

Indiana University Southeast School of Education

Unit Conceptual Framework

Educators Engaged in Growth

Mission Statement: The mission of the Indiana University Southeast School of Education is to develop high quality, caring professionals who are leaders in the continuous improvement of schools within a diverse society.

Indiana University Southeast School of Education (SOE) prepares candidates to work in schools as teachers and as other professional school personnel through the following programs: Bachelor of Science in Education with majors in elementary education, secondary education and special education and the Master of Science in Education with concentrations in elementary education, secondary education and counseling. The Unit currently prepares candidates for initial licensing for elementary and secondary education, educational leadership, special education, reading, computer, gifted and talented, and school counseling under the Indiana Office of Educator Licensing and Development (OELD) licensing patterns, “Rules 2002” and Rules for Educator Preparation and Accountability (REPA I). The Unit has transitioned to NCATE 2008 standards and REPA’s content and developmental standards.

Preface

The Indiana University Southeast SOE constantly strives to look to the future. We update our curriculum, educational and physical resources and revise our goals to ensure that we are aligned with new legislative priorities, cultural shifts and research findings, looking especially at the areas of diversity and technology due to the rapidly shifting ground in these areas. We launch from the basic philosophies presented as the Conceptual Framework in this document to guide us as we move forward.

*The Unit also complies with Kentucky Statutes for the preparation of Kentucky candidates qualifying under the “Memorandum of Understanding between Indiana and Kentucky Regarding Tuition Reciprocity .”

** The CF was adopted September 19, 2001 and the first modifications were approved April 2004. The second modification was approved December 10, 2010. (See Conceptual Framework Timeline document for specific information on the CF modifications.)

I. Overview

“Educators Engaged in Growth” is used by the Unit to denote both commitment and reflective action. This descriptor highlights the proactive expectations established for Unit candidates: to engage in life-long professional growth aimed at bringing about renewal of schools within a diverse society.

“Educators Engaged in Growth” Unit Conceptual Framework (CF) and underlying knowledge base are aligned with the IU Southeast Campus and SOE mission statements. The IU Southeast campus mission is to “provide high-quality educational programs and services that promote student learning and prepare students for productive citizenship in a diverse society, and to contribute to the intellectual, cultural, and economic development of the region...The campus is committed to offering educational programs and services which promote and support diversity in all of its aspects.” (IU Southeast Bulletin, 2009-2011, p. 7). The IU Southeast campus mission and the SOE Unit mission support each other because of the intricate relationship between the quality of higher education provided to teachers and other school personnel and the youth that are prepared by these educators in area schools. The Unit Conceptual Framework articulates our professional commitments to knowledge, professional practices, teaching competence, and student learning. The Conceptual Framework also supports the Campus core values which have been added since the Conceptual Framework was written. The core values provide the foundation for the campus vision, mission, and strategic plan. Those core values are “nurturing environment, holistic learning, integrity, and connectedness”.

The Unit Conceptual Framework describes the benchmark for high-quality, challenging and innovative programs. Unit programs provide opportunities for candidates to gain skills, knowledge and dispositions for growth and success as they strive to meet the changing needs in our communities. The complex endeavor of learning the work of schools is embodied in our programs. High quality educators are shaped and reshaped by their continuous preparation, educational practices and teaching environment. IU Southeast teacher education programs reflect best practice knowledge about teaching and learning, view teaching as complex, as contingent on students’ needs and instructional goals, and as continually shaped and reshaped by students’ responses to learning events as described by Darling-Hammond (1999).

The Unit Conceptual Framework incorporates the SOE themes, SOE disposition statements, and individual program standards. The beliefs of the Unit are explicit, pervasive and evident within instructional practices. The CF is a shared vision developed and reviewed in collaboration with our professional community composed of unit faculty (tenure-track, lecturers, and part-time), unit professional staff, content faculty, P-12 faculty and administrators, program candidates, and program alumni. The CF provides a system to ensure coherence among curriculum, instruction, field experiences, clinical practice and assessment as candidates progress through programs. The CF is integrated into the UAS design and implementation. The CF outlines the dispositions that faculty value in teachers and other professional school

personnel. The School of Education believes that high quality educators cannot separate sound educational decision making from the dispositions associated with “caring.” The CF is a commitment to preparing candidates to support learning for all students and integrates diversity across curriculum, instruction, field experiences, clinical practices, assessments and evaluations. The CF includes a commitment to the use of technology to help all students learn and for educators through curriculum, instruction, field experiences, clinical practice, assessments, and evaluations. Candidate proficiencies are aligned with professional and state standards, including Indiana Professional Standards and with the learned societies aligned with NCATE.

A. Unit Goals Stated as Outcomes (Adopted 2007)

Candidates completing the Indiana University Southeast School of Education programs of study will demonstrate:

1. Knowledge of content and the use of best practices in delivering effective instruction to all students;
2. Dispositions necessary to help all students learn; and
3. Knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to participate in school transformation.

B. Unit Conceptual Framework Dispositions (Adopted 2001)

The following dispositions are assessed behaviorally at various points in each program to ensure that the Unit prepares high quality educators who:

- respect the legal and ethical norms and values of education
- effectively interact and collaborate with others and foster similar behaviors among students
- are committed to diversity through equitable treatment and respect for all individuals
- exhibit personal management behaviors valued by the professional education community
- are committed to inquiry and application of the knowledge base of education
- exhibit enthusiasm and respect for education as a practice and a profession
- are committed to database decision-making and fair practices
- are committed to continuous self-evaluation and personal improvement

(NOTE: A ninth disposition to strategically address the belief that all children can learn was approved by the unit in Fall 2012 for implementation in Fall 2013 upon the identification and approval of the specific elements.)

Adherence to Unit standards is monitored in various ways by program teams, advisory boards, and quality teams (Quality teams: Diversity; Faculty Performance and Development/Student Support and Recognition; Unit Governance and Resources; Program Assessment and Unit Evaluation; Curriculum Development; and Field

Experiences and Clinical Practice. Program teams: Elementary, Secondary, Special Education, Counseling, and Graduate Studies). The following sections describe each theme in depth and how the themes are integrated into the unit, programs, courses, assessments and candidate experiences.

C. Unit Conceptual Framework Themes

The Unit framework themes are derived from the SOE Mission and are aligned to the SOE Goals. Each of the four themes incorporates a set of assumptions about learning, teaching, and professional competence. The themes signify our commitment to professional education at Indiana University Southeast and guide our work in the Unit. These themes and corresponding SOE outcomes (in parentheses) are:

- High Quality Educators (SOE Outcomes 1, 2, 3)
- Caring Professionals (SOE Outcome 2))
- Continuous Transformation of Schools (SOE Outcome 3)
- Diverse Society (SOE Outcome 3)

II. **Theme: High Quality Educators**

High Quality Educators is the overarching Conceptual Framework theme. In May 2009, the School of Education faculty concluded that High Quality was embedded in and served as the foundation for the other three themes. This decision was reached after a syllabi review, an analysis of practices, and a discussion at a faculty retreat. One summary statement best captures the faculty members' thinking: "High quality is integrated throughout the curriculum and is reflected in our teaching. We emphasize best practice research applications for the candidates and they, in turn, implement such practices." These practices, in turn, ensure that candidates acquire the knowledge and skills necessary for being caring professionals, participating in the transformation of schools, and addressing the needs of all students in a diverse society.

High quality is defined as commitment to best professional practices as identified in programs' standards and to candidate and program assessment. The Unit Conceptual Framework theme of High Quality Educators is supported by a knowledge base developed from standards as outlined by the Indiana Professional Standards Board (OELD). The initial licensing programs of Elementary, Secondary and Special Education include standards for knowledge, skills and dispositions established by the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) as well as content and developmental standards developed by OELD and informed by national professional organizations. For example, in addition to INTASC standards, Special Education candidates meet OELD Exceptional Needs content standards informed by standards from the Council for Exceptional Children Advanced Standards, whereas candidates in the Master's in Elementary and Secondary programs meet standards established by the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). The School Counseling program uses the standards from the American School Counselor Association as guidelines. Licensure programs are aligned to their respective specialized professional associations: Educational Leadership with Educational Leadership Constituent Council;

Reading with International Reading Association and the National Council of the Teachers of English; Technology with ISTE: National Educational Technology Standards; and Gifted/Talented with the Council for Exceptional Children. Program standards align and incorporate OELD's developmental standards with guidelines from learned societies.

Based on the standards identified by learned societies and other professional organizations, we have identified two particular strands which, when woven together, create a high quality educator who represents our mission and vision. The first strand describes effective educators who know and can teach their content. The second strand is an assessment system that provides feedback to candidates and programs at multiple points as candidates prepare to become high quality educators.

A. Standards to Ensure Effective Educator Strand

High Quality Educators know and can teach their content. They have general and discipline-specific teaching knowledge and apply best practices differentially when working with different learning needs. Standards-based reformers have argued that teacher education is improved by establishing national benchmarks of high expectations against which candidates' performances can be measured. The Unit has established standards in accordance with OELD guidelines. Program standards delineate key aspects of professional practice and incorporate planning and preparation, creating a multi-cultural learning environment, effective instruction, leadership qualities, and professional responsibilities.

Initial candidates demonstrate general education knowledge related to the arts, communications, history, literature, mathematics, the natural sciences, and the social sciences. Candidates in the Unit understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structure of the discipline(s) they teach, plan, and create educational experiences that make these aspects meaningful for students. Unit standards include specific program content standards developed by specialized professional associations: Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC), International Reading Association (IRA), ISTE: National Educational Technology (ISTE: NETs-T), National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM), National Science Teachers Association (NSTA), Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), and *American School Counselor Association (ASCA)*.

The effective educator not only understands the discipline she/he teaches but must also possess the teaching knowledge necessary for creating environments where students can learn. Darling-Hammond (1992) warned that more rigorous achievement standards will not yield better schools unless instructional and delivery standards receive equal attention. The importance of both quality content and pedagogy preparation upon student achievement continues to be supported by research by Monk (1994), Goldhaber and Brewer (2000), Wenglinsky (2002), and Darling-Hammond, Holtzman, Gatlin, and Vasquez-Heilig (2005). The Unit ensures that candidates blend content knowledge with teaching knowledge to understand how children learn and develop, incorporating OELD Developmental Standards at appropriate levels.

Unit candidates meet standards regarding how and why instructional variety is important to motivation, management, and learning and provide opportunities to support intellectual, social, and personal development. Candidates use their understanding of intellectual, cultural, social, emotional, physical and psychological development to make informed decisions about which techniques to use in a particular context. By understanding how students think, why they tend to do what they do and how their needs and desires change, educators can facilitate instructional success. Effective educational professionals are attuned to students—listening to them and observing how they learn. Effective educators create learning environments that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and nurturing social environments that lead to increased student motivation to learn and take responsibility for their actions.

Candidates demonstrate mastery of subject content, appropriate practices, and the processes of critical thinking and creative thinking, and problem solving. Candidates use effective methods, including Instructional Technology, to achieve diverse educational goals aligned with professional standards and make decisions based on data information. Candidates create safe and effective learning environments aligned with the concerns, needs, and resources of individual students, their families, the school, and the community.

B. Assessing Candidate Performance Strand

The second aspect of preparing quality professionals is a systematically evolving assessment system that incorporates candidate proficiencies established from program standards. Assessment tasks are linked to program standards and situated in real-world problems or activities that are intended to be highly relevant to authentic experiences of educators in the field. Decisions about candidate performance are based on assessments made at multiple points before program completion. Valid and reliable assessments are used to systematically evaluate how well candidates' performances match program expectations.

Comprehensive assessment of candidate performance on standards is done in sequential clinical experiences. Candidates are immersed in school communities where they develop and demonstrate competence in the professional roles for which they are preparing. Early field experiences offer opportunities to assess prospective teachers' contextual awareness, which in later clinical work facilitates teaching techniques and learning processes (Staton and Hunt, 1992). The 2005 Studying Teacher Education: The Report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education reported the importance of early field and clinical experiences that are "planned, guided, and sustained interactions with pupils" (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education). Later field and clinical experiences include designing lesson plans and assignments, and observations by university and school faculty. Additionally, candidates prepare videotapes, collaborate with others on projects, compile samples of student work, and write reflectively to address goals, effectiveness, intentions, and analyses of student learning.

Candidate performance emphasizes specific ability and skills rather than the accumulation of course credit or other input measures. Assessments of teacher education candidates by means of standardized tests and grade point averages are used as one set of indicators of professional competencies. Performance data are also derived from a wide variety of other sources such as projects, essays, tests that demonstrate subject content mastery, portfolios, audio and video tapes of field and clinical experiences, reflections, and other evidence of proficiencies, including licensure tests. Unit candidates evaluate textbooks and materials; analyze teaching events, case studies and vignettes; assess student learning and needs; and defend decisions based on knowledge of learning, curriculum, students, and pedagogy. Certain elements included in the Unit's teacher preparation program reduce the attrition of first year teachers: "training in the selection and use of instruction materials, observation of other classes, feedback on teaching, and practice teaching". (Allen, 2003). In addition to authentic field experiences, cases and narratives illuminate the concerns and dilemmas of teaching and serve to link these issues to broad principles of knowledge (Bliss and Mazur, 1997). The Specialty Professional Association Program Review assessments on the authentic experiences related to planning, clinical work, and impacting student learning are included in each program's decision points and are used as part of the campus assessment report on the unit.

Performance-based assessment tools are used to describe what candidates should know and be able to do. Scoring rubrics are used in both initial and advanced programs to assess and improve candidate learning. Formative assessments are used for individual candidate performance in specific coursework. Summative assessments of individual candidates are conducted at crucial decision points in each program. Best practices are heavily reliant on the use of scoring rubrics (Arter and McTighe, 2001; Campbell, Melenyzer, Nettles, and Wyman, 2000).

The Unit values assessment as both a process and product . Assessment and evaluation are dynamic, ongoing processes that can be meaningfully and authentically assessed through a variety of assessments that are aligned to standards. Such assessments include but are not limited to portfolios reflecting work from selected courses, projects reflecting how candidates have impacted student learning, research such as the teacher as researcher paper, papers and projects reflecting candidates' ability to plan, and evaluations of both field and clinical placements. With the advent of the Program Review Process, programs have transitioned to the use of the required assessments to provide summative evidence of candidate learning. Programs have embedded formative assessment of standards in coursework prior to clinical and field experiences and related to the Decision Points.

Reflection is used in course assessments, research assignments, essay writing, journal keeping, discussion groups, debate, and in field and clinical work. Candidates' abilities to reflect on personal and professional beliefs and practices are also assessed through written teaching philosophies and position papers on topics such as inclusion, cultural diversity, classroom motivation, and assessment. Reflection is valued as a retrospective analysis, synthesis and evaluation of experiences that lead to informed changes in practice and enables educators to frame and reframe learning and formulate new plans of action (Schon, 1991).

Delandshire (1996) argues that candidates must play an important role in defining and discussing their own knowledge during the assessment process. SOE candidates also engage in self-assessment by examining and reflecting on personal successes and areas of needed growth at various points in their program. When possible, programs incorporate individual conferencing with candidates to further assess the accuracy level of candidate self-assessment. The Unit values the development of its candidates as reflective practitioners, one that Good and Brophy cite as a practice of effective teachers (2007).

The development of program assessment involves the expertise of various members of the professional community. Practitioners in the field are consulted in the design of assessments that are related to authentic school experiences. Program assessments undergo pilot testing, revisions and field trials. Assessment measures used at summative decision points are reviewed by program teams to ensure consistency and fairness. Rater training is utilized when multiple raters engage in “high-stakes” decision making.

The major assessment components for judging performance regarding degrees of success are clearly defined for candidates at various points in each initial and advanced program and incorporate a common rating system. Candidates are informed of standards and assessments through printed materials accompanying application packets, pre-admission advising sessions, course syllabi, Unit website, and the IU Southeast Bulletin.

Candidates receive feedback regarding their progress at major summative decision points. Evaluations are designed to encourage candidates to engage in continuous improvement by providing opportunities for remediation where appropriate to maintain the highest standards for the Unit. Additionally, the Unit provides a mechanism for candidates to appeal decisions at the course and program levels. The Unit’s assessment interventions promote excellence in the programs.

Systematic evidence of candidate progress is compiled, stored, and retrieved electronically. Program and Unit evaluations are compiled and analyzed to determine overall program success and areas needing attention. The Council on Preparing Education Professionals (COPEP, formed in Spring 2004) assists with assessment reviews. Other stakeholder groups convened by program teams also engage in assessment reviews. Data from Praxis and Educational Leadership testing and beginning educator documentation further assess respective programs. These analyses along with other feedback data are used to direct program revisions.

The campus Office for Intuitional Research and Assessment (OIRA) requires that each degree program report its candidate outcomes related to each Units’ goals or outcomes. The required reporting format has been aligned to each program’s assessments utilized for SPA reviews. This format has created a mechanism to look at all programs in a more cohesive manner and added a strategic way to look at each outcome across the unit as well as by each program.

High quality school personnel must also exhibit the second theme of the SOE mission: Caring Professionals. A high quality educator, who is effective in and out of the classroom with students, other professionals, parents/guardians and the community, will demonstrate the types of attributes of a caring professional. High quality is meaningless without positive affective attributes.

III. Theme: Caring Professionals

The second Unit theme that is indicative of high quality and assessed at various times within each program is Caring Professionals. The Unit is mindful that there is no prototypical “teacher or school leader personality” but believes that standards would be incomplete without attention to dispositions. Unit Dispositions are used as indicators of this theme.

A. Dispositions Strand

The SOE firmly believes that high quality educators cannot separate sound educational decision making from the dispositions associated with “caring.” The values found in the theme of “caring” are crucial to educators engaged in growth (Noddings, 1987). The common threads that run through this theme include the roles educators play in the lives of their students, in the welfare of the community, and in the ethics of personal and professional accountability (Ladson-Billings, 1995).

A caring professional:

- 1 respects the accepted legal and ethical norms and values of education
 - a) maintaining confidentiality of student records, parent communications, and private professional communications
 - b) using language free of profanity and derogatory statements toward any individual or groups
 - c) knowing and employing legal requirements of the education profession
 - d) adhering to high standards of truthfulness and honesty
 - e) showing respect for the ethical and moral values and concerns of the school, students and community
- 2 effectively interacts and collaborates with others and fosters similar behaviors among students
 - a) willingly and actively participating in group assignments, projects or activities
 - b) contributing positively and equitably to projects involving others
 - c) seeking membership on collaborative projects
 - d) leading projects or activities in a fair and equitable manner
 - e) facilitating the functioning of all group members in a shared project
 - f) designing and using collaborative activities and assessment
- 3 is committed to diversity through equitable treatment and respect for all individuals
 - a) being sensitive to the varying needs and dispositions of others
 - b) accepting and adapting to differences in learning styles and individual capabilities
 - c) facilitating learning by those with disabilities or with exceptional capabilities
 - d) examining diverse values, languages, and traditions in a respectful manner

- 4 e) giving thoughtful consideration to alternative and contradictory opinions
exhibits personal management behaviors valued by the professional education community,
- a) being present and punctual for professional activities and assigned duties\
 - b) being prepared for professional engagements
 - c) completing assigned work on time
 - d) showing leadership, self-respect and a willingness to take responsibility
 - e) fostering a sense of self-respect and self-control in others
 - f) respecting the intellectual property of others
 - g) maintaining the confidentiality of private records and meetings
- 5 is committed to inquiry and application of the knowledge base of education
- a) adopting contemporary modes of practice based on research and demonstrated best practices of the profession
 - b) maintaining an analytical openness to new ideas expressed in the professional literature
 - c) reading and learning continuously from the professional literature and professional development activities
 - d) participating regularly and enthusiastically in professional development activities
- 6 exhibits enthusiasm and respect for education as a practice and a profession
- a) expressing positive attitudes and a commitment to quality education
 - b) seeking opportunities to build positive relationships with others in the profession
 - c) participating in the meetings and activities of local, state and national professional associations and organizations
 - d) pursuing personal goals for professional development
 - e) exhibiting care for quality in the preparation and implementation of educational activities
 - f) being energetic and proactive in professional activities
 - g) listening and responding to others with enthusiasm and care
 - h) exhibiting positive leadership in professional activity
- 7 is committed to data-based decision making and fair practices
- a) using data based assessments to improve practice
 - b) engaging in action research to test and evaluate new ideas and recommendations
 - c) sharing the results of research with others
 - d) collecting data to understand a situation before taking or commending action
 - e) ensuring that all problems are addressed in due process for all
 - f) listening to children and families to ensure that their ideas and opinions are considered
- 8 is committed to continuous self-evaluation and personal improvement
- a) engaging in meaningful continuous reflective self-assessment and showing such assessment leads to plans for change
 - b) demonstrating positive changes in educational practices or personal behaviors over time
 - c) responding analytically and proactively to assessments by supervisors or others and making changes to address legitimate concerns

- d) actively seeking ways to solicit feedback for purposes of making quality improvements in practice

The Unit supports values, commitments and professional ethics that influence behaviors toward students, families, colleagues, and communities and that affect candidate learning, motivation, and professional growth. Candidates engage in continuous self-improvement and professional growth, support the professional development of others and display positive professional behaviors and dispositions as further evidence of caring professionals engaged in effective practice. Service learning is used to support this strand in several programs within the Unit.

B. Caregiver Strand

Just because people reason at higher levels of development does not guarantee that they will behave in moral and ethical ways. Too often, there is an absence of an explicit relationship between moral judgment and moral action (Sockett, 1992). Educators are caregivers, models, and mentors and must treat students with respect, set good examples, and support positive social behavior (Lickona, 2001). Teacher education programs must strive to create educators who are nurturers, who do not doubt the capacity of their students and respect the cultures in their community (Hilliard, 2001). Brophy and McCaslin (1992) report that ‘successful educators’ demonstrate more willingness to become personally involved with students and show confidence in their abilities to help students improve their behaviors. “As we close out a turbulent century and ready our schools for the next, educating for character is a moral imperative if we care about the future of our society and our children” (Lickona, 2001, p. 96).

Various cohort configurations within the Unit provide opportunities for candidates to learn in cooperative learning settings, to appreciate others’ perspectives, and provide collegiality to one another. The Counseling program prepares candidates in a “closed cohort model” in which selected candidates take all their coursework together in a prearranged sequence. Educational Leadership candidates move through a sequence of courses often enrolled with the same groups of candidates. The remaining programs are more “fluid” and allow flexibility for candidates to join at different stages rather than at a single entry point. Collaborative projects are used in efforts to strengthen socialization and provide faculty with greater insights into candidate ability to work with others.

A caring professional is concerned about students, colleagues, and the community. This means that a high quality caring professional will step forward and assume a leadership role in making sure that the school and community engage in activities that support the concept of teaching to the whole child. The third theme of the conceptual framework requires a high quality, caring professional who is prepared and willing to be involved in the transformation of schools.

IV. **Theme: *Continuous Transformation of Schools***

The third theme that is supported through high quality is the Continuous Transformation of Schools. The original theme was the “continuous renewal of schools” which was

defined as having knowledge of schools as organizations, knowledge about central issues that are at the center of school change, and skills to analyze and revise new approaches proposed in reforms (Holmes Group, 1986). School transformation encompasses not only the elements reflected in the “school renewal” definition but adds a focus on school reform. The subtle difference in definition was one that the Unit believed better reflected the desired outcomes for its candidates. Systematic reform takes into consideration the interrelatedness of all components that function together in the education system. As one component changes, so must the others in order to maintain the integrity, unity, continuity, and consistency of the entire system (Slick and Burrett, 1995).

Change involves learning to do something new. Interaction is the primary basis for social learning (Fullan, 2001). “New meanings, new behaviors, new skills, and new beliefs depend significantly on whether teachers are working as isolated individuals or are exchanging ideas, support, and positive feelings about their work” (Fullan, 2001, p. 84).

Transformed schools can rise to new challenges and find better ways to meet the needs of all students. Unit graduates must be equipped with the skills necessary to learn from the past and envision the future rather than be paralyzed by it. Considerations of change in education will be superficial if new teachers and other newly prepared school personnel lack well-developed visions about successful school practices.

Contemporary school change calls for systematic reforms that emphasize high levels of achievement for all students, interconnectedness, active learning, and shared decision making (Anderson, 1993). “In educating teachers, we can provide no formulas, only an induction to the kind of thinking and practice that good teaching involves, and the continued support of such thinking and practice” (Proefriedt, 1994, p. 75). The theory of school change clearly points to the importance of peer relationships in schools. “Effective teachers are informal leaders on the cutting edge of reform and are not afraid to take risks to improve education for all students” (2007. Stronge, 29).

A caring, high quality, educator is well positioned to participate in the transformation of schools. SOE preparation includes attention to four key knowledge and skill areas needed for transforming schools: effective communication, knowledge of assessment, Instructional Technology, and professional development. Knowledge and skills addressing these areas are imbedded in Unit and program standards and assessments.

A. Effective Communication Strand

Restructured schools begin with the premise that student learning is central (Henn-Reinke and Kies, 1998). Therefore, the ability of the educator to communicate effectively about student learning becomes crucial. Transformation of schools calls for educators who can communicate effectively with students, their families, other professionals and the community.

The communication contexts of schools and the educational process are complex. Educational settings are orchestrated around particular ways of speaking; asking for

and/or displaying information and knowledge; working with, for and against others as both individuals and members of groups; critiquing, contesting and connecting information; and interpreting all of these behaviors and events (Cochran-Smith, 1997). Candidates in the Unit learn communication techniques that foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction.

An essential characteristic of the educator intent on school transformation is the ability to reflect critically on one's practice and to communicate to others the insights from that process (Erickson, 1986). Candidates have many opportunities to develop reflective thinking throughout their programs. Portfolios are utilized to create habits of the mind that foster continual professional growth in educators, especially valuable in the first years of teaching (Anderson and DeMeulle, 1998; Grant and Huebner, 1998; Stone, 1998; Tierney, 1992).

School transformation is often reflected in the field as schools organize into professional learning communities. "To create a professional learning community, focus on learning rather than teaching, work collaboratively, and hold yourself accountable for results" (DuFour, 2004, 6). At the core of these three elements is the ability to communicate effectively.

Schooling is increasingly dependent upon collaboration between and among students, families, professionals and community members. Candidates in the Unit are given many opportunities to work collaboratively with other candidates in course-related projects, K-12 teaching communities, and higher education faculty. Candidates are also encouraged to engage in collaborative teacher renewal through the various professional organizations.

B. Knowledge of Assessment Strand

A second area crucial to school renewal centers on assessment that provides data needed for making professional decisions. Creating or selecting appropriate techniques and interpreting data collected require a thorough understanding of developmental levels and individual differences in P-12 students.

Assessment of student learning is "a central element of the teaching process. Assessment is used to determine the effectiveness of a lesson in terms of student learning and student engagement, to evaluate student progress, and as a basis for continuing instruction" (Stronge, 2007). Initial teaching candidates learn appropriate assessment strategies and implement these skills during clinical practice. Graduate teacher candidates build upon this knowledge and apply assessment principles in both a data analysis field placement project and a capstone research project. High-performing schools share the common element of having a focus on using assessment data to set instructional goals and make adjustments at the school level. (Cawelti, 2004; Heritage & Chen, 2005). Other school personnel candidates learn to analyze school data using it to plan and lead school improvement initiatives.

An understanding of the potential and limitations of various assessment techniques is crucial for school transformation to occur (Gardner, 1993; Gilligan, 1982; Kohn, 2000). Taking an active role in the transformation of schools means making comparative decisions with regard to the effectiveness of strategies such as cooperative learning (Johnson and Johnson, 1991; Marshall, 1998) versus behavioral master learning models. Candidates learn to plan and orchestrate instructional opportunities for P-12 students based on state standards and to assess progress through basic assessment concepts and skills; examine social and political issues associated with assessment; and learn how to relate decisions to assessment data. In addition, candidates learn about program assessment through their own involvement in the Unit's assessment system.

C. Instructional Technology Strand

Instructional Technology offers much potential for school transformation efforts. "Not only is the encroachment of information technology into children's lives inevitable, but it is critical to their future—and ours" (Snider, 2001, p. 356). Educators must be prepared to make appropriate decisions about the use of technology (Gillani, 2000). Accessibility to information and resources, individualization for student learning needs, ability to receive specific and immediate feedback, ability to experience real-world problems in the classroom and the potential to extend beyond the classroom are all initiatives that hold promise or invite misuse in school reforms. Teachers who receive professional development in the use of Instructional Technology are more likely to use computers in the classroom for projects such as student work that involves corresponding with experts, authors, or students from other schools as opposed to using the computer primarily for practice drills (U.S. Department of Education, 2000).

Candidates learn about Instructional Technology for: 1) planning, development, delivery, and assessment of instruction including project based learning, personal web pages, cloud computing; 2) problem solving; 3) school and classroom record keeping and administration; 4) educational research; 5) electronic information access and exchange that serves to enhance worldwide communication between youth; 6) enhancing visual literacy and creativity; and 7) personal productivity. The Unit is committed to preparing candidates who are able to use Instructional Technology to help all students learn. Instructional Technology builds on information processing models and constructivist theories that encourage inquiry and discovery learning whereby students inquire into subjects and seek to discover knowledge for themselves. Instructional Technology is integrated through standards for curriculum, field and clinical experiences, assessments and evaluations.

Faculty model the uses of Instructional Technology through e-mail, list serve discussion groups, chat rooms, Power Point, video conferencing, Internet searches, research projects, and hybrid, on-line and distance education courses. Faculty utilize various components of Oncourse, the university's online course management system; components include grade books, messages, announcements, assignments, syllabi, links, chat rooms, Wiki, blogging, and podcasting. They also utilize online websites such as Web 2.0. Distance learning has been implemented in the master's programs in off-campus workshops. The Unit also utilizes Instructional Technology to monitor the

UAS through the use of a campus supported Scantron data collection system and with assistance from the Unit's data coordinator.

D. Professional Development and Scholarship Strand

The continuous transformation of schools calls for quality professional development of current educators. For example, the undergraduate programs utilize research conferences, the Science Olympiad, and professional conferences. The advanced programs in the Unit incorporate the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) propositions to prepare master teachers, the American School Counselors Association Standards to prepare school counselors, and the Educational Leadership Constituent Council and the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards to prepare administrators. By aligning master's degree courses to these standards, the unit ensures that its graduate candidates are professionals who:

- are committed to students and their learning
- know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students
- are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning
- think systematically about their practice and learn from experience
- are members of learning communities

The "Teacher as Researcher" process has become a vehicle for candidates in the Master's in Elementary and Secondary Education to reflect about and improve the teaching and learning process. This research process values inquiry, collaborative work and proactive involvement from educators (Louis, Marks and Kruse, 1996). Through teacher-based research, practitioners reframe their understanding of teaching and learning in meaningful ways, and their voices contribute to the creation of the knowledge surrounding school transformation (Mertler, 2006; Ulichny and Schoener, 1996). The summative decision points for the master's program ensure that master educators can analyze and reflect on their practice and formulate school change.

The Unit prepares school administrators to act as the catalyst and creator of conditions of excellence so staff work together to implement academic goals. Candidates in the program learn the role of instructional leadership through study of curriculum, assessment and school reform (Beach and Reinhartz, 2000; Bennett, 1986; Bondi and Wiles, 2000). Fundamental to being an effective principal is having a compelling vision of leadership (Covey, 1994; Lambert, 1998; Fullan, 1997). Following state and national standards, school administrators are prepared for visionary leadership needed for school renewal through knowledge, skills, and dispositions involving: 1) visionary leadership (Bennis and Goodsmith, 1997; Costa and Kallick, 2000; Eaker & DuFour, 2008), 2) instructional leadership/school reform (Acheson and Gall, 1997; Arnold & Stevenson, 1998; Beach and Reinhartz, 2000; Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon, 2009), 3) organizational leadership (Razik and Swanson, 1995), 4) collaborative leadership/diversity (Delgado, 1995; Eagleton, 2000; Eaker & DuFour, 2008; Kozol, 1992; Persell, 1997), 5) legal/ethical leadership (Bradley, 2000; Cambon-McCabe, N., McCarthy, M., & Thomas, S., 2008; Covey, 1991; LaMorte 1996), and 6) systemic leadership/change (Bredesen, 1993; Daresh and Playke, 1992; Fullan, 1997).

The Unit prepares school counselors to facilitate the support of academic achievement of students along with the social and personal skills that candidates need to be successful in school renewal efforts. The Education Trusts Foundation (1998) has identified the school counselor as one of the key players in a school who can help close the achievement and opportunity gap for low income and minority students. Candidates in the school counseling program must understand the educational system and work for continuous renewal of that system in the service of students. The Counseling program prepares candidates in knowledge, skills and dispositions for the following areas: professional identity, social and cultural diversity, students and the learning process, education and learning systems and organizations, career development, intervention assessment, family and community, and program development/ implementation/evaluation.

In addition, SOE candidates and alumni take an active role in the School of Education Unit assessment process. Candidates are encouraged to participate on committees in charge of developing and reviewing Unit standards and assessments. In these roles, educators analyze the practice of exemplary educators as they create benchmarks and professional development materials.

Faculty engage in the transformation of schools through consulting and school improvement initiatives with K-12 schools as well as professional activities both within the Unit and at the campus level via the Institute for Learning and Teaching Excellence (ILTE). Grants such as the National Writing Project, the Scott County Partnership , and the Office of English Language Acquisition-English as a New Language provide opportunities for collaborative projects involving school transformation (See School Activities Document.) A partnership with two schools in Ecuador provides school transformation opportunities for candidates who participate in this international experience each summer. Another partnership exists between a faculty member and Sofia University in Bulgaria.

The essential element uniting all the strands of the high quality caring educator is the understanding and demonstration of effectively working and living in a diverse world. Diversity is the final theme of our conceptual framework.

V. Theme: Diverse Society

The high quality, caring professionals who focus on stimulating transformation of schools cannot be successful unless they are mindful of our multicultural, diverse society. The Unit defines diversity as the multiplicity of identities such as culture, race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, language, gender, religion, sexual orientation, geographic origin, and exceptionalities in accordance with NCATE (2000). Since the original CF initially framed the fourth theme around diversity, the Unit changed the theme from “Multicultural Society” to “Diverse Society” in May 2009 believing that the term more accurately defined its purpose. Feedback from stakeholders also provided rationale for this change. The stakeholders frequently identified only race and ethnicity as multi-cultural thus overlooking the other elements of diversity. The Diverse Society theme stresses the central human values of social justice, equal opportunity, and

respect for the dignity of all, regardless of their backgrounds and individual characteristics. “All students of all backgrounds bring talents and strengths to their learning and as educators we need to find ways to build on these” (Nieto, 2001, p. 121). This fourth theme is operationalized through diversity proficiencies that were adopted by the faculty in 2009. These proficiencies are embedded throughout each program and license area as reflected in curriculum and assessment mapping.

The adoption and support for these proficiencies is necessary for two reasons. First, these proficiencies were needed to implement the Unit’s Diversity Plan. It was written in 2000 and implemented through 2006 after which the Diversity Quality Team’s work plan included the unit’s diversity plan. The Unit’s Diversity Plan ensures educators can and will demonstrate proficiencies representative of pluralistic perspectives vital to improving teacher quality, expanding multicultural education, and increasing global awareness. The Diversity Plan was based on the following beliefs:

- The future of society depends on the valuing and success of each person.
- Education is a life-long process that includes the creation of new avenues for learning, access, and opportunities for all people.
- Student success is possible when educators, stakeholders, and communities provide support, and address varied learning needs, as well as create an environment that values diversity, multicultural, and global educational.
- As educators, we are more effective and productive when we respect and value cultural differences, and accept multicultural and global education as valid perspectives.

The second reason for adopting diversity proficiencies was the 2005-2009 IU Southeast Strategic Plan, which suggested that inclusion of diversity goals would require effort by the campus community. “Improved diversity and equity at the University require: a) a commitment from all its constituencies, b) curricular and co-curricular alignment with these principles, c) a pluralistic and welcoming campus climate, and d) a consistent and steady effort to ensure increased diversity of students, faculty, staff, and administrators.”

The Plan further enumerated:

- Diversity and equity will be among the guiding principles of IU Southeast and will be the responsibility of the entire campus community.
- IU Southeast will prepare students to function effectively in a culturally diverse community and a global society by infusing principles of diversity and equity throughout the curriculum.
- IU Southeast will improve the campus climate so that it reflects, respects, and is inviting for a diverse campus community, as well as the community at large.
- IU Southeast will become a model for diversity and equity in Southern Indiana by increasing the diversity of the campus community to at least that which reflects the population of our service area in appropriate proportions, including Southern Indiana and the Greater Metro Louisville region. We will create a pluralistic and

equitable learning environment that prepares students for the world at large and reflects the values of diversity, equity, and global awareness professed by the campus.

In keeping with these beliefs, the School of Education adopted the following diversity proficiencies, stating that all candidates will:

1. Respect diverse learners and their families
2. Understand and apply social justice
3. Create an inclusive learning community where differences are respected
4. Adjust lessons, educational materials, resources, guidance, and other materials to accommodate students' needs
5. Examine and reflect on personal practice to reduce bias and stereotypes within their work

The Unit understands that attitudes and beliefs about diversity affect decisions about student standards and assessment. The Unit provides candidates with opportunities to reflect on their own membership in multiple groups (e.g., ethnicity/race, class, gender) access to power and privilege (Hooks, 1994; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Zeichner, 1993). Richardson (1995) suggests that there is a continual interaction among knowledge, belief and practice and that effective professional development can include efforts to change teacher beliefs. Print and video materials are used for awareness training, discussion guides, and for fostering and promoting tolerance throughout the SOE curriculum. "Given the tremendous diversity in our society, it makes eminent good sense to educate all our students to be comfortable with differences" (Nieto, 2001, p. 121).

Proefriedt (1994, p. 74) warns, "Preparing teachers to work in a multicultural society is clearly not as simple as identifying a definable learning style for each group and inventing assignments, motivational strategies, and other aspects of educational environment in response to it." The Unit assesses candidate dispositions as they explore the interconnectedness between issues of race, class, and gender; power and privilege; and equity and equality.

The Unit helps prospective educators deconstruct the "magic bullet" myth and learn that pedagogical knowledge, like other forms of knowledge, must be socially constructed to take into account the specific group of students and other contexts, such as location and resources. With the proliferation of Internet sites, the old excuse, "I can't find materials on different cultures" can no longer be used (Gorski, 2001). "While no teacher can understand all of the reality of any other culture, much less the many different cultures represented in some of today's classrooms, every teacher can develop a series of critical skills and perhaps most important, attitudes of curiosity and respect, which will foster a sense of engagement, for the students and for the teacher" (Fraser, 2001, p. viii).

Candidates in the Unit learn knowledge, skills, and dispositions to respond appropriately to diversity and to the needs of all students, and promote educational success and positive personal change in themselves and others. Candidates familiarize themselves

with a broad range of literature on diversity issues (Ackerman, Bowen, Beier, & Kanfer, 2001; Asante, 2001; Association for the Gifted, 2001; Avramidis, Bayliss, & Burden, 2000; Bandura, 1977; Banks, 1995, 1997, 2002, 2004; Bennett, 2003; Bhatia & Ritchie, 1999; Boutte, 2002; Brannon, 2002; Brice, 2002; Canter, 1989; Charles, 2002; Delpit, 1995; Diaz-Rico & Weed, 2002; Erikson, 1968, 1980, 1985; Garcia, 2002; Glasser, 1986, 1990; Goldenberg, 1996; Gollnick and Chinn, 1994; Gorski (2001); Gurian & Henley, 2001; Hallahan & Kauffman, 2003; Halpern, 2000; Hamm, 2000; Irvine & Armento, 2001; Kohn, 1991, 1993; Koppelman, 2010; Kounin, 1970; Maslow, 1970; Mead, 1950; Nieto, 1992; Ogbu, 1991; Piaget, 1963; Roberts and Lindsey, 2005; Schlesinger, 2001; Shipler, 2004; Skinner, 1971; Spring, 2001; Tatum, 1994; Vygotsky, 1978; 1987; Woolfolk, 2004; Yugen, 1996).

Instructional strategies promote multiple perspectives on subject matter, presented in ways that take into account students' life experiences and circumstances. Motivational and instructional strategies that run counter to a cultural group's values are identified. Successful candidates learn to recognize and avoid what Grant (2001) calls "false understandings" with regard to phrases like "at-risk" which can lead to inaccurate knowledge and the miseducation of diverse learners. Candidates learn that unless youth are given multiple educational opportunities, higher standards will victimize students already harmed by gross inequities in the educational system (Ysseldyke, 2001).

Culturally relevant teachers are also passionate about subject matter (Ladson-Billings, 1994; Meier, 1995). High quality culturally competent educators place emphasis on the strengths of children and on using those strengths to build content knowledge (Day-Vines, 2000). Culturally competent school leaders ensure that schools are culturally proficient by practicing moral leadership that ensures that the educational needs of all students are met (Roberts, Lindsey and Jones, 2005).

The number of English as a New Language (ENL) students is growing and schools must focus on effective teaching practices. Increasing numbers of students are in our service area and the Unit has responded to preparing candidates, practitioners, and faculty through a University funded initiative (New Neighbors) and a Federal Professional Development grant (Network Capacity Building for ENL Best Practices). This five-year project systematically prepares faculty, candidates, and school personnel to meet the needs of English Language Learners. Teachers and other school personnel must be knowledgeable about effective classroom practices that include a wide range of grouping practices, communication strategies, assistive technologies, and reinforcement initiatives (Carter, 2000; Center for Equal Opportunity 2000; Haver, 2003; Krashen & Terrell, 2000).

Program candidates learn that language must be developed across the curriculum, that meaning is connected to students' personal lives, and that learning a second language involves teaching through various modalities. "The child brings into the classroom his or her personal inventory of intellectual, cultural, and linguistic resources, developed within the structures of his family, home, and community—and these resources are

replenished on a continual basis throughout his academic career” (Garcia & Beltran, 2003, p. 206). Additionally, language is a tool for learning (Vygotsky, 1978).

A child’s development cannot be understood without examining the external, social and historical world in which the individual’s life develops (Bronfenbrenner, 1960; Vygotsky, 1978, 1987.) Development is a collaborative enterprise between the members of the society and the child. Each member of the society assists the child by providing a learning environment that promotes the child’s cognitive development. Candidates learn to work in inclusive settings and seek assistance from other institutions that shape the values of the young, such as families, and community organizations and other resources (Davern, 1999).

On the surface, diversity and disability approaches share a common goal, that of access. However, several features of the relationship between the two demonstrate that they are not the same (Pugach and Seidl, 1998). Successful teaching candidates must also show evidence of their ability to plan, teach, and provide interventions and adaptations for the student with exceptional needs based upon assessment. “Essential components of inclusive assessment systems that must be understood and addressed are student participation in assessments, testing, accommodations, alternate assessments, reporting results and accountability. The implementation of these components directly influences the extent to which inclusive policies and practices become reality” (Lehr, 2003). Candidates learn how to differentiate instruction and utilize brain compatible strategies. Other school professionals must have the knowledge and skills necessary to provide support and leadership for students with exceptional needs. All candidates need to understand how a child’s social, emotional, and cognitive development can be impacted by exceptionalities in order to promote the health and wellbeing of the entire child.

All candidates must have the knowledge about student differences and care about the learning of all children. Candidates in the Unit are prepared to take an active role in making sure that all children receive an excellent high quality education.

VI. Conclusion

The Unit Conceptual Framework provides the basis for the Unit’s intellectual philosophy that distinguishes IU Southeast graduates from other institutions. The framework establishes a shared vision for the Unit’s efforts in preparing educators to work in P-12 schools. It provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, and field experiences as well as faculty scholarship, service, and unit accountability.

The Unit Conceptual Framework portrays an image of the teacher as a caring intellectual rather than a technician, and a knowledge generator rather than simply an implementer. The Indiana University Southeast School of Education Conceptual Framework is not permanent; it will continue to undergo continuous development and systematic management and change. The Unit is and has been “engaged in growth” as reflected in the clarifying changes in goals/outcomes, the adoption of “high quality” as the overarching theme, and the modifications made to two of the themes.

References

- Acheson, K. & Gall, D. (1997). *Techniques in the clinical supervision of teachers* (4thed). White Plains, NY: Longman Publishers.
- Ackerman, P. L., Bowen, K. R., Beier, M., & Kanfer, R. (2001). Determinants of individual differences and gender differences in knowledge. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 93, 797-825.
- Alderman, M. K. (2004). *Motivation for Achievement: Possibilities for Teaching and Learning*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
- Allen, M. (2003). *Eight questions on teacher preparation: What does the research say? A summary of the findings*. Education Commission of the States.
- Anderson, B. (1993). The stages of systemic change. *Educational Leadership*, 51(1), 68-73.
- Anderson, R., & DeMeulle, L. (1998). Portfolio use in 24 teacher education programs. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 23-31.
- Arnold, J., & Stevenson, C. (1998). *Teachers' teaming handbook: A middle level planning guide*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace & Company.
- Arter, J., & McTighe, J. (2001). *Scoring rubrics in the classroom*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Asante, M. (2001). The Afrocentric idea in education. In J. Noll (Ed.). *Taking sides*. Guilford, CN: Dushkin/McGraw-Hill.
- Asante, M. (1987). *The Afrocentric idea*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Association for the Gifted. (2001). *Diversity and developing gifts and talents: A national action plan*, Arlington, VA: Author.
- Athanasos, S. (1994). Teachers' reports of the effects of preparing portfolios of literacy instruction. *The Elementary School Journal*, 94(4), 421-439.
- Avramidis, E., Bayliss, P., & Burden, R. (2000). Student teachers' attitudes toward the inclusion of children with special education needs in the ordinary school. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16, 277-293.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Banks, J.A. (2004). *Handbook of research on multicultural education*. New York: Jossey-Bass.
- Banks, J. A. (2002). *An introduction to multicultural education* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Banks, J. A. (1997). *Teaching strategies for ethnic studies* (6th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Banks, J.A. (1995). Multicultural education: Historical development, dimension, practice. In J.A. Banks, & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.). *Handbook on research on multicultural education* (pp. 3-24). NY: Macmillan.
- Banks, J.A. (1994). *Introduction to multicultural education*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Banks, J.A. (1991). *Teaching strategies for ethnic studies* (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Beach, D. & Reinhartz, J. (2000). *Supervisory leadership: Focus on instruction*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

- Bennett, C. I. (2003). *Comprehensive multicultural education. Theory and practice* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Bennett, J. (1986). *First lessons – A report on elementary education in America*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Bennis, W. & Goldsmith, J. (1997). *Learning to lead: A workbook on becoming a leader*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Bhatia, T. K., & Richie, W. C. (1999). The bilingual child: Some issues and perspectives. In W. C. Richie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of child language acquisition*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Bliss, T., & Mazur, J. (1997). *How INTASC standards come alive through case studies*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Phoenix, AZ.
- Bondi, J. & Wiles, J. (2000). *Supervision: A guide to practice* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Boutte, G. S. (Ed). (2002). *Resounding voices: School experiences of people from diverse ethnic backgrounds*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bradley, M. (2000). Professionalism and ethics: An interdependent relationship. *Views, Insights and Perspectives*, 23(6), 1-4.
- Brannon, L. (2002). *Gender: Psychological perspectives* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bredesen, P. (1993). Letting go of outlived professional identities. *Education Administration Quarterly*, 29(1), 34-68.
- Brice, A. E. (2002). *The Hispanic child: Speech, language, culture, and education*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1960). Freudian theories of identification and their derivatives. *Child Development*, 31, 15-40.
- Brophy, J., & McCaslin, M. (1992). Teachers' reports of how they perceive and cope with problem students. *The Elementary School Journal*, 93(1), 3-68.
- Cambron-McCabe, N., McCarthy, M. & Thomas, S. (2008). *Public school law: Teachers' and students' rights* (6th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Campbell, D., Melenyzer, B., Nettles, D., & Wyman, R. (2000). *Portfolio and performance assessment in teacher education*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Canter, L. (1989). *Assertive discipline for secondary school educators*. Los Angeles: Lee Canter and Associates.
- Carter, C. (2000). *No excuses: Lessons from 21 high-performing, high-poverty schools*. Washington, DC: Heritage Foundation.
- Cauley, K. M., Linder, F., & McMillan, J. H. (editors) (2004). *Educational Psychology 03/04* (18th ed.). Guilford, Connecticut: McGraw-Hill/Dushkin.
- Cawelti, G. (Ed.). (2004). *Handbook of research on improving student achievement* (3rd ed.). Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.
- Center for Equal Opportunity. (2000). *The ABC's of English immersion: A teachers' guide*. Washington, DC.
- Center for Research on Education Diversity & Excellence. www.crede.ucsc.edu
- Charles, C. (2002). *Building classroom discipline*. (7th ed.) NY: Longman. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (1997). Knowledge, skills, and experiences for teaching culturally diverse learners: A perspective for practicing teachers. In J. Irvine (Ed.). *Critical*

- knowledge for diverse teachers and learners*. Washington, DC: AACTE Publications.
- Costa, A., & Kallick, B. (2000). Getting into the habit of reflection. *Educational Leadership*, 60, 62.
- Council for Exceptional Children, (2001), *CEC Performance-Based Standards*. http://www.ced.sped.org/ps/perf_based_std/standards.html.
- Covey, S. (1994). *First things first*. NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Covey, S. (1991). *Principle centered leadership*. NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Daresh, J., & Playke, M. (1992). *The professional development of school administrators*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1999). *Reshaping teaching policy, preparation and practice Influences of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards*. Washington, DC: AACTE.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Holtzman, D., Gatlin, S., and Vasquez-Heilig, J. (2005). Does teacher preparation matter? Evidence about teacher certification, teach for America, and teacher effectiveness. http://school_redesign.net
- Davern, L. (1999). Parents' perspectives on personnel attitudes and characteristics in inclusive school setting: Implication for teacher preparation programs. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 22(3), 165-182.
- Day-Vines, N. (2000). Ethics, power and privilege: Salient issues in the development of multicultural competencies for teachers serving African American children with disabilities. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 23(1), 3-18.
- Delandshire, G. (1996). From static and prescribed to dynamic and principled assessment of teaching. *The Elementary School Journal*, 97(2), 105-120.
- Delgado, R. (1995). *Critical race theory—the cutting edge*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University.
- Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children*. NY: The New Press.
- Diaz-Rico, L. T., & Weed, K. Z. (2002). *The crosscultural, language, and academic development handbook* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Dietz, M. (1995). Using portfolios as a framework for professional development. *Journal of Staff Development*, 16, 40-43.
- DuFour, R. (2004). What is a “professional learning community?” *Educational Leadership*, 61 (8), 6-11.
- Dutro, S. (2001). *Reading instruction for English language learners: Ten pedagogical considerations*. November 13, 2001, Noyce Foundation ELL study meeting. http://www.noycefdn.org/literacy_programs/ecrwfiles/Ten_Considerations.pdf
- Eagleton, T. (2000). *The idea of culture*. MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Eaker, R. & DuFour, R. (Eds.) (2008). *The collaborative administrator: Working together as a professional learning community*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.
- Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching*. NY: Macmillan.
- Erikson, E. (1985). *Childhood and society*. NY: Norton.
- Erikson, E. (1980). *Identity and the life crisis*. NY: W.W. Norton.
- Erikson, E. (1968). *The challenges of youth*. NY: Doubleday.
- Fraser, J. (2001). Preface. In J. Irvine (Ed.). *Critical knowledge for diverse teachers and learners*. NY: AACTE Publication.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *The new meaning of educational Change*. NY: Teachers College Press.

- Fullan, M. (1997). *What's worth fighting for in the principalship*. NY: Teachers College Record.
- Garcia, E. (2002). *Student cultural diversity: Understanding the meaning and meeting the challenge*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Garcia, G. & Beltran, D. (2003). *Revising the blueprint: Building for the academic success of English learners*. In G. Garcia, English Learners. Newark, DE: IRA.
- Gardner, H. (1993). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. NY: Basic.
- Gillani, B. (2000). Using the web to create student-centered curriculum. In R. Cole (Ed.). *Issues in web-based pedagogy*. Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Glasser, W. (1990). *The quality school: Managing students without coercion*. NY: Harper & Row.
- Glasser, W. (1986). *Control theory in the classroom*. NY: Harper and Row.
- Glickman, C., Gordon, S., & J. Ross-Gordon. (2009). *The basic guide to supervision and instructional leadership*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Goldenberg, C. (2001, January 25). Commentary: These steps can help us teach Johnny to read. *The Los Angeles Times*, p. B11.
- Goldenberg, C. (1996). The education of language-minority students: Where are we, and where do we need to go? *The Elementary School Journal*, 96, 353-361.
- Goldhaber, D.D., & Brewer, D.J. (2000). Does teacher certification matter? High school certification status and student achievement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 22, 129-145.
- Gollnick, D. & Chinn, P. (1994). *Multicultural education in a pluralistic society*. New York: Macmillan.
- Good, T. L., & Brophy, J. E. (2007). *Looking in classrooms (10th ed.)*. New York: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.
- Gorski, P. (2001). *Multicultural education and the Internet: Intersections and integrations*. NY: McGraw Hill.
- Grant, C.A., & Sleeter, C. (1986). Race, class, and gender in education research: An argument for integrative analysis. *Review of Educational Research* 56(2), 195-211.
- Grant, G. (2001). Critical knowledge, skills and experiences for the instruction of culturally diverse students: A perspective for preparation of preservice teachers. In J. Irvine (Ed.). *Critical knowledge for diverse teachers and learners*. NY: AACTE Publication.
- Grant, G., & Huebner, T. (1998). The portfolio question: A powerful synthesis of the personal and professional. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 233-43.
- Gurian, M., & Henley, P. (2001). *Boys and girls learn differently: A guide for teachers and parents*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hallahan, D. P., & Kauffman, J. M. (2003). *Exceptional learners: Introduction to special education (9th ed)*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Halpern, D. F. (2000). *Sex differences in cognitive abilities*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hamm, J. (2000). Do birds of a feather flock together? The variable bases for African American, Asian American, and European American adolescents' selection of similar friends. *Developmental Psychology*, 36, 209-219.
- Haver, J. (2003). *Structured English Immersion*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

- Henn-Reinke, K., & Kies, K. (1998). Institutionalizing a standards-based approach to teaching, learning and assessment. In M. Diez, (Ed.). *Changing the practice of teacher education*. ACTE.
- Heritage, M., & Chen, E. (2005). Why data skills matter in school improvement. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 86(9), 707.
- Hilliard, A. (2001). Teacher education from an African American perspective. In J. Irvine (Ed.). *Critical knowledge for diverse teachers and learners*. NY: AACTE.
- Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers*. East Lansing, MI: Author.
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress*. NY: Routledge.
- Irvine, J. J., & Armento, B. J. (2001). *Culturally responsive teaching: Lesson planning for elementary and middle grades*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- International Reading Association. (2001). *Second-language literacy instruction: A position statement of the International Reading Association* [online]. <http://www.reading.org/pdf/1046.pdf>
- International Reading Association, (2002). *Standards for reading professionals*. <http://www.reading.org/advocacy/standards/introduction.html>
- International Society for Technology in Education, (2002), *Educational Computing and Technology Standards*. <http://cnets.iste.org/NCATE>
- Johnson, D., & Johnson, D. (1991). *Learning together and alone* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Kohn, A. (2000). *The case against standardized testing: Raising the scores, ruining the schools*. Portsmouth, NY: Heinemann.
- Kohn, A. (1993). *Punished by rewards*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Kohn, A. (1991). Caring kids. *Phi Delta Kappan*, March 1991.
- Koppelman, K. (2010). *Understanding human differences: Multicultural education for a diverse America*. (3rd ed.) Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Kounin, J. (1970). *Discipline and group management in classrooms*. NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Kozol, J. (1992). *Savage inequalities: Children in American schools*. NY: Harper-Collins.
- Krashen, S.D., & Terrell, T.D. (2000). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom* (3rd ed.). Essex, UK: Pearson Education.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465-491.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lambert, L. (1998). *Building leadership capacity in schools*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- LaMorte, M. (1996). *School law cases and concepts*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Lickona, T. (2001). The return of character education. In J. Noll (Ed.). *Taking sides*. Guilford, CN: Duskin/McGraw-Hill.
- Louis, K.S., Marks, H.M., & Kruse, S. (1996). Teachers' professional community in restructuring schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, 33(4), 757-798.
- Luhr, C., & Thurlow, M. (2003). *Putting it all together: Including students with disabilities in assessment and accountability systems* (Policy Directions No., 16). Minneapolis, MM: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes. Retrieved 4/2/2010, from the World Wide Web: <http://education.umn.edu/NCEO/OnlinePubs/Policy16.htm>
- Marshall, H. H. (1998). Teaching educational psychology: Learning-centered and constructivist perspectives. In N.M. Lambert & B.L. McCombs (Eds.), *How*

- students learn: Reforming schools through learner-centered education* (pp. 449-461). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Maslow, A. (1970). *Motivation and personality*. (2nd ed). NY: Harper & Row.
- McLaughlin, M. (1995). *Performance assessment: A practical guide to implementation*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Mead, M. (1950). *Coming of age in Samoa*. NY: New American Library.
- Meier, D. (1995). *The power of their ideas*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Mertler, C.A. (2009). *Action research: Teachers as researchers in the classroom* (2nd ed.). L.A.: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Monk, D. (1994). Subject area preparation of secondary mathematics and science teachers and student achievement. *Economics of Education Review*, 13 (2), 125-142.
- National Association for the Education of Young Children, 2002. Advanced Programs. <http://www.naeyc.org/>
- National Association for the Education of Young Children, 2001. Initial Licensure Programs, <http://www.naeyc.org/>
- National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. What makes a teacher effective? A summary of key research findings on teacher preparation. Retrieved from <http://ncate.org/public/tachereffective.asp?ch=48>
- National Council for the Social Studies, (2000). *Programs for Initial Preparation of Teachers of Social Studies for Middle/Junior High and Secondary Teaching*. <http://www.ncss.org/standards/>
- National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (2003). *Program for Initial Preparation of Mathematics Teachers*. <http://www.nctm.org/>
- National Middle Schools Association, (2001). *Middle Level Teacher Preparation Standards*. <http://www.nmsa.org/>
- National Science Teachers Association, 1998. *Program for Initial Preparation of Teachers of Science or Science Specialists*. <http://www.nsta.org/>
- Nieto, S. (2001). What does it mean to affirm diversity? In J. Noll (Ed.). *Taking sides*. Guilford, CN: Duskin/McGraw-Hill.
- Nieto, S. (1992). *Affirming diversity: The Sociopolitical context of multicultural education*. White Plains, NY: Longman, Inc.
- Noddings, N. (1987). Do we really want to produce good people? *Journal of Moral Education*, 16(3), Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Ogbu, J. U. (1999). Beyond language: Ebonics, Proper English, and identity in a Black American speech community. *American Educational Research Journal*, 36, 147-184.
- Ogbu, J. (1991). Immigrant and involuntary minorities in comparative perspective. In M.A. Gibson & J. Ogbu (Eds.), *Minority status and schooling*. NY: Garland.
- Persell, C. (1997). *Education and inequality: The roots and results of stratification in America's schools*. NY: The Free Press.
- Piaget, J. (1963). *Origins of intelligence in children*. NY: Norton.
- Proefriedt, W. (1994). *How teachers learn: Toward a more liberal teacher education*. NY: Teachers College Press.
- Pugach, M., & Seidl, B. (1998). Associate Editors' Exchange: Responsible linkages between diversity and disability: A challenge for special education. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 21(4), 319-333.

- Richardson, V. (1995). *A theory of teacher change and the practice of staff development*. NY: Teachers College Press.
- Roberts, L., Lindsey, R. & Jones, F. (2005). *Culturally proficient school: Implementation guide for school leaders*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Santrock, J. W. (2003). *Adolescence*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Schlesinger, A. (2001). The disuniting of America. In J. Noll (Ed.). *Taking sides*. Guilford, CN: Dushkin/McGraw-Hill.
- Schlesinger, A. Jr. (1991). *The disuniting of America*. Knoxville, TN: Whittle Direct Books.
- Schon, D. (1991). *The reflective turn: Case studies in and on educational practice*. NY: Teachers College Press.
- Shipler, D. (2004). *The working poor: Invisible in America*. New York: Knopf.
- Skinner, B.F. (1971). *Beyond freedom and dignity*. NY: Bantam/Vintage.
- Sherman, A. (1994). *Wasting America's future: The Children's Defense Fund report on the costs of child poverty*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Slick, G., & Burrett, K. (1995). Bits and pieces. In G. Slick (Ed). *Emerging trends in teacher preparation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin, Press, Inc.
- Slovenia, R. (1991). Synthesis of research on cooperative learning. *Educational Leadership*, 48(5), 71-82.
- Smetana, J. G. (2000). Middle-class African American adolescents' and parents' conceptions of parental authority and parenting practices: A longitudinal investigation. *Child Development*, 71, 1672-1686.
- Smith, D. D. (1998). *Introduction to special education: Teaching in an age of challenge* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Snider, J. (2001). Education wars: The battle over information-age technology. In J. Noll (Ed.). *Taking sides*. Guilford, CN: Duskin/McGraw-Hill.
- Sockett, H. (1992). The moral aspects of the curriculum. In P.W. Jackson (Ed.). *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 543-69). NY: Macmillan.
- Spinelli, C. G. (2002). *Classroom assessment for students with special needs in inclusive classrooms*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice-Hall.
- Spring, J. (2001). *Deculturalization and the struggle for equality*. (3rd edition). NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Staton, A., & Hunt, S. (1992). Teacher socialization: Review and conceptualization. *Communication Education*, 41(2), 109-137.
- Stipek, D. (2002). *Motivation to Learn: Integrating Theory and Practice*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Stone, B. (1998). Problems, pitfalls, and benefits of portfolios. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 105-114.
- Stronge, J. (2007). *Qualities of effective teachers*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Tatum, B. (1994). Teaching white students about racism: The search for white allies and the restoration of hope. *Teachers College Record*, 95, 462-476.
- Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, (2001). *Standards for Initial Preparation of Teachers of Secondary English Language Arts*.
<http://www.tesol.org/assoc/standards/index.html>
- Tierney, D. (1992). *Teaching portfolios: 1992 update on research and practice*. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

- Tracz, S., Sienty, S., & Mata, S. (1994). *Self-reflection of teachers compiling portfolios for national certification: Work in progress*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Chicago.
- Ulichny, P., & Schoener, W. (1996). Teacher-researcher collaboration from two perspectives. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(3), 496-524.
- U.S. Department of Education (2000). *Stats in Brief: Teacher use of computers and the internet in public schools*. Office of Educational Research and Improvement. NCES 2000-090.
- Vygotsky, L. (1987). *The collected works of L.S. Vygotsky*, Vol. 3. In R Rieber & A. Carton, (Eds.). NY: Plenum Press.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wenglinsky, H. (2002). How schools matter. The link between teacher classroom practices and student academic performance. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 10 (12). Retrieved from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v10n12/> .
- Wolf, K., & Dietz, M. (1998). Teaching portfolios: Purposes and possibilities. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 9-21.
- Woolfolk, A. (2004). *Educational psychology* (9th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Ysseldyke, J. (2001). Reflections on a research career: Generalizations from 25 years of research on assessment and instructional decision making. *Exceptional Children*, 67(3), 295-309.
- Yugan, . (1995). *Constructivism and gender education*.
- Zeichner, K. (1993). *Educating teachers for cultural diversity*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.

APPENDIX

Conceptual Framework Timeline

Fall 1999

- The Unit begins the process of revising the Conceptual Framework.
- The Danielson model is piloted with the undergraduate programs and based on INTASC standards.
- The NBPTS outcomes are adopted for the Master's in Elementary and Secondary Education program and aligned with INTASC standards.
- Counseling, Ed. Leadership and Special Ed. evaluate their programs for IPSB content standards.
- The Danielson model is reported to not be working for the secondary team.

Spring 2000

- Fields, Gilbert and Wall are designated to draft Unit Dispositions. (1/19/00)
- A Conceptual Framework Survey is conducted with SOE faculty and analyzed.
- Stakeholder groups provide SOE with feedback on dispositions.
- Dispositions are adopted by the SOE. (4/19/00)
- Spring Retreat focuses on development of Unit Belief Statements. (5/4/00)

Fall 2000

- Goals and Beliefs are reviewed by stakeholder groups and reviewed by SOE program teams.
- Belief Statements are approved by SOE. (9/20/00)
- SOE Dispositions are included in course syllabi and advising sessions.
- SOE designates Wall, Bailey and Hottman to work on Mission Statement. (10/16/00)
- Goals and Belief statements are aligned with INTASC, IBSB and approved by SOE. (10/16/00)

Spring 2001

- Refined Mission Statement approved by SOE. (1/17/01)
- Beliefs, Goals and Dispositions are shared at Superintendents Breakfast. (2/1/01)
- Quality Teams created: Diversity, Unit Assessment, Faculty Development, Governance/Resources. (2/00)
- The Unit Assessment Team begins to monitor UA progress.
- Feedback from stakeholder groups is provided to SOE.
- Program teams develop Knowledge Base to support Conceptual Framework.
- IU Southeast Office of Institutional Research collaborates with unit to develop electronic data collection.
- A Unit Assessment Director is assigned to direct the transition to IPSB 2001 standards.
- Summative Decision Point descriptors and rating categories are finalized by the SOE.

Summer 2001

- Coordinators are provided with release time and meet weekly to refine Unit Assessment.

- Coordinators identify four themes taken from mission statement to organize the Conceptual Framework. (6/15/01)
- Coordinators assure the Unit that INTASC/ IPSB standards are included in program standards. (6/30/01)
- Coordinators provide a Program Knowledge Base to form the basis of the Conceptual Framework. (6/30/01).
- School Council reviews first draft of Conceptual Framework.
- Faculty and Stakeholder Groups receive written notice from the SOE Dean indicating that a draft of Conceptual Framework is on the SOE website for review.
- Conceptual Framework is discussed at SOE Fall Retreat (9/21/01).
- Faculty and stakeholders provide additional changes in Conceptual Framework.
- Program Coordinators meet individually with Office of Institutional Research to share program-specific information for electronic database.

Fall 2001

- SOE Dean holds orientation meetings with Fall 2001 adjuncts to review new standards, CF, assessment and licensure changes, and syllabus.
- Program Coordinators finalize how data from Dispositions will be aggregated and reviewed.
- The Office of Institutional Research creates a common electronic application for all undergraduate programs.
- Draft of Conceptual Framework is placed on the website for final review by adjuncts and full-time faculty. (9/5/01).
- Final draft of SOE Conceptual Framework is approved (9/19/01).
- Unit Assessment Team begins 2000-2001 data collection and review process as outlined in Conceptual Framework.
- The Unit Assessment Team establishes plans for monitoring the Unit Conceptual Framework annually for modifications, changes, and revisions and brings these changes through the Unit procedures for review.

Spring 2002

- UAT reviews Conceptual Framework to ensure that INTASC and IPSB standards are embedded (12/01).
- Draft of minor modifications to Conceptual Framework is sent to SOE and stakeholders via e-mail for review.
- Modifications to Conceptual Framework are approved by SOE (4/17/02).

Spring 2003

- UAT reviews CF and asks programs for any suggestions on changes. No modifications were made.

Spring 2004

- PAUE Quality Team (Formerly UAT) reviews ENL as addition to CF under diversity theme.
- The knowledge base sources are updated to reflect texts and readings used in programs by Babione, Morganett, and Murray.
- Drafts of the proposed changes are shared and discussed at Faculty Meeting 3/18/04 and 4/16/04 and changes are incorporated into document.
- The Executive Summary of the CF is reviewed to ensure that it continues to reflect the full CF document.

Spring 2005

- No changes recommended. Technology in CF recommended to study in 05-06. Dean will convene an ad-hoc study group.

Fall 2005

- NCATE visit

Fall 2007

- Faculty members begin to discuss the alignment of the SOE Goals with the Conceptual Framework and whether to adopt goals that are aligned with the Conceptual Framework
- Faculty explores how the suggested goals that are more closely aligned to the Conceptual Framework would assist in communicating the Unit's goals in the Campus assessment report

Spring 2008

- Faculty members approve the revised candidate goals and renamed them outcomes. A revised mission statement was written to align with the new language.

Fall 2008

- New outcomes and mission are reflected on syllabi.
- Quality team chairs meet to review Conceptual Framework and decide to complete a syllabi review to determine whether changes need to be made to the Conceptual Framework.
- New outcomes are included in the campus assessment reports.

Spring 2009

- Syllabi review is completed and results reported at faculty retreat
- Faculty reviews information and recommends changes to the conceptual framework.

Fall 2009

- Conceptual Framework document draft revision written

Spring 2010

- Conceptual Framework document draft reviewed by faculty
- Faculty provides input to updated knowledge base
- Stakeholders review updated Conceptual Framework

Fall 2010

- Revised draft reviewed by faculty and stakeholder groups
- Additional revisions based upon stakeholder feedback
- Final version approved by faculty (12-10-2010)

Summer 2012

- Addendum related to Standard Three written

Fall 2012

- Added disputation to measure belief that "all children can learn": ad hoc committee appointed to identify elements
- Addendum reviewed
- Updated/edits due to unit and state changes

January 2013

- Addendum approved

Transforming Teacher Education at IU Southeast through Clinical Practice

Addendum to Conceptual Framework

To prepare and empower educators for the 21st century classrooms, teacher education at IU Southeast is shifting from emphasizing high quality academic preparation and coursework moderately tied to school-based experience to initiatives that are fully grounded in clinical practice and interwoven with high quality academic content and professional coursework (NCATE, 2010). IU Southeast proposes to transform our School of Education (SOE) programs by placing “practice” at the center of educator preparation through the formation of strategic school partnerships to better serve prospective teachers and advanced program candidates and the students and families they serve.

In order to make this change to a more clinically-based model, the unit resolves to work more closely in partnerships with school districts. These partnerships will include shared decision making and oversight on candidate performance and program completion. Accountability will be brought closer to the classroom, and more attention to the impact on student learning. Personnel in designated schools will undertake a more substantial role in designing and implementing teacher education programs, selecting candidates for placement in their schools, and assessing candidate performance and progress.

The unit will collaborate with targeted area schools to create varied and extensive opportunities for SOE candidates to prepare for work in school settings. A clinically based approach to teacher education will give prospective and in-service educators the opportunity to integrate theory with practice, to develop, implement, and evaluate classroom management and pedagogical skills, and strengthen their abilities to work with their professional community. This initiative will strengthen the knowledge, skills and dispositions of educator candidates, as outlined in the IU Southeast School of Education Conceptual Framework. To strengthen the SOE Conceptual Framework theme of diversity, program candidates will complete early and clinical field experiences with diverse populations (as defined by NCATE) in schools designated as ‘partners’ for collaborative professional development initiatives.

Clinical faculty will be selected from higher education and P-12, using established benchmarks and criteria. P-12 clinical and university faculty will jointly determine whether teacher candidates are ready to enter classrooms, based on candidate performance and student outcomes. Advanced program clinical faculty also ensure that candidates are prepared to enter clinical experiences. Candidates, at the initial and advanced levels, will experience working directly with students in schools as they study theory, content, and pedagogy of teaching and also prepare for their area of teaching through virtual classrooms assignments, online research, delivery of content through online instruction, and documentation of instructional proficiency via digital media.

The SOE will work to shift the reward structure to value faculty involvement in schools through initiatives involving promotion and tenure requirements. We will work to reduce structural barriers and

create supports for partnerships with districts by changing schedules in teacher preparation programs to align with school calendars and utilize school sites for coursework and meetings.

The field and clinical experiences at IU Southeast are articulated around the 10 Design Principles for Clinically Based Preparation as stated in the report of the Blue Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation and Partnerships for Improved Student Learning (2010):

- 1 Student learning is the focal point for the design and assessment. Candidates will develop practice as defined by the Common Core State Standards for the subjects for which they have been developed.
- 2 Clinical preparation will be integrated throughout the teacher education program with content and pedagogy woven around clinical experiences in coursework, laboratory-based experiences and in-school practices.
- 3 Candidate progress will be judged on the basis of student outcome data including summative and formative assessments, data from structured observations of candidate skills by supervising teachers and university faculty, and data on program changes.
- 4 Programs will prepare teachers who are expert in content and how to teach content as innovators, collaborators and problem solvers through a broad range of effective and differentiated teaching practices and multiple assessments, evaluated within changing environments.
- 5 Candidates will learn in interactive and collaborative professional communities with rigorous peer review of their practice and impact of student learning.
- 6 Field and clinical supervisors are drawn from both higher education and the P-12 sector and rigorously selected and prepared and commensurately rewarded.
- 7 Specific sites will be designed to support candidate learning and student achievement.
- 8 State-of-the-art technologies will be employed to promote best practices and facilitate on-going professional development.
- 9 A powerful research and development infrastructure will jointly be developed to gather and use data on teaching effectiveness, best practices and program performance.
- 10 Strategic partnerships will be formed with common work for responsibility, authority, and accountability covering all aspects of program development and implementation. Systematic changes will take place in policy and practice in partnering institutions.

Timeline for Implementation:

- 2010-2011 Unit votes to move Standard 3 to 'target' in December 2010.
- Unit begins discussions to determine a baseline for how close each team is to the 'target' for NCATE.
- 2011-2012 Verbal commitments, plans, and organizational work begins. Unit discusses high quality field experiences at faculty meetings/retreats.
- Advanced licensing programs, such as Reading, Gifted and Talented, Technology, Educational Leadership, and Special Education, strengthen field and clinical component requirements with assessments aligned to specialty organization standards for accreditation reviews.
- Graduate Program maps all core coursework to include field experiences focused on differentiating instruction, with a focus on diversity.
- Elementary Team begins the first steps toward implementing a clinically-based model. Schools are selected for partnerships and collaborative field components are formed.
- Unit sends selected faculty to co-teaching training.
- 2012-2013 Each SOE program conducts a 'self-study' to determine status of program for alignment to NCATE Standard 3 'target.'
- PD is implemented for clinical faculty, in areas noted in need of improvement.
- QT3 prepares Target Checklist for IR for NCATE Standard 3.
- Unit prepares and adopts a position paper on IUSoutheast Best Practices for Field and Clinical Experiences, (BPFCE) to be included as an Addendum to the SOE Conceptual Framework.
- Unit continues to move undergraduate programs to partnership school involvement with an emphasis on involvement from Clinical Faculty.
- Elementary team pursues clinical field experiences with two diverse schools in Jefferson County Schools.
- Elementary Block II team incorporates an action research focus to improve the quality of teaching and learning in the classroom, analyzing data from their own teaching through multiple forms of assessments.

Elementary team implements a 'pilot' co-teaching model for student teaching, where teacher candidates and their mentor teachers will work together to improve student learning.

Advanced programs strengthen collaboration with in-service teachers, educational administrators and community leaders through action research initiatives to improve the quality of teaching and learning in the classroom.

By May 2015 Unit addresses the needs of area schools to help improve P-12 student learning.

Unit uses contemporary technology, online streaming videos, case studies and analysis to help candidate learn skills necessary for improving student learning.

Quality teams study the changes needed for Unit compliance:

QT1: Rigorous assessments of knowledge, skills and dispositions will be evaluated and redesigned as determined through collaboration between SOE and P-12 Clinical Faculty and aligned to national and state standards and SOE CF. (HQ, CP)

QT2: Ensure that program assessments are reviewed by Clinical Faculty regarding "buy-in" and assessed in collaboration with partner sites. (HQ, CT)

Assist programs to design assessments with a focus on understanding teaching and learning through observation protocols and school and district reviews. (HQ)

QT3: Field and clinical compliance to NCATE Standard 3.

Partnerships must have a significant role in designing and implementing programs, selecting candidates for placement in their schools, and assessing candidate performance and progress. (HQ, CT)

Team determines acceptable partnerships with regard to technologies. (CT)

QT4: Diverse field experiences built into the collaborative partnerships so that all candidates are exposed to settings with diverse students. (MS)

QT5: PD initiatives become shared experiences between SOE Faculty and Clinical Faculty in the field. (HQ, CT)

Criteria for the qualifications of cooperating teachers, and school mentors for Principal and Counseling are reviewed to ensure expertise. (HQ, CP)

QT6: Governance related issues such as load requirements from University Faculty working in the field are studied such as recommending changes in thereward

structure to value clinical teaching and support effective mentoring and improvement in clinical preparation. (HQ)

Identify financial incentives to reward expansion of partnerships such as grant initiatives. (HQ, CT)

By or Before May 2016 Goals of the partnership are integrated into the partnering institutions.

Partnership work is expected and supported and reflects what is known about best practice.

Unit collects data to monitor progress of programs and disseminate what has been learned from this research.

By or Before May 2017 Systematic changes are in place in policy and practice in partnering institutions.

Policy, at the district and university levels, supports partnerships for clinically based teacher preparation.

Improvement of student learning is documented.

Improvement of school partnerships for clinically-based teacher preparation is documented.

Improvement of collaboration with school partners to advance curriculum content and professional coursework is documented.

New staffing models are in place in partnership schools.

By or before May 2019 Extensive field clinical practice and implementation of evidence-based interventions are in place.

Best practices as evidence of delivering innovative teaching are documented.

Advising-mentorship duties and responsibilities for both advisors and advisees to promote student success are established.

Unit adopts TaskStream and 100% of programs use it to store and analyze data for program improvement.

Preparation that takes place in school settings will help ensure that candidates will be prepared. Transforming teacher education by placing clinical preparation at the center of training programs has the potential for purposeful changes in schools. Through new roles, incentives, and rewards for teachers and

faculty, the SOE will work together to develop assessments and new instructional approaches. This Addendum to the Conceptual Framework is a 'living document' and will be in need of modifications and updating as the IU Southeast School of Education continues to move towards 'target' for NCATE accreditation.

Source:

Transforming teacher education through clinical practice: A national strategy to prepare effective teachers. (2010). Commissioned by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.