principles as the conceptual framework for teacher education. At the next meeting of the Council, on March 7, 1996, the members considered a set of guidelines for interim reports from each license area. After some discussion, the Council unanimously adopted a set of guidelines which were sent to all faculty members and associate instructors in the School of Education (BL/ I.A.5). The Council also decided at that meeting that interim reports reflecting progress toward implementing the conceptual framework would be submitted to the Council by May 13, 1996, with final reports due by January 13, 1997.

License area groups met during the remainder of the spring, 1996 semester, to consider creating new programs and/or making revisions in current ones that would be consistent with our conceptual framework. The Council reviewed each of the interim reports that was submitted, and provided written feedback to the license area coordinator (see BL/ I.A.6).

License area discussions continued through the fall, 1996 semester, and into January, 1997. By January 23, 1997 five program areas had submitted either proposals for new programs (Early Childhood Education and a new elementary education program, "Democracy, Diversity, and Social Justice") or plans to revise continuing programs so that they would be consistent with our conceptual framework (Community of Teachers, Elementary Certification Graduate Program, and Art Education). A number of other reform groups (Elementary Education, Secondary Education, Teacher As Decision Maker, Middle School Education, Special Education, and a new secondary education program option, "Inquiry and Social Justice") requested additional time to complete their program reform efforts. At its meeting on January 23, 1997, the Teacher Education Council approved extending the final due dates for these reports to April 1, 1997.

Several important changes and innovations have taken place in teacher education at IUB, all of which are related to the creation and implementation of a new conceptual framework: new programs are in the process of being invented; a new spirit of collegiality and community is in evidence; there has been, and continues to be, hard, sustained, thoughtful work on the part of almost everyone involved in undergraduate education. While the process is ongoing, and will obviously take additional months to conclude, there is ample evidence that there exists a written, articulate, collectively developed, and shared conceptual framework for teacher education. That framework expresses the will of the teacher education community, makes clear our direction

and commitments in teacher education, and has already resulted in a clear, unambiguous relationship between the commitments and principles embodied in our conceptual framework and the courses, experiences, and standards that comprise teacher education at IUB.

A Draft (December 1996) Conceptual Framework for Advanced Programs in the IUB School of Education. Teacher education has been a part of the historical mission of Indiana University since it was chartered in the early 1800s. Over the years the mission of Indiana University School of Education (SOE) has expanded or broadened dramatically to include the preparation of a wide variety of professional educators as well as to prepare professionals in educationally related fields. Students in advanced programs in the School of Education have been prepared to serve as change agents who seek solutions to problems which affect schooling and the needs of the clients they serve. Likewise, advanced programs of educator preparation focus on the development of reflective professional practice. Finally, just as teaching, research, and service are among the basic tenets in the life of a university professor, we expect our advanced program graduates to model appropriate levels of scholarly inquiry.

Thus, our faculty concluded that our collective and collaborative efforts should be focused upon developing professionals who model **Reflective Practice, Facilitation of Change, and Scholarly Inquiry**. All advanced programs include these guiding principles among the coursework in which graduate students enroll and within the field work which advanced students experience.

The School of Education in its quest for preparing educators for the 21st century is constantly reminded and keenly aware of the change forces which affect its programs, curriculum, instructional strategies, diversity and the need to prepare professionals who have the ability to adapt easily and naturally to changes in their environment. Therefore, the faculty recognize its responsibility to prepare all advanced students to serve as **facilitators of change**. Our graduates must view change as a normal and expected part of their work, even a part of their professional life. Graduates of advanced programs must be prepared to provide leadership for change within their professional positions.

As our advanced students and graduates continue their professional careers in teaching, student services, and in administration, we strive to prepare them to become problem solvers of difficult school - related problems through **reflective thinking and practice**. Key writers emphasize that action is an essential aspect of the reflective process. Thus, the unit prides itself in providing well-planned practica, internships, and other field experiences which are key to the development of reflective thinking and practice.

Finally, as a research University, it should be no surprise that our faculty have included **scholarly inquiry** as one of the foci of advanced programs. Therefore, our students are prepared to assume leadership roles in solving educational and social problems within their professional environments. It is our belief that the acquisition of knowledge and professional development in a research oriented environment provides the best forum and climate for students to experience scholarly inquiry and research and collaborate with faculty who are involved with their own scholarly endeavors.

Integrative Studies. While integration of knowledge acquired through general education courses, content specialization, and the professional/pedagogical program occurs throughout the initial teacher education curriculum, it is a major focus in methods courses and field experiences. These courses teach lesson planning, peer teaching, and the production of teacher-developed activities such as independent projects, learning centers, and manipulatives. A broadly based, required general education program includes specific courses from the humanities, life and physical sciences, the social sciences and fine arts. In some parts of the program, a cluster approach to scheduling and curriculum content insures that candidates see conceptual

relationships as they design learning experiences. Techniques for content integration are modeled by instructors throughout the teacher education program.

Each subject and licensing area has a well-defined program of discipline-based content and both professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. Candidates in the elementary program on the Bloomington campus are required to have a content area of specialization as well as the broad general education requirements. Both Elementary and Secondary candidates have carefully designed courses of study drawn from the College of Arts and Sciences. In concert with these content requirements, education courses support and extend the content through learning experiences that make the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the disciplines more meaningful to the role of a professional teacher.

Early field experiences are an integral part of at least four courses in the teacher education curriculum. These provide opportunities for students to observe and practice the blending of pedagogical knowledge and skills with content areas, the use of tools of inquiry to advance student learning, and the structuring of lessons, including content and pedagogical skills, that are meaningful for all students.

Teacher education candidates come to Indiana University from nearly every state in the Union and from nations throughout the world. In any one class, instructors may have students from Africa, southeast Asia, Europe, and Latin America as well as from urban Indianapolis, suburban Chicago, and rural Indiana. Along with their varied places of birth, candidates come with varied experiences, exceptionalities, and cultural backgrounds. Diversity and multiculturalism are integrated throughout the teacher education program and emphasized specifically in E300 and M300, Teaching in a Pluralistic Society. Required courses taken by teacher candidates explore a variety of cultural and diversity issues while themes of race, gender, socioeconomic status, and other exceptionalities are part of courses such as P465 (Childhood Socialization), H340 (Education and American Culture), and K205 (Introduction to Exceptional Children). Finally, the student teaching experience provides opportunities for candidates to teach in culturally diverse settings. Currently, candidates are student teaching in inner-city schools, suburban and small town schools, and rural schools throughout Indiana and in several other states. Moreover, over 100 candidates are currently participating in the Cultural Options program. More than 40 students are enrolled in the American Indian Reservation Student Teaching Project and more than 60 are student teaching in the Overseas Student Teaching Project, which includes England, Wales, Scotland, Ireland, Australia, New Zealand, and India.

Quality of Instruction. There is nothing more important than maintaining high expectations for the teaching practices of our faculty and associate instructors, and articulating and maintaining high expectations for our students. A variety of approaches to teaching are in evidence in the School of Education, as might be expected especially at a research university. By design, all of our classes-- with only 2 exceptions-- are relatively small, containing typically 25-30 students. That environment allows instructors to initiate a variety of classroom configurations, including whole class discussions, cooperative learning, field trips to schools and other institutions, and student projects and activities. Examples of these and other pedagogical practices can be seen in the syllabi for our courses (see BL/ I.G.1).

A particular emphasis currently exists on the need to facilitate students' critical thinking abilities. One of the six principles that constitutes our conceptual framework for teacher education, noted above, is Critical Reflection. That element of our conceptual framework ensures that students will learn to think and observe critically in our courses. The extensive use of both field experiences and laboratory activities in our program supports this emphasis on reflection and its integration with practical work in classrooms.

Each course in teacher education is evaluated by the students enrolled, reviewed by the Teacher Education Office, and then forwarded to the instructor for his or her examination and reflection. Many instructors

solicit additional, narrative feedback from students both during, and at the end of, the semester. In the case of associate instructors, the results of those evaluations are shared with the appropriate program coordinator(s). For faculty members, student evaluations of courses play a major role in our annual merit review process.

Technology plays an ever increasing role in the teacher education program. We provide micro-teaching labs for students so that they can observe and practice good teaching without always traveling to schools. In our classes students use the latest equipment and educational software. Additionally, several funded projects in the School incorporate technology in the development of new teaching practices.

In January of 1997, the Associate Dean for Teacher Education convened a meeting of all undergraduate program coordinators to consider the question of the level of intellectual engagement and academic rigor inherent in teacher education, and the standards instructors employ regarding student activities and assignments. This meeting was held not because anyone perceived there to be a significant problem in this regard, but because such questions need to be continuously considered by all those involved in teacher education. The meeting itself was lively and productive, with all who attended noting its importance. It was decided that each coordinator would meet in the next month to discuss these questions with their faculty members and associate instructors, and that a subsequent meeting, scheduled for March 3, 1997 would be held for all coordinators. These activities and discussions document our commitment to rigorous standards and high quality teaching.

Advanced Programs. In this section we focus on the advanced programs that are relevant to the NCATE and state review processes. By their nature, it is impossible to talk broadly about the focus of and changes in advanced programs. Each advanced program is responsive to changes in state licensure, to changes in their respective fields, and to the unique strengths of the faculty. Some advanced programs in the School of Education have not undergone the dramatic changes evident in the undergraduate programs at both IUPUI and Bloomington. Other programs, such as school administration, has made dramatic changes since the last NCATE visit. This section examines advanced programs that fall within the purview of NCATE. This includes the following programs: all school administration options, school psychology, school counselor, art education, elementary education, secondary education, social studies education, special education, language education, speech pathology and audiology, and both school media education options.

Each of our advanced programs have collaborative relationships with relevant external educational groups such as state and regional associations of school administrators and school psychologists. Graduate students enrolled in advanced programs are required to enroll in internship and practica courses that also provide direct linkages for students and faculty to the world of practicing professionals.

Because of the research mission of Indiana University, advanced programs on the core campus have a strong emphasis on research and evaluation. In addition, the program faculty focus on the latest ideas and practices relevant to the respective programs. There is an ethic of service to students, teachers, and the communities of the state and nation that is emphasized in all advanced programs. Of course, there is an emphasis on assessment and accountability in all advanced programs. Program faculty also give attention to the skills and abilities of all incoming students and all graduating students. The students we admit and graduate are the best indicators of the quality of our advanced programs. In preparation for this review, all coordinators of advanced programs have reviewed their curricula and the standards.

Professional Community. As noted already, the enhancement of community is central to the mission of teacher education, comprising one of the six principles that constitute our conceptual framework. As discussed above, all of the people with a stake in teacher education have been involved in our effort to

reconceptualize teacher education and design new and revised programs. Faculty members continue to develop, and be involved in, partnership relationships with local schools. The Elementary Certification Graduate Program has also developed a partnership relationship with Lakeview Elementary School (one of the MCCSC schools recently put on probation by the Indiana Department of Education), and is committed to working with teachers there in the area of mathematics especially. Collaborative research projects with local schools have also been initiated through funding from the School's Research Institute on Teacher Education (see BL/ I.I.1). Other efforts include external grant proposals, for example, in collaboration with Broadview Elementary School and the School of Education.

In conjunction with our reform effort, and consistent with our collective commitment to inquiry in the program, more recent efforts to develop enhanced forms of professional community have included discussions with two area principals (one working at an elementary school, the other at a secondary school) to develop more intensive, on-going partnerships with the School of Education. Such partnerships are also central to several new teacher education program designs that have been developed (see especially in this regard the Early Childhood Education program proposal, and the proposal from the elementary education program, "Democracy, Diversity, and Social Justice").

Because of the distinctive focus of each of our advanced programs, the resulting intentional communities are also diverse. Furthermore, they are different on each campus. For example, on the Bloomington campus, the school administration program is a cohort program. Part-time students from the Indianapolis area and around the state participate in classes that are alternately offered in intensive weekend formats held in Bloomington and via interactive television. The intensive weekend courses are intended to create communities among each new student cohort. Practicing administrators are guest lecturers, students are required to do internships, and some class projects require students to engage in projects related to their jobs. In this way the program creates an expanded sense of professional community. Another example of professional community is evident in the advanced programs in school psychology at Bloomington. These students are typically full-time graduate students. The faculty have students work carefully with local public schools. Through the Institute for Child Study, students do practica on these schools. This collaboration has been so successful that at least one school considers this relationship integral to the range of educational services it provides.

We continue to have written, formal agreements with area schools concerning student teaching and early field experience placements. We also receive regular and systematic feedback from the teachers and schools with whom we work. At the same time, we have cooperatively developed concise informational booklets outlining the purpose of those experiences, which we share with our school-based colleagues (BL/ I.H.1).

Assessment and Evaluation. Issues and alternatives regarding assessment principles and practices have been widely discussed as a part of our efforts to reconceptualize and redesign programs. Indeed, a plan for assessment is one of the specific areas that must be addressed in the final reports for new or revised programs (see BL/ I.D.1, "Guidelines for License Area Final Reports Regarding New or Revised Teacher Education Programs"). The discussions that continue have been fueled in part by the movement toward performance assessment through the adoption of the INTASC Principles by the Indiana Professional Standards Board, as well as by a general desire on the part of faculty in the School of Education to think more broadly about assessment and evaluation. Further, the range of domains that are pertinent in these discussions is quite large, including: criteria for admission and retention in teacher education; how we assess students in courses and in field experience and student teaching placements; how we evaluate the quality of teaching in our courses; the level of intellectual rigor that is required in all of our courses and programs; and how we evaluate the effectiveness of each program are relative to the aims and purposes of those programs.

It is hoped that a written document will result from the discussions concerning academic rigor noted above.

This process will provide a set of guidelines for all teacher education programs. That document and, more importantly, the continuing discussions within and across program areas will result in a rigorous, cohesive, appropriately demanding set of standards for the quality of student work.

In addition, the School of Education has developed an assessment committee that will consider new ways to assess all phases of both the graduate and undergraduate curriculum and related experiences. That committee, which will begin its work during the spring 1997 semester, will provide a starting point for thorough-going conversations about assessment that will be continued with all our constituents. Like the effort to reconceptualize teacher education generally, our efforts in redesigning assessment activities will be thorough and even visionary.

The core campus School of Education has a long tradition of high quality advanced programs. Masters theses, doctoral qualifying exams and doctoral dissertations are a traditional form of assessment in advanced programs. Another indicator is the various rankings of graduate programs in education. For the past two decades, the School of Education has been ranked among the top twenty schools of education in the United States. Some studies have placed the School among the top five or six. Several studies have ranked individual programs among the top five programs (BL/I.F.1). However, these indicators are not sufficient.

Just as we have directed our energies toward improving undergraduate teacher education, we are equally committed to enhancing our advanced programs. In 1997-98 we will begin a three-year process of reviewing all graduate programs. The Associate Dean for Graduate Studies has already circulated a self-study questionnaire. Each department will identify a group of external experts to conduct rigorous formative evaluations of its graduate programs. This will be a two and half year process that will involve self-assessment by program faculty, students, alumni, and an external peer review. Our goal is to strengthen our programs and identify important needs where they exist. The process should be completed by 1999-2000.

CATEGORY II. CANDIDATES IN PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

The unit has been successful in recruiting candidates who demonstrate potential for success as prospective teachers and support service workers. Even though the grade point average for admission to the Teacher Education Program (TEP) is generally higher than that for admission to other units, the number of candidates in initial programs continues to increase. In 1990 at IUB, there were 2,071 candidates admitted to the TEP and in the Fall 1996 semester there were 2,330. This represents an increase over a six year period of 12 percent. The Fall 1996 semester credit hour generation has grown to about 29,000 hours of credit which is the largest since 1973.

In 1991, there were 1,574 candidates seeking a B.S. Degree from the School of Education and an additional 497 enrolled in other units on campus who were seeking licensure. In 1996, there were 1,764 candidates seeking their initial degree and license and an additional 558 seeking licenses only. The increase in licensure students may be attributed in part to the fact that all social studies majors must complete their Bachelor's degrees through the College of Arts and Sciences.

Enrollment in graduate programs reflects a change of preference at the doctorate level from the Ed.D. to the Ph.D. As a result, the number of students reflected on typical enrollment reports do not show this trend since Ph.D. students are counted in enrollment figures for the Graduate School. During the Fall 1996 semester, there were 592 Masters level students, 29 pursuing the Ed.D., and 486 students seeking the Ph.D. from the Graduate School.

Once candidates are enrolled in degree programs within the unit, the retention rate is very high. The net retention rate for all students in the School in initial license programs is 88 percent. This rate exceeds that of the campus for sophomores by five percentage points (83 percent). For juniors, the campus retention rate and that of the unit is identical (both 88 percent). However, the unit's retention rate jumps dramatically ahead of the campus' for seniors. It exceeds the campus rate by 19 percentage points (84 percent to 65 percent). Even though the rates are reasonably high, the unit has created a new service called the Student Support Team to work with students identified as not making acceptable academic progress. It is hoped that the Team's efforts will improve the retention rate even further.

We also want to make note of our efforts to enroll undergraduate and graduate students of color. Currently 7.9 percent (140) of all undergraduate teacher education majors are students of color. This is above the campus average and suggests that some of our efforts have been successful. Nevertheless, much remains to be accomplished. Any efforts will require close coordination with the Office of Undergraduate Admission. Unlike graduate programs, most undergraduates enter colleges and universities because of their overall attraction to the campus and not because of individual programs. At the graduate level, our proportion of students of color has slowly but steadily risen. In 1990-91, 24 minority graduate students were enrolled in the School of Education. In 1996-97, 58 students of color were enrolled. This is a 59 percent increase. Additionally, there were 313 graduate students in the School who represented a wide range of racial, cultural, and ethnic diversity among the student body. During the same time period the total number of FTE graduate students has declined slightly which makes this increase all the more impressive. The state of Indiana population reflects a 7.8 percent population of persons of color.

During the 1993-94 academic year, the IUB School of Education embarked on an aggressive program to increase the diversity of its graduate student population through the recruitment and support of minority students in its more highly regarded graduate programs. There is, within the national academic community, an acknowledged need for minority higher education administrators. In each of the past three years, the

School of Education has earmarked \$40,000 of its reserves for a program to train minority candidates for administrative roles in higher education and in counseling psychology (2 years at \$20,000 each), routinely programs with highly qualified candidates. In the past year, this initiative was expanded to all areas of graduate study. Specifically, the programs would recruit a cohort of candidates of color who were to be admitted to graduate programs. The earmarked funds are typically leveraged with other resources to provide financial support for those candidates. With matched contributions from the campus, the size of the cohorts now range from 5 to 8 per year. Matching support for fellowships in the College Student Personnel Program was provided through the Research and University Graduate School (RUGS). The minority fellowship program has affected the overall diversity of the graduate student population in the Higher Education program. Candidates of color enrolled in graduate programs now constitute more than just those supported under the fellowship program. The School intends to continue this initiative.

We have participated in numerous campus activities designed to enhance the diversity of the unit's undergraduate student body. For example, during the Fall 1996 semester there were 58 students of color who received financial assistance from the Minority Teacher Scholarship Fund provided by the state of Indiana. The total amount of money distributed for the Fall semester was approximately \$28,000. Although we do not have the figures, additional funding of an equal or greater amount is expected for the Spring 1997 semester. Another effort of the unit involved locating a donor who provided on-going funding to create a professional position for a Coordinator of Diversity and International Programs (BL/ II.B.1). Finally, the unit's Policy Council created a standing committee called the Diversity Committee to assist in the enhancement of programs, activities, and services related to further development of a diverse student body. The Committee was assigned the task of combining the plans for all efforts for diversity enhancement into one written document(BL/ II.B.2).

The IUB School of Education will continue its commitment to expanding access to undergraduate and graduate students. It is difficult for the College of Arts and Sciences or any professional school to act alone to increase enrollments from under represented groups. In most instances, undergraduate students select campuses first and then programs. However, the School is undertaking two important efforts. With the assistance of funds provided from the Strategic Directions Charter internal grant competition, the School of Education is undertaking two initiatives to reach out to African American and Latino students. The Bilingual Teacher Education Program is a new academic program for undergraduate education students to prepare teachers who can instruct in both Spanish and English. Again, a key element of this program is the use of interactive audio-video technology for the delivery of classes and for meetings of program participants. Similarly, Project Team has also been funded to recruit more African American high school students from the State of Indiana. This project works directly with high schools and future teacher organizations to encourage more African American students to aspire to teach. An indirect benefit, we hope, will be that many of these students will subsequently enroll at Indiana University. Both initiatives are supported by School of Education and university funds.

The IUB School of Education also works closely with Project Student Exploratory Teaching (SET) sponsored by the State Department of Education. This program provides state scholarships for students of color attending public institutions who plan to enter the field of teaching. We identify candidates and actively recruit them. In 1996-97, the Bloomington School of Education enrolled more first-year SET students than any other public institution.

Effective with the Fall 96 semester, new freshmen have been given the opportunity to sign-up for a new program called GradPact. As a GradPact enrollee, the student is committed to meeting outlined conditions and benchmarks under a four year or 128 credit hour degree completion plan. Indiana University will pay the

remaining tuition for any courses still required for graduation should the student satisfy all GradPact benchmarks and conditions. Some of the general guidelines for students are that they must declare their intended major early, check their progress regularly with an academic advisor, use the IU computerized degree audit system (IU Care), course wait list, and raincheck systems, and remain in good standing in the School. There were 119 declared education majors among the Fall 96 freshmen who enrolled in the option (about 30 percent of those eligible).

Another service provided candidates during the past year is the availability of a Student Support Team, mentioned above. The team is headed by an advanced graduate student experienced in counseling psychology and an experienced elementary teacher. In its third semester of operation, preliminary data indicate that the Team is helping students in academic difficulty succeed in their studies and thus the retention rate of the School is improved as well (BL/ II.C.1).

The Student Services Office continues to assist students with a range of activities and programs. Since 1990, the number of academic advisors available to assist initial level students with their advising needs has increased from 2.5 FTE to 6.5 FTE. This has required substantial budgetary commitment from the School. Additionally, faculty advisors serve majors in all science fields, mathematics, visual arts, and in most specialty programs (BL/ II.C.2). Advanced programs assign new students their faculty advisor upon admission to their programs. Advisors schedule regular appointments with students, handle walk-in students on selected days, and sponsor an E-Mail system for students to use called "Ask an Advisor." Additionally, an increasingly large amount of information is now available on the World Wide Web and easily accessible by all students 24 hours a day. All IU students have direct and easy access to a wide range of computer-based resources including individual E-Mail accounts.

The Career Services area within the Student Services Office continues to provide employment assistance for students, alumni, and employers and usually assists over 2,000 registrants annually. A new computerized registration system was installed during the Fall semester. Called Resume Expert for Educators, it permits the user to register electronically with the Office and helps registrants design virtually an unlimited number of unique resumes. Staff members assist candidates in their employment activities through individual appointments, group seminars, and academic classes. One example of a new addition to the range of services for registrants is a seminar designed to help candidates for employment prepare employment portfolios. In early 1997, all job vacancies will become available on the World Wide Web for registrants actively seeking employment and who are mobile (BL/ II.C.3). The success of candidates with their job search is described in the *Annual Report of Supply and Demand for Educational Personnel* (BL/ II.C.4). Over the past ten years, IUB education graduates have been very successful in the job market as evidenced by placement rates ranging from a low of 76 to a high of 86 percent.

Students are monitored each semester to ensure that they are making acceptable academic progress toward the completion of their academic major. The Retention Policy (BL/ II.C.5) of the unit describes the process in detail. Prior to being recommended for licensure, all candidates must satisfactorily complete all course, program, and degree requirements including satisfactory performance in student teaching. Additionally, all students must achieve a qualifying score on the Praxis II assessments of basic skills and a subject specialty exam(s) prior to being recommended for licensure (BL/ II.D.1). The results of these assessments clearly document the high quality of students completing their program of study at Indiana University.

CATEGORY III. PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION FACULTY

At IUB, there are 120 full-time faculty using the definition supplied by NCATE. In reality, there are 105 full-time faculty in the School of Education. However, for purposes of this report, we will use the NCATE definition. In terms of gender, there are 45 female faculty members and 75 males on the faculty. More than 40% of our faculty are newly hired since 1990. Almost all of these new faculty teach both undergraduate and graduate level courses. Their early socialization and teaching commitments offer evidence of our efforts to simultaneously emphasize undergraduate and graduate education. In 1984-85, 80% of the faculty were male. In 1996-97, 62% of the faculty are male. Of the forty-two faculty hired since 1990-91, 52% were women. Our efforts to increase our ethnic diversity reveal a similar pattern. In 1984-85, four faculty members were ethnic minorities. In 1996-97, twelve are ethnic minorities. In terms of racial/ethnic origin, there are two Asian/Pacific Islander faculty members, one American Indian, three African American faculty members, five Hispanic faculty members, one from a non-listed group, and 108 White faculty members. Continued emphasis is placed on recruitment of a more diverse faculty and all faculty search reports must include a section which details the efforts and results in recruiting persons of color. There are ten part-time professional education faculty who work full-time in the institution and of these four are female and six are males. Two of the ten part-time faculty are of Asian descent. There are 57 part-time faculty members employed largely for supervising student teachers and other intern. These individuals are based off-campus and come to campus for regular professional development sessions and for meetings with student teachers. Of the 57 faculty, one is an African American and the remainder White. In terms of gender, 35 are female while 22 are male (BL/ III.B.1).

We are particularly proud of the associate instructors (AIs) who assist faculty with their teaching responsibilities. There are 104 graduate teaching assistants appointed in professional education and 68 of them are female while 36 are male. In terms of their racial/ethnic origin backgrounds, eight are Asian, five are African American, four are Hispanic, 84 are White, and three are from non-listed groups. AIs are generally assigned to teach three classes per year if they are appointed full-time. In terms of professional development opportunities, the Office of Teacher Education has increased its offerings for Associate Instructors, who now take part in four activities during the school year, and are encouraged to take part in additional, university-wide professional development activities. At the departmental level, another three-credit course has been developed for associate instructors in the Department of Counseling and Educational Psychology. This new offering joins a similar course which has been taught for several years in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction. Where possible, efforts are made to provide support for prospective associate instructors before they teach their first course, so they may observe other instructors in their area and spend time creating syllabi, activities, and so on, before they actually have their own classroom. Beyond those formal courses and experiences, associate instructors meet regularly with faculty program coordinators, and are supervised regularly by a faculty member in that program area.

As a result of enrollment growth and careful attention to faculty teaching loads, the School of Education has steadily increased its productivity. All faculty, regardless of their grant activity, and all academic administrators are required to teach at least one class each year (BL/ III.C.1). Faculty must cover at least 40% of their salaries with grants or contracts before they receive **any** released time from teaching. Except in rare instances, no released time is given for undergraduate or graduate program coordination activities. However, the newly appointed elementary and secondary program coordinators each receive a one course reduction in their teaching assignments per year. These figures have not yet been computed for 1996-97, but in 1995-96, the average teaching load for an FTE faculty member was slightly more than four classes per academic year.

The School of Education devotes substantial resources to faculty development (BL/ III.D.1). Our primary

focus is upon new, untenured, faculty, but a broad set of support systems is in place for all faculty. New faculty are provided with \$2,000 in professional development funds at the time of their appointment. These funds can be used for professional travel, to hire students to assist with research, to acquire educational materials and software, and so forth. In addition, all new faculty are provided with a total of \$500 in travel funds each year until they receive tenure. The School releases all new faculty from one of their two courses during their first semester of teaching. Also, we provide generous funding for the computer and related technology needs of all new faculty. All new faculty members are assigned mentors by their respective departments. In addition the Dean of Faculties Office for the entire campus sponsors an extensive array of workshops and summer fellowships primarily for new faculty. Finally, we require that all new faculty have an annual meeting with their department chairs to discuss their professional development and progress toward tenure and promotion.

Besides these programs for new faculty, a wide variety of professional development and support services are available to all faculty. The School hosts a full-time staff member to assist faculty with instructional and pedagogical development. This office assists an individual faculty member with course development, integrating new technology into their teaching, and works on an individual consulting basis with faculty who wish to improve their teaching. All tenured faculty are eligible for a sabbatical once each seven years. All tenured faculty are also allocated \$300 per year for professional travel. Additional funds are available from the Office of the Dean of the School of Education and from the Chancellor of the Bloomington campus for international travel. It would not be unusual for a faculty member to receive funding from both offices for travel to an important international conference. In addition, both the School of Education and a variety of offices at the campus level sponsor competitions for small grants to support faculty development for teaching and research.

CATEGORY IV. THE UNIT FOR PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

During the Fall semester 1992, the core campus School of Education engaged in discussions which resulted in the generation of a document called the *Report on Productivity and Enhancement: Core Campus School of Education (BL/ IV.A.1)*. This document reflected on the School's current status and accomplishments and established a set of priorities upon which future budgetary planning could progress. The *Report* has been augmented by the Schools's long-range planning process and conforms to efforts currently underway at the university level in response to *The Strategic Directions Charter*.

The unit has adequate resources to support teaching and scholarship by the faculty. In 1991, the budget for professional education was \$12,236,617 and of this amount \$8,384,821 was devoted to teacher education programs. In 1996, the total budget was 14,962,282 and of this amount \$13,446,571 was committed to teacher education programs. This means that of the total unit's budget, 90 percent was dedicated to initial and advanced programs for the preparation of educational personnel. In addition to the budgeted funds, in 1996 faculty were successful in receiving \$5,600,000 in external funding from grants and project proposals.

The unit is housed in a facility which opened in 1992 and provided much needed space to permit all academic units to be together for the first time, provided facilities for technology which are state-of-the-art, provided classrooms, conference rooms, and offices for both staff and faculty. The facility is now considered home to the School of Education, the Center for Excellence in Education, and the Education Library. A significant portion of the funding for this facility was dedicated to the creation of a national demonstration center for the use of technology in education. Technology has quickly become a hallmark of the teaching and research agenda of many faculty. In 1992-93, four courses were offered using interactive audio-video technology. In 1996-97, nineteen interactive distance education courses will be offered. In addition, eight web-based courses will be offered. The School of Education now has one graduate program that can only be offered because of its use of technology as part of a cohort experience. Through this program it is possible for some of the most talented educational administrators in the state of Indiana to earn a doctoral degree. This program is a model for other programs within and outside of the School of Education. The building and its facilities provide a significant competitive advantage in our efforts to attract high quality students, outstanding faculty, and grants. We have committed ourselves to the admittedly high costs of maintaining and upgrading the equipment and related facilities.

The Education Library is a state-of-the-art facility which occupies about 19,000 net square feet, has seating for 281, including 62 study carrels wired with network connections for portable computers. There are also five videocassette recorders and four laser disk players with monitors. Thirty-four public computer workstations are available to access the Libraries catalog, databases, and other electronic resources. There are four photocopiers in the facility. With over 80 operating hours per week, over 250,000 people use the education library annually. There are over 80,000 bound volumes in six print collections including teaching materials and resources to aid in planning instruction, K-12 textbooks for all subjects and grade levels, journals, research monographs, reference materials, and over 17,000 children's literature titles generally found in school media centers and libraries. There are over 500,000 documents on microfiche from ERIC clearinghouses. Additionally, there are about 400 current periodical subscriptions for publications and a non-print collection of over 16,000 items. These and many other electronic resources are also available to staff, faculty, and students from offices, residence halls, and from off-campus housing units. The budget for the Education Library is about \$99,305 with about half for periodicals and half for the print collection. Additionally, the School of Education committed about \$6,000 for Library expenditures and another \$28,900 for computer software.

Section II. Summary of Changes and New Initiatives (contd) **Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis**

At IUPUI, the most dramatic changes since the last joint BOE visit are reflected in two categories of standards: the design of the professional education program (especially the initial teacher certification program) and the professional education faculty.

CATEGORY I. DESIGN OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

Beginning with the appointment of a Task Force on Teacher Education in the Fall of 1990, IUPUI has been heavily involved in re-designing its initial teacher preparation program. The Task Force included representatives from the metropolitan area, from other academic units at IUPUI, from outside the bounds of traditional "teacher education," as well as faculty with a commitment to the preparation of future teachers. The recommendations of the Task Force were taken up by an Implementation Committee that worked through subcommittees that focused on general education requirements, professional development schools, and curriculum. The resulting program took shape as "Learning to Teach/Teaching to Learn." The first cohorts of students matriculated Fall 1994 and graduated May 1996. (IN/ I.A.1)

Learning to Teach/Teaching to Learn at IUPUI was designed originally around the principles of the NBPTS. During the last year, faculty have worked to shift the program framework so that it is aligned with the INTASC Principles (see IN/ I.G.1) The program design reflects a faculty commitment to modeling in our teacher education program those skills we expect of our graduates (e.g. collaborative teaching, cooperative learning, more authentic assessment, the integration of technology, on-going inquiry). An evaluation committee was appointed Fall 1994 to design and direct the evaluation of LT/TL. That committee which includes the campus Vice Chancellor for Planning and Institutional Improvement along with faculty involved in teacher education, meets regularly to monitor data and to revise protocols and instruments. (IN/ I.A.2)

A number of features distinguish LT/TL from traditional teacher preparation at IUPUI: (1) collaboration with a select group of professional development schools, (2) a cohort structure to provide support and build a community of learners, (3) teaching done by a team of university faculty who plan the curriculum and integrate assignments, (4) substantial field experience each semester of the program that integrates content areas and is based in the PDS site.

Professional development schools (PDS) represent a unique collaboration between P-12 schools and the university to (a) prepare future teachers, (b) support the on-going professional development of practicing professionals, and focus university research and development activities on the problems of educational practice. In Fall 1994, six area schools collaborated as PDS sites; in Fall 1996, LT/TL students were based in 12 schools. There has been some turnover among our PDS sites that resulted from low expectations (on our part) in initial site selection, as well as an absence of shared commitment to teaching/learning that reflected best practice by school-based faculty. (IN/ I.I.1) -- present detailed information about the characteristics of our PDS sites and their history of involvement with LT/TL). Our experience with LT/TL has lead us to move toward a "professional development school model" for field experience throughout the undergraduate teacher education program and to begin to offer more methods classes in school sites. (IN/ I.I.2)

The cohort structure of LT/TL is best characterized as "variations on a theme." There are considerable differences between elementary and secondary cohorts and between cohorts at the same level. During the initial year of implementation, the elementary cohort of 24 students was spread across 4 elementary schools

(primarily because no PDS was willing to take a full cohort of 25-30 students). Since then, we have been able to shift to a model where students in an elementary cohort are assigned to no more than two schools. Secondary cohorts have assignments at both middle and high school sites. (IN/ I.G.2)

To build stronger connections between theory and practice and between university and P-12 classrooms, traditional course work has been significantly modified. In many cases, the content of three credit hour courses has been spread over two or three semesters and linked to or embedded within larger blocks of content. Curriculum addresses broad semester themes rather than narrow course descriptions. This integration of content presupposes the collaboration of faculty *teaching teams*. Rather than offering “their” courses in isolation, faculty now work together to plan around semester themes. Teaching teams have begun to move consideration of diversity issues from designated courses to the center of professional preparation and to every aspect of teaching/learning/assessment. Teams coordinate readings and craft assignments that require students to integrate knowledge from different content areas and address “problems” that are grounded in the PDS. Students, in turn, are expected to integrate content and professional knowledge in their own teaching, and to engage in sustained inquiry. (IN/ I.E.1)

We are shifting to *block scheduling* of courses and field work in the professional education sequence so that students spend more concentrated time in combined university- and field-work better connecting theory and practice. In LT/TL, student cohorts (who are registered for 13-15 credit hours) spend two entire days per week at the PDS and in formal classwork. Typically students spend the mornings in field work and afternoons in class. Outside LT/TL, we are experimenting with blocking on a smaller scale (6 cr hrs plus field experience scheduled for a single day) to create the same benefits for students and faculty.

Across all programs, faculty employ a range of teaching/learning and assessment strategies (IN/ I.G.3). Since 1990, most notable changes are in the extent of collaborative teaching, the use of cooperative learning, service learning, and the use of technology to support teaching/learning in and outside the classroom. The availability of distance education technology enables faculty to bring national experts, authors, and practitioners into the class. The Internet and e-mail improve student contact with experts and resources and with the instructor outside class hours. (IN/ I.G.4 and IN/ I.G.5)

In the fall of 1995, we established the Professional Development School Coordinating Council (PDS/CC). The Council provides a vehicle for the discussion of major changes in PDS operation and program structure, for the exchange of ideas concerning educational reform, and for enhancing coordination and collaboration among area schools and IUPUI. Membership includes representatives from each PDS, a student from each active cohort, clinical faculty from each PDS, and IUPUI team leaders and relevant administrators. (IN/ I.I.3) One tangible outcome of the Coordinating Council was the School/University Conference on Collaborative Inquiry in Teacher Education held on campus in April, 1996. Over 100 individuals attended the event which included presentations by students, faculty, and clinical faculty, and which showcased work at the PDS sites. The Conference will be held again this spring at Crispus Attucks Middle School with invitations to faculty and students from the other teacher education programs in Indianapolis.

While professional development schools are perhaps the most visible evidence of professional community, faculty, students, and P-12 colleagues also collaborate on funded inquiry, on service learning projects, and on conference and professional presentations. (IN/ I.I.4)

The entire IUPUI campus continues to work on issues related to general education. In Spring 1996, academic units and the Council for Undergraduate Learning adopted nine principles to characterize undergraduate education at IUPUI. Units are now in the process of delineating how mastery of each principle will be

assessed and what level of performance will be expected. Senior faculty from the School of Education have been closely involved in this campus effort. (Education's response to the principles and the campus documents are available in Files IN/I.B.1). This work has been disrupted somewhat by the introduction of a proposal for the formation of a new "University College" beginning Fall 1997. The University College would be responsible for all entering students and the general education program. (IN/I.B.2)

The advanced programs offered through IUPUI reflect the guidelines of their professional associations and are congruent with the programs at IUB. The notable exception is that IUPUI requires a culminating inquiry project of all candidates for an advanced degree in elementary, secondary, and special education. We direct students into Strategies for Educational Inquiry (Y520) early in the program in order to establish an orientation to practitioner research. (IN/I.F.1)

Distance education technology enables graduate students at IUPUI to access more specialized course work from faculty at IUB. The number of courses offered via distance education has continued to increase both in summer and during the academic year. (IN/I.F.2)

Beginning in 1993, we modified the nature of post-baccalaureate summer offerings in Education at IUPUI to reflect growing interest in professional development per se as distinct from work toward an advanced degree. To complement the degree-related offerings which conform to a traditional summer school calendar, we began to offer an array of courses in workshop formats with a more narrow content focus (e.g., cooperative learning, integrating technology). Material describing summer offerings are available in File IN/I.F.3.

CATEGORY II. CANDIDATES IN PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

Though graduate enrollments have declined somewhat since state licensing no longer requires candidates to earn the masters degree, undergraduate enrollments have grown consistently since 1990, with students taking more credit hours per semester. At IUPUI, the education student body continues to become more diverse. In 1995, 8.8% of the Education students were from traditionally under represented groups (steadily up from 7.5% in 1991). In 1996, 8.6% of the undergraduates and 8.4% of the graduate Educations students were minority. The figures represent almost exclusively African Americans. Sadly, however, the percent of actual degree recipients falls below the data on minority enrollment, though it, too, shows progress: the percent of baccalaureate degrees awarded to minority students has increased from 2.8 in 1992 to 6.3 in 1996. Historical data on enrollments and student demographics are available (IN/ II.A.1).

Despite some progress, the recruitment of candidates from traditionally under represented groups remains a priority for us because of our urban location. The School sponsors "Educators of Tomorrow" in collaboration with area high schools in Marion County to recruit minority and first-generation college students to careers in teaching. We also work closely with the SET program operated out of the Indiana Department of Education, and are a "Partner in Education" to a nearby middle school with predominantly minority enrollment. A more recent strategy to increase minority enrollments takes the form of field trips to campus by classes from PDS sites. During Fall 1996, classes from four PDS sites visited the campus ending their tours in the School of Education. We think that the visibility of diverse role models among our faculty, staff, and students will have an influence long term. (IN/ II.B.1-- provides information on "Educators of Tomorrow" and other recruitment activities)

One strategy to increase the diversity of the student body is to increase the diversity of the unit's staff and faculty. Education Student Services now employs three African Americans (the director, one of two full time counselors, and the recorder) and one Hispanic (part-time counselor). Having individuals of color in visible positions of leadership and responsibility should serve to attract even more students of color to the School. The presence and participation of faculty and students on site in PDS schools (most of which have substantial minority enrollments) should also have long-term pay off in terms of minority recruitment.

Since 1990, the School has begun a more systematic use of graduate student internships and assistantships to extend the resources of the Students Service unit. In 1996, Student Services began extended hours (to 7:00 p.m. Monday-Thursdays) in order to be more responsive to the urban student body. Student Services has initiated monthly orientation programs for prospective students from campus or community. Student Services staff encourage students to use technology to become more familiar with program requirements and to take responsibility for planning prior to formal meetings with counselors. During peak advising/registration periods, peer mentors provide training on the use of IU Care. The School has received campus funds to facilitate the development of advising protocols and program information for the world wide web. This project will be completed in 1997.

IUPUI graduates continue to do well on NTE core battery and specialty area tests (IN/ II.D.1).

Members of the Evaluation Committee have drafted an instrument based on INTASC principles to guide the formative evaluation of candidates in LT/TL and to guide students in building a professional portfolio (Andis, Berghoff & D'Ambrosio, 1995; IN/ II.D.2). The instrument has been field tested by a set of university supervisors. While it seems useful for formative assessment and to accustom students and cooperating professionals to peer review and reflective practice, there is a consensus that a different approach may be necessary for the portfolio process. Faculty have submitted several proposals to seek funding for work

required by this next stage of assessment (IN/ II.D.3).

In order to begin to focus faculty and students on more authentic assessment, we have instituted an *evaluation week* as part of LT/TL. Formal class meetings are stopped a week earlier than stipulated by the university calendar and “finals week” activities are moved up accordingly. This arrangement creates an additional week for faculty to meet as a group to discuss students’ work.

According to the annual survey of graduates conducted by the campus Office of Information Management and Institutional Research, IUPUI Education graduates are successful finding employment in the field. Candidate responses indicate a high level of agreement that the program prepared them well. (IN/ II.C.1).

IUPUI graduates of both initial and advanced programs are recognized for excellence. File IN/ II.D.4 presents a partial listing of students recognized by district or statewide competitions.

Since 1990, the School has increased the financial support available to students in the form of scholarships, stipends, or assistantships. Descriptions of these improvements are included in File IN/ II.C.2.

CATEGORY III. PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION FACULTY

In 1992, Executive Associate Dean for Indianapolis Hugh Wolf was appointed director of Intercollegiate Athletics for IUPUI. Barbara Wilcox, professor in special education, was appointed as his replacement.

A large number of retirements since 1992 have greatly altered the composition of the Education faculty at IUPUI. Of the 29 tenure line faculty, only 5 have been on campus 16+ years, while 10 have been at IUPUI less than 5 years. The unit also has a more senior faculty than in 1990: six faculty now hold the rank of full professor, compared to one in 1990. Recent hires have created a more representative faculty. Indeed, the School meets or exceeds targets set by campus Affirmative Action. Of the tenure line faculty in the School of Education, 12 (41%) are women and 5 (17%) are from traditionally under represented groups. The School of Education at IUPUI has established a standing Committee on Diversity charged to attend to students, faculty, and staff issues. The committee has been responsible for programs at faculty retreats and for additional brown bag topical meetings during the academic year.

Not only is the current faculty more diverse, but also it is very productive (see faculty vitae File). Support from federal, state, and university sources has increased dramatically. There is increased IUPUI involvement with core campus doctoral programs and more doctoral students electing to collaborate with IUPUI based mentors. Documentation which provides information on the campus hiring history, faculty demographic data, and vitae for tenure line, visiting, and part-time faculty is available.(IN/ III.A.1)

Virtually all faculty members who teach in certification/licensure programs maintain substantial involvement with the world of practice. This involvement takes many forms: serving as faculty liaison to a PDS site; teaching courses on location in a P-12 school; direct supervision of student practica, projects, or field experience; involvement in collaborative research or on-going professional development activities with educational professionals; or significant service activities to area school corporations or professional associations. File documents illustrate faculty collaboration with practitioners (IN/ III.D.1). In addition to the work with schools and informal educational institutions, faculty in the School are involved in significant collaborative activities with other units on campus [e.g, Science, Nursing, Social Work, Journalism, Physical Education, Library/Information Science]. Information on these efforts are presented in Files IN/ III.C.1.

The on-going professional development of tenure line faculty is supported through several mechanisms: the campus Office of Faculty Development, formal mentoring, and the annual/merit review process. Each of these is described in detail in File IN/ III.D.2.

As a means to expand the resources of the School and to invite collaboration with individuals interested in P-16 education, the School has extended formal adjunct appointments to others on campus, to educators in informal education settings in the metropolitan area, and to individuals in leadership roles in area schools. Similarly, we have been more aggressive in seeking adjunct appointments for Education faculty in relevant academic units outside the School. At present, Education faculty hold adjunct appointments in Nursing, Computer Science, Geology, Biology, and Mathematics. File IN/ III.A.2 presents the adjunct appointments.

IUPUI takes advantage of its urban location to draw upon large community of practicing professionals as part-time instructors. Since the last BOE visit, we have reduced the proportion of undergraduate credit hours taught by part-time instructors to 36 percent. It is important to note (1) that this figure included as "part-time" graduate assistants and individuals employed in professional staff positions in the School, and (2) this figure is quite low for the campus. Since further reduction is unlikely (given budget constraints), it is perhaps more important to consider changes in the support and integration of those part-time instructors. We have: (1)

created a new position of assistant to the dean through internal reallocation and dedicated .5 FTE to support of part-time faculty, (2) initiated an active program of professional development for part-time instructors, (3) assigned all part-time instructors a designated mentor or team leader from among the tenure line faculty, (4) relieved part-time instructors from responsibility for developing their own field experience placements, instead developing a set of geographically dispersed "professional development schools" that will serve as the locus for the field work for course clusters, (5) implementing careful review of all instructors, (6) developed a procedural manual for the School which is distributed to all part-time instructors, and (7) significantly extended the level of support available to part-time instructors (individual mailboxes, e-mail accounts, and access to photocopying 24 hrs/day 7 days/week, shared office space or carrels).

For both initial and advanced programs, we attempt to build a cadre of "permanent part-time instructors." The phrase refers to those practicing professionals who routinely teach the same course, and are in effect, genuine members of the School community by virtue of regular participation with faculty in on-going curriculum development activities. One such "permanent part-time" instructor received the Chancellor's Award for Teaching in 1996. A number of part-time faculty have received significant support for conference travel or course development activity through the campus Office of Faculty Development (see Files IN/ III.D.3).

Like many other institutions of higher education, Indiana University is under pressure to be more accountable about the deployment of resources, especially faculty time. At IUPUI, this has taken the form of the "capacity model" (with several variations on the themes over successive years). Application of these models has been complicated somewhat by the developmental work on the Learning to Teach/Teaching to Learn program and associated experimentation with course blocking and faculty team planning. Files IN/ III.C.2 present faculty assignments and documentation from the various capacity modeling efforts.

At IUPUI considerable attention is directed to the development of cooperating teachers. The professional development of practicing professionals (cooperating teachers) is inherent in the PDS relationship which is at the heart of the LT/TL program. At some sites, cooperating teachers are expected to participate in weekly seminars with faculty as a condition of having students place in their classrooms while in other sites there is simply an open invitation for teachers to attend the on-site linking seminar. Prior to the start of each semester, the Office of Student Teaching and Field Experience holds a two hour orientation for cooperating teachers. Attendance is nearly perfect despite the size of the audience (well over 100).

Summer 1996, the Director of Student Teaching/Field Experience offered a course for cooperating teachers that introduced them to current trends (e.g., performance assessment, INTASC and NBPTS), provided some initial training on key topics (e.g. collaboration, inclusion, inquiry oriented curriculum), and discussed common problems/solutions in the student teaching process. The course was very well received and will be offered again Summer 1997. Files IN/ III.D.4 present information about support to cooperating teachers/university supervisors.

CATEGORY IV. THE UNIT FOR PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

In Spring 1993, the School of Education was reorganized into two areas following the recommendations of a task force appointed by the University Dean and the Executive Associate Dean for Indianapolis. Teacher Education (TE) comprises those faculty with appointments in the core campus department of Curriculum & Instruction and Language Education while Human Development, Leadership & Technology (HDLT) includes those faculty with appointments in the core campus departments of Counseling & Educational Psychology, Educational Leadership & Policy Studies, and Instructional Systems Technology. Each area is lead by a chair who serves a 2-3 year appointment. Faculty with tenure line appointments at IUPUI are members of the core campus departments and attend department meetings and participate in other departmental responsibilities (admissions, search & screen, doctoral recruitment and advising) in addition to meeting service responsibilities at IUPUI. IUPUI operates as a committee of the whole with monthly meetings with agenda/announcements distributed in advance. Areas and/or programs convene additional meetings as relevant issues arise.

One of the most noticeable changes since 1990, is the improvement in technology for faculty and staff, and for instruction and student use (see Files IN/ IV.B.1).

In April 1994, IUPUI dedicated a new University Library. The new five floor facility is 256,880 square feet, over three times the size of the previous facility. There are twice the number of study carrels (now 1740), 2 full classrooms, 42 group study rooms, 40 faculty study rooms, an auditorium, and a large suite of adaptive educational services. There are over 140 "scholars' work stations" in place. Through our library liaison, each new faculty is invited to order up to \$500 of books in their professional area.

A Center for Teaching and Learning opened in the Library to provide support to faculty to improve teaching/learning/assessment, especially in relation to technology. One member of the Education faculty chairs the advisory board for the Center, a second sits on the board, and others have designed programs offered by the Center. Faculty, staff, and graduate assistants from Education are frequent participants in the training offered by the Center (see File IN/ IV.B.2).

The School of Education maintains a large Curriculum Resource Center (CRC) on the first floor of the Education/Social Work Building. In addition to a large collection of P-12 curriculum materials, the CRC is a textbook adoption site and houses one of four "Shared Information Services" offices funded by the Indiana Department of Education to support teachers of students labeled gifted and talented. Since 1990, the CRC has added workstations with Internet access, a large collection of material on CD-Rom, and equipment for student check out (camcorders, zapshot cameras, laptop computers).

Section III. Future Directions

The School of Education will base its future directions and plans upon the four NCATE Categories of Standards, the draft standards from the Indiana Professional Standards Board, our internal planning documents, and research activities associated with the implementation of new and revised programs.

Category I. Design of Professional Education

At IUPUI:

- Plan and conduct campus program reviews to follow up BOE visit.
- Continue evaluation of LT/TL program and make adjustments based on data. Include comparative cost information.
- Review secondary cohort model in LT/TL, and make appropriate adjustments based on faculty/student/PDS feedback and evaluation of options.
- Involve programs other than elementary and secondary education in PDS sites. Advanced programs (e.g., counseling/counselor education, school administration) and graduate programs (e.g. instructional systems technology) in education and in other units (e.g., Nursing, Social Work, Criminal Justice) could contribute to the operation of PDS sites.

At IUB:

- Plan and conduct programmatic reviews to follow up BOE visit.
- Fully implement the reform effort exemplified by our new conceptual framework as described throughout this document.
- Refine programs as needed so they are consistent with the statewide efforts of the Indiana Professional Standards Board (IPSB).
- Undertake research activities that are related to the functioning of our new programs, starting in the fall semester of 1998, perhaps funded through the Research Institute on Teacher Education.
- Integrate the discussions, conclusions, and policies initiated through our Assessment Committee discussions as they affect the implementation of new and revised program offerings.
- Evaluate the development of new partnerships with local and regional schools, and consider their possible extension in conjunction with other programs. .
- Participate in a pilot research project, during the 1997-98 academic year, that will involve selected

sites from the Big 10 Universities; this general effort is being spearheaded by three faculty members from around the Big 10, including the Associate Dean for Teacher Education at IUB.

- Participate in a more extensive and intensive research investigation, during the 1998-99 academic year, regarding multiple university sites within the Big 10, that will result in comparative studies and inquiry that will help us understand the dynamics of our new and revised programs, as well as their effectiveness.

Category II. Candidates in Professional Education

At IUPUI:

- Implement more formal admissions process to Teacher Education.
- Continue work on authentic assessment (especially portfolio assessment) and increase collaboration between school-based and university-based faculty in both formative and summative assessment of teacher education candidates.
- Design and offer a new "recruitment course" to introduce interested students to best practices in teaching/learning/assessment, current issues in education, and the field of practice.

At IUB:

- Consider new admission and retention policies as these are contained in the recommendations of program coordinators, as part of the review of our commitment to intellectual engagement **d** academic rigor.
- Continue focus group discussions dealing with the Draft Standards developed by the Indiana Professional Standards Board's Advisory Groups.
- Fully develop and implement activities associated with the INTASC Principles.

Category III. Professional Education Faculty

At IUPUI:

- Increase the diversity among university supervisors and cooperating teachers.
- Expand professional development opportunities for university supervisors to ensure that they are knowledgeable about the design of the professional education program, familiar with what may be new themes (diversity, technology, inquiry), and comfortable using new instruments to evaluate performance during student teaching.
- Expand professional development opportunities for cooperating teachers (especially outside the LT/TL sites) to ensure that they are knowledgeable about changes in program design and expectations.
- Expand professional collaborations between P-12 and IUPUI faculty, especially in professional development schools.

At IUB:

- Through the Office of Professional Development, a new venture, expand opportunities for faculty members to work with their public school colleagues.
- Expand professional development opportunities for Associate Instructors.
- Investigate the expansion of university-public school partnerships.

Category IV. The Unit for Professional Education

At IUPUI:

- Increase the number of full time faculty so that there are at least two in each key program area.
- Implement plan to decrease reliance on “developmental” courses to support unit.
- Implement plan to guide the development of courses and possible programs at IUPUC.

At IUB:

- Increase the number of tenure track faculty members who teach in undergraduate teacher education.
- Investigate the effects of new, interdisciplinary courses and the feasibility of additional team-taught courses.
- Pursue additional collaborate relationships with faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences and perhaps other units of the university.

The Indiana University core campus teacher education faculty also has taken an active role in helping articulate new draft standards through service with the Indiana Professional Standards Board. One member of the faculty was chair of the Science Advisory Group, a second member was chair of the Early Childhood Advisory Group, another served on the English/Language Arts Advisory Group, and yet another faculty member chaired the School Services Advisory Group. In addition, the Assistant Dean for Student Services was the Facilitator for the Social Studies Group, while three other members of the faculty testified before that group. Several other faculty members and instructors provided input to other Advisory Groups. Another faculty member wrote a successful grant proposal to collect, collate, and analyze individual and focus group input to the draft standards in all licensing areas.

At another level, faculty and associate instructor “focus groups” continue to be engaged in discussing draft IPSB standards, and in providing feedback concerning those standards. Regarding assessment, it should be noted that one of our faculty members has been actively engaged in helping create performance-based standards for both public school and university students and courses. That pattern of leadership will certainly continue into the future. In sum, the Indiana University Teacher Education faculty and staff will continue to be active and effective participants in this important statewide reform of both initial preparation and continued professional development of education professionals. Combined with its research expertise and ongoing activities, and its demonstrated commitment to teacher education, Indiana University will certainly continue to be on the cutting edge of teacher education initiatives and a leader in developing and implementing first rate programs.

In fulfilling its special responsibilities as a professional school, the School of Education advances the entire University. To the degree that it prepares superior teachers, counselors, and administrators, it elevates elementary and secondary education throughout the state. It creates special bonds between the University and the state's public and private school systems and assures that the students most likely to attend Indiana University are well prepared for college work. The reputation of our programs is such that school corporations, colleges and universities seek to employ our graduates. In these ways, the School advances the quality of precollegiate and collegiate education. It plays a vital role in the University's effort to enhance the economic strength and cultural richness of Indiana and the nation.