

Summary Program Report, Elementary Education
IUPUC Division of Education
June 4, 2012

Each semester the Division of Education at IUPUC collects data related to two student learning outcome frameworks. The first framework is the Principles of Undergraduate Learning, a set of campus-wide expectations for all IUPUI/IUPUC undergraduate programs. The second is a division-specific framework, that until recently was a shared framework across the three campuses (Bloomington, IUPUI, IUPUC) of Indiana University School of Education Core Campus.

The Division of Education at IUPUC has recently adopted a conceptual framework separate from that of the Indiana University School of Education Core Campus Principles of Teacher Education (PTE) to formally articulate the learning outcomes for IUPUC DoE's teacher candidates. The framework is currently in draft form and is subject to revision by faculty committee. The move to a separate framework comes as a result of two events. First, at the conclusion of the division's NCATE (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education) accreditation process in 2010, the state of Indiana required that in all future accreditation efforts IUPUC DoE submit program reports independently of the Indiana University School of Education at Bloomington and IUPUI. In the program reports due to NCATE in the fall of 2014, IUPUC DoE, for the first time, will complete the accreditation process separately from the Indiana University School of Education core campus. Secondly, changes to the state's teacher licensing policies have necessitated revisions of our program's structure. The Revisions to Professional Educator Preparation and Accountability (REPA) led the division to develop areas of concentrations and revisions of program credit hours in order to be in compliance with the new policies mandated by the state. The Division found that Indiana University's PTEs no longer captured the learning outcomes sought by the revised programs. In the spring of 2012, the IUPUC DoE faculty approved the draft form of the Division's conceptual framework, *Critical Components of Effective Teaching (CCETs)* (see Appendix A). The CCET outcomes are aligned with the standards of the Division's accrediting professional organization, the Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI). The ACEI standards are included in Appendix B.

I. Learning Outcomes

For the 2011-2012 academic year, the DoE collected data across several courses related to the indicators within the Principles of Undergraduate Learning (PULs). Specifically, the division collected evidence of learning outcomes associated with three PULs:

- Core communication and quantitative skills as demonstrated by the candidate's ability to comprehend, interpret, and analyze ideas and facts.
- Critical thinking as demonstrated by the ability of candidates to engage in a process of disciplined thinking that informs beliefs and actions.

- Integration and Application of Knowledge as demonstrated by the ability of candidates to use information and concepts from studies in multiple disciplines in their intellectual, professional, and community lives.

All IUPUC teacher candidates are expected to develop understandings, skills, and knowledge aligned with these principles through a variety of courses and related to a variety of content areas associated with their preparation as future elementary teachers.

The division is revising the formal assessment system for accreditation based on the new conceptual framework (CCETs, Appendix A) and the new program structure established in response to REPA (as described in an earlier paragraph). Three existing assessments will continue as part of the assessment system. The first two are not performance assessments and will not be discussed in this report. The third, a two-semester long student teaching evaluation, is a performance assessment administered in the senior year of the program. The student teaching evaluation assessment is administered in each semester of the candidates' senior year and was developed to capture evidence of candidates' ability to implement best practices in K-6 classroom settings. In total, there are twenty-six individual learning outcomes associated with this assessment. For the purposes of this report, the focus will be on five primary learning outcomes that define the skills, knowledge and dispositions expected of the elementary education candidates by program completion. These five learning outcomes are related to the CCET cluster of teaching all learners and have been identified as priority outcomes in terms of targeting actions taken in response to findings to inform program improvement. The primary learning outcomes measured by this assessment are as follows:

- Candidate demonstrates knowledge of student learning and development. (CCET 4) *Knowledge of Student Learning*
- Candidate creates an environment where K-6 students are fully engaged and on task and within which diverse opinions are encouraged and nurtured. (CCET 4.b, 4.d) *Learning Environment*
- Candidate implements lessons that are creative, engaging, and appropriate for the learning community. (CCET 4.a, 4.c) *Lesson Implementation*
- Candidate develops instructional activities that address multiple learning styles and facilitate development of metacognitive strategies for problem solving and reasoning. (CCET 4.c) *Instructional Activities*
- Candidate builds productive learning relationships with students. (CCET 4.e) *Teacher/Student Relationship*

II. Assessment Measures

The degree to which teacher candidates meet PUL expectations was measured across several Division of Education courses in the spring and fall semesters of 2011. Course instructors aligned individual course assessments to PULs 1B, 2 and 3, and submitted results at the conclusion of the course as part of the course grading process. Candidates were evaluated on a four-point scale, with a score of "1" representing ineffective performance, "2" representing a somewhat effective performance, "3" representing effective performance, and "4" representing very effective performance.

The student teaching evaluation assessment is administered in both semesters of the candidates' senior year. The evaluation instrument is completed by the supervising classroom teacher and the university supervisor based on multiple classroom observations of candidate performance. For the purpose of this report, results from the five evaluation categories described earlier are presented from the fall semester of 2011 and the spring semester of 2012. These categories relate to the CCET cluster of "Teaching all Learners" and have been identified as important indicators for informing program improvement efforts. The candidates were assessed on a four-point scale with a score of "1" given for unsatisfactory performance, "2" for underdeveloped performance, "3" for performance consistent with that of a developing professional, and "4" for exemplary performance. The target performance for all DoE candidates is that of "developing professional." The detailed descriptions of the scoring categories for each of the CCET indicators are given in Appendix C and help to differentiate between the levels of performance expected in each category.

III. Assessment Findings

A. PUL Performance

The results of the 2011 PUL evaluation are shown in Table 1. IUPUC teacher candidates performance scores for the PULs assessed were lowest for candidates evaluated in both the spring and fall semesters of 2011 within the PUL Indicator 1B, Quantitative Skills. For both cohorts, the highest scores were realized in the category of critical thinking. Of most concern is the percentage of candidates (3.85%) evaluated at the "not effective" level for Indicator 1B – Quantitative Skills. A closer look at the details of this learning outcome reveals that of the three PULs evaluated over the two semesters, IUPUC teacher candidates are less effective in the area of comprehending, interpreting, and analyzing ideas and facts. Candidates were assessed to be more effective in the other two outcomes relating to critical thinking and integration an application of knowledge.

Table 1: Percent of Candidates Assessed at each PUL rating (F=Fall, S=Spring semester of 2011)

PUL Indicator	Not Effective	Somewhat Effective	Effective	Very Effective	Average PUL rating
1B Quantitative Skills	S – 3.85% F – 3.85%	S – 23.08% F – 23.08%	S – 57.69% F – 57.69%	S – 15.38% F – 15.38%	S – 2.85 F – 2.85
Critical Thinking	S – 2.56% F – 2.86%	S – 11.54% F – 16.19%	S – 57.69% F – 52.38%	S – 28.21% F – 28.57%	S – 3.11 F – 3.07
Integration and Application of Knowledge	S – 0.00% F – 2.51%	S – 7.44% F – 13.07%	S – 83.47% F – 72.36%	S – 9.09% F – 12.06%	S – 3.02 F – 2.94
Average	S – 1.33% F – 2.73%	S – 10.67% F – 14.85%	S – 71.56% F – 64.85%	S – 16.44% F – 12.06%	S – 3.03 F – 2.97

B. CCET Performance

The results of the fall 2011 and spring 2012 CCET are shown in Table 2. For the fall semester cohort, highest scores were realized in Indicator 1, Knowledge of Student Learning, while the spring cohort's highest score was associated with Indicator 2, Learning Environment. IUPUC teacher candidates' performance scores for the CCETs assessed were lowest for candidates across both semesters within the CCET Indicator 4, Instructional Activities. A small subset of the spring cohort included candidates who were scored below the target of "Developing Professional" within Indicators 2 and 4 (Learning Environment and Instructional Activities, respectively). A closer look at Indicator 4 (Appendix C), the indicator in which both cohorts realized the lowest scores and within which the spring cohort had candidates not reaching target, reveals that the candidates are experiencing less success in differentiating their instruction by making use of their knowledge of multiple learning styles and teaching strategies to meet diverse student needs, than in the results of the other learning outcomes assessed.

Table 2: Percent of Candidates Assessed at each CCET-aligned Learning Objective (F= Fall semester of 2011 (n= 9), S = Spring Semester of 2012 (n = 20))

CCET-aligned Indicator	Unacceptable	Under-developed	Developing Professional	Exemplary	Average Indicator Rating
1.Knowledge of Student Learning	F - 0% (0) S - 0% (0)	F - 0% (0) S - 0% (0)	F - 44% (4) S - 75% (15)	F - 66% (5) S - 25% (5)	F - 3.56 S - 3.25
2.Learning Environment	F - 0% (0) S - 0% (0)	F - 0% (0) S - 5% (1)	F - 89% (8) S - 20% (4)	F - 11% (1) S - 75%(15)	F - 3.11 S - 3.7
3.Lesson Implementation	F - 0% (0) S - 0% (0)	F - 0% (0) S - 0% (0)	F - 100% (9) S - 80% (16)	F - 0% (0) S - 20% (4)	F - 3.0 S - 3.2
4.Instructional Activities	F - 0% (0) S - 0% (0)	F - 0% (0) S - 15% (3)	F - 100% (9) S - 70% (14)	F - 0% (0) S - 15% (3)	F - 3.0 S - 3.0
5.Teacher/ Student Relationship	F - 0% (0) S - 0% (0)	F - 0% (0) S - 5% (1)	F - 66% (5) S - 60% (12)	F - 44% (4) S - 35% (7)	F - 3.44 S - 3.3

IV. Actions Taken in Response to Findings

The division is piloting an instructional activity in the first semester of the candidates' senior year that was designed to help candidates grow in their ability to 1) comprehend, interpret, and analyze ideas and facts related to teaching and learning in K-6 classrooms (PUL 1b) and 2) differentiate their instruction by making use of their knowledge of multiple learning styles and teaching strategies to meet diverse student needs (CCET Indicator 4). These two instructional goals connect directly to the two

categories from the PUL and CCET assessments where candidates realized lowest performance scores. It is the hope of the Division that this instructional activity will evolve into one of the major assessments for program accreditation.

The activity was developed by a committee of faculty members who serve as university student teaching supervisors during the first semester of the candidates' senior year. The activity is a two-stage performance assessment, with the first stage consisting of a partner activity in which candidates work together to identify a rich task that when implemented in a K-6 classroom has the potential to reveal the varieties and complexities of student understandings within the classroom. The second stage of the activity is completed by candidates individually and requires each candidate to develop their own task that meets the same criteria as the task developed in the partner activity.

In the spring semester of 2012, the first stage of the activity was piloted. The activity description is included in Appendix D. Candidates met in pairs with their university faculty supervisors mid-way through their eight-week student teaching placement to present the task they developed and student work collected as a result of implementing the task. The three university faculty supervisors met as a committee to discuss the results and plan for ways in which to support the students as they worked towards producing an individual product at the end of the placement. The purpose of piloting the partner activity was to provide insight into the types of supports the candidates require from the university supervisors as they work towards producing individual products. The university faculty supervisors learned from the pilot that candidates struggled in making sense of tasks that meet the diverse needs of individual students, as well as comprehending and interpreting the meaning of individual student thinking as evidenced in students' written work. As a result, the university faculty supervisors will focus discussions that follow each teaching observation on the topic of task selection and analysis of student work resulting from the task. Although formal assessment data was not collected as part of the pilot, it is the hope of the faculty committee that the activity will be expanded in future semesters to include a formal evaluation of the learning outcomes at the individual candidate level, eventually becoming a major program assessment. The faculty committee's work during the fall semester of 2012 includes the creation of a rubric aligned to both the PUL and CCET framework that will capture evidence of candidate performance that will inform future program improvements.

In addition to the activity described above and in Appendix D, the Division is currently revising its program assessment system and will keep in mind the PUL and CCET result related to the two indicators discussed above as new assessments and supporting instruction are incorporated into the new program structure.

Appendix A

*IUPUC Division of Education
Elementary Education Conceptual Framework
Critical Components of Effective Teaching*

Upon completion of the elementary education program, each candidate is expected to develop the skills and knowledge related to teaching and learning in the elementary grades as outlined in the following five Critical Components of Effective Teaching.

1. Supporting Learner Development

The candidate uses inquiry to discover each child's path to learning by considering

- a) Society and culture (ACEI 1, ACEI 2.4, ACEI 5.2)
- b) Developmental differences (ACEI 1)
- c) Motivation for learning (ACEI 1)
- d) Documentation of student learning (ACEI 4.0)
- e) Learning experience design (ACEI 1, ACEI 2)

2. Facilitating Learning

The candidate uses knowledge of the learner to plan, facilitate, and monitor learning in each curricular area, including

- a) Literacy (ACEI 2.1, ACEI 4)
- b) Mathematics (ACEI 2.3, ACEI 4)
- c) Social Studies (ACEI 2.4, ACEI 4)
- d) Science (ACEI 2.2, ACEI 4)
- e) The Arts (ACEI 2.5, ACEI 4)
- f) Health and Physical Education (ACEI 2.6, 2.7, ACEI 4)

3. Creating a Community of Learners

The candidate uses inquiry to discover professional attributes related to the role of a teacher in a community of learners including

- a) Modes of instruction (ACEI 3.3)
- b) Instructional materials and tools (ACEI 2.1, ACEI 2.2, ACEI 2.3, ACEI 2.4, ACEI 4)
- c) Development of a professional stance (ACEI 5.1, ACEI 5.2)
- d) Structure of curriculum (ACEI 2.8)

4. Teaching All Learners

The candidate recognizes the necessity to identify and foster each child's learning potential through

- a) Integration and application of knowledge for instruction (ACEI 2.8, 3.1)
- b) Differentiation of instruction to diverse learners (ACEI 3.2)
- c) Development of critical thinking and problem solving as related to instructional goals and equitable learning opportunities (ACEI 3.3)
- d) Engagement in learning (ACEI 3.4)
- e) Communication and collaboration in the classroom (ACEI 3.5)

5. Teaching within a Professional Community

The candidate demonstrates an understanding of the professional role of teachers including the recognition of the importance of

- a) Reflective practice (ACEI 5.2)
- b) Career-long learning (ACEI 5.1)
- c) Sustainable relationships with families and community partners also entrusted with the growth and well-being of children. (ACEI 5.3, ACEI 5.4)

Appendix B

ACEI Standards

Development, Learning and Motivation

1. Development, Learning and Motivation—Candidates know, understand, and use the major concepts, principles, theories, and research related to development of children and young adolescents to construct learning opportunities that support individual students' development, acquisition of knowledge, and motivation.

CURRICULUM STANDARDS

2.1 English language arts—Candidates demonstrate a high level of competence in use of English language arts and they know, understand, and use concepts from reading, language and child development, to teach reading, writing, speaking, viewing, listening, and thinking skills and to help students successfully apply their developing skills to many different situations, materials, and ideas.

2.2 Science—Candidates know, understand, and use fundamental concepts in the subject matter of science—including physical, life, and earth and space sciences—as well as concepts in science and technology, science in personal and social perspectives, the history and nature of science, the unifying concepts of science, and the inquiry processes scientists use in discovery of new knowledge to build a base for scientific and technological literacy.

2.3 Mathematics—Candidates know, understand, and use the major concepts, procedures, and reasoning processes of mathematics that define number systems and number sense, geometry, measurement, statistics and probability, and algebra in order to foster student understanding and use of patterns, quantities, and spatial relationships that can represent phenomena, solve problems, and manage data.

2.4 Social studies—Candidates know, understand, and use the major concepts and modes of inquiry from the social studies—the integrated study of history, geography, the social sciences, and other related areas—to promote elementary students' abilities to make informed decisions as citizens of a culturally diverse democratic society and interdependent world.

2.5 The arts—Candidates know, understand, and use—as appropriate to their own understanding and skills—the content, functions, and achievements of dance, music, theater, and the several visual arts as primary media for communication, inquiry, and insight among elementary students.

2.6 Health education—Candidates know, understand, and use the major concepts in the subject matter of health education to create opportunities for student development and practice of skills that contribute to good health.

2.7 Physical education—Candidates know, understand, and use—as appropriate to their own understanding and skills—human movement and physical activity as central elements to foster active, healthy life styles and enhanced quality of life for elementary students.

2.8 Connections across the curriculum—Candidates know, understand, and use the connections among concepts, procedures, and applications from content areas to motivate elementary students, build understanding, and encourage the application of knowledge, skills, and ideas to real world issues.

INSTRUCTION STANDARDS

3.1 Integrating and applying knowledge for instruction—Candidates plan and implement instruction based on knowledge of students, learning theory, subject matter, curricular goals, and community.

3.2 Adaptation to diverse students—Candidates understand how elementary students differ in their development and approaches to learning, and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse students.

3.3 Development of critical thinking, problem solving, performance skills—Candidates understand and use a variety of teaching strategies that encourage elementary students' development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

3.4 Active engagement in learning—Candidates use their knowledge and understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior among students at the K-6 level to foster active engagement in learning, self motivation, and positive social interaction and to create supportive learning environments.

3.5 Communication to foster collaboration—Candidates use their knowledge and understanding of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the elementary classroom.

4. **Assessment for instruction**—Candidates know, understand, and use formal and informal assessment strategies to plan, evaluate and strengthen instruction that will promote continuous intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of each elementary student.

5.1 **Practices and behaviors of developing career teachers**—Candidates understand and apply practices and behaviors that are characteristic of developing career teachers.

5.2 Reflection and evaluation—Candidates are aware of and reflect on their practice in light of research on teaching and resources available for professional learning; they continually evaluate the effects of their professional decisions and actions on students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community and actively seek out opportunities to grow professionally.

5.3 Collaboration with families—Candidates know the importance of establishing and maintaining a positive collaborative relationship with families to promote the academic, social and emotional growth of children.

5.4 Collaboration with colleagues and the community—Candidates foster relationships with school colleagues and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well-being.

Appendix C - Detailed scoring description at each CCET-aligned Learning Objective

CCET-aligned Indicator	Unacceptable	Underdeveloped	Developing Professional	Exemplary
Knowledge of Student Learning	Level of Content is inappropriate for most students. Minimal knowledge of student development evidenced.	Basic understanding of developmental characteristics. Some activities and assignments demonstrate understanding of appropriate student development.	Activities and assignments often address the needs of individual learners as well as whole group.	Level of content is differentiated consistently to address a range of abilities. Activities and assignments incorporate all cognitive levels.
Learning Environment	Allows off-task behavior. Students demonstrate negative behaviors towards peers. Diverse opinions relating to learning taking place are not welcomed.	Creates an environment in which students are involved and on task. Students are able to work cooperatively to accomplish instructional objectives.	Creates an environment in which students consistently are involved and on task. Diverse opinions are respected. Students feel safe taking risks to accomplish instructional objectives.	Creates an environment where students are fully engaged and on task; in which diverse opinions are not only encouraged, but nurtured. Students accept and encourage one another to take ownership in accomplishing instructional objectives.
Lesson Implementation	Lessons lack creativity. Minimal effort evident to connect curriculum content to the learning community.	Some effort is evident to connect curriculum content to the learning community. Lessons reflect some creativity at a basic level.	Student engagement is reflected both in the classroom environment and in student work. Through creative activities, lessons reflect the interests of the students.	Lessons demonstrate a strong connection between students' interests and life experiences. Students are inspired to pursue interests through creative lessons that incorporate higher level thinking skills.

<p>Instructional Activities</p>	<p>Depends on one or two teaching strategies that do not meet all learning styles. No development of metacognitive strategies.</p>	<p>Limited awareness of learning styles. Begins to address the basic diverse needs of students. Few metacognitive strategies.</p>	<p>The curriculum is adapted to diverse learners with unique needs and talents. Lesson plans reflect a variety of strategies, some of which facilitate metacognitive strategy use.</p>	<p>Lesson plans indicate the use of multiple teaching strategies that address multiple learning styles and facilitate development of metacognitive strategies for problem solving and evaluate reasoning.</p>
<p>Teacher/Student Relationship</p>	<p>Views students only as part of the whole classroom. Limited effort is made to view the individual student holistically. Limited effort is made to build a foundation of respect and rapport.</p>	<p>Some efforts are made to view individual students holistically. Teacher-student interaction builds a foundation of respects and rapport.</p>	<p>Attempts to understand each individual student. Builds a foundation of respect and rapport not only through interactions but also through quality teaching strategies.</p>	<p>Develops a multi-faceted picture of each student through a variety of assessments and personalized learning engagements. Establishment of mutual respect and rapport are evident.</p>

Appendix D - Block III Mid-Semester Interview

Overview

The primary purpose of the mid-semester interview is to introduce you to the processes and tasks that will comprise the final student teaching placement interview. Towards the end of your 8-week field experience placement, you and your student teaching partner will meet together with your university supervisor. You will be asked to bring to that interview samples of student work that your supervising teacher had his/her students complete during your placement. During the interview, you will be asked to talk about that work.

What to Bring to the Interview

You and your student teaching partner should identify and use the same materials for your mid-semester interview. Each of you should *not* bring in a separate set of the materials.

Bring with you to the interview:

1. **Hard copies of student work for the *same* assignment from three different students/student pairs/student groups.** *Be sure to remove student names from the work samples.*

The student work samples should:

- Represent a range of ability levels, to the extent possible.
- Result from a lesson/unit that you feel was well-designed.
- Represent a task that you feel was meaningful.
- Allow for qualitative interpretations. (Therefore, do *not* bring in math facts quizzes, spelling tests, grammar worksheets, etc.) The following should be true of the work that you bring in: A) All students could design different products and each product could still be deemed “excellent,” and B) “Excellence” is not defined by things that can be counted.

2. **Any rubrics, scoring guides, assignment descriptions, guidelines, etc. that accompanied the task.** If these things do not exist as hard copies, talk to the teacher to find out what guidelines and/or explanations were given to students verbally. Also, if the work was graded/evaluated, ask the teacher how grading decisions were made.

What to Expect from the Interview

The mid-semester interview will be informal. You will be asked to answer the questions below based on the work that you bring in. However, you may answer the questions with your student teaching partner (working as a team) and bounce ideas off of one another. You are also welcome to ask clarifying questions about the interview questions, and request support from your university supervisor in answering the questions.

The mid-semester interview is not evaluated. It is designed to prepare you for the final interview at the end of the semester. However, the mid-semester interview is a requirement and you are expected to come to it prepared.

Some or all of the following questions will be asked. Follow-up/clarifying questions (in response to your answers) may also be asked:

1. Tell me about the task that students completed (i.e., that resulted in the student products that you brought to the interview).

- What teaching/learning preceded it?
 - How were students introduced to the task?
 - How did students complete the task? (For example, did they complete it at home or in class? Was the task completed with others, or did students work entirely independently? Could students get support from parents, classmates, or the teacher?)
2. What is the purpose of the task?
 - What was the task designed to support students with/assess? (Be specific.)
 - What are the strengths and limitations with regards to how the task was designed?
 3. How successful was the task in supporting students with/assessing students on whatever it was designed to support/assess? Why? How do you know?
 4. Based on the student products, what can you conclude about specific skills, knowledge, and understandings that the students have? What strengths are indicated by the work?
 5. Based on the student products, what can you conclude about specific skills, knowledge, and understandings with which students need support?
 6. What are instructional next steps for each student/pair/group based on this sample of work?

Frequently Asked Questions

What if the majority of the work that our teacher assigns asks students to indicate right/wrong answers? OR, What if everything the students in our class do comes from workbooks and/or a standardized, prepackaged curriculum?

Do the best you can to find a high-quality task that requires students to engage in higher-order thinking skills. However, if you are unable to identify one, then bring in an assignment that meets as many of the criteria listed under the "What to Bring to the Interview" section as possible.

How long will the interview take?

Mid-semester interviews will be scheduled for one half hour.