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Introduction

Purdue University hosted a continuing accreditation visit during March 6-10, 2004, in West Lafayette, Indiana. This visit was a joint visit of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Indiana Professional Standards Board (IPSB). The previous continuing accreditation visit was in 1999, and the Unit Accreditation Board (UAB) granted Purdue University continuing accreditation at that time.

Please consider this document as the official rejoinder to the Board of Examiners Report for the Continuing Accreditation Visit to Purdue University that was held in March 2004. Following this visit, the Board of Examiners (BOE) found all standards met at the initial and advanced levels. However, the BOE cited one continued weakness, i.e., Area for Improvement, and five new Areas for Improvement. However, we respectfully request the removal of two of these Areas for Improvement. We are particularly pleased that two of the weaknesses from the previous visit were removed. This removal acknowledges the dedication and hard work of our faculty and staff.

First and foremost, we appreciate the feedback from the BOE. We know that we have a strong Teacher Education Program and are pleased to have external confirmation of that fact with the team’s findings of “Met” for each of the six NCATE standards. We also are pleased with the overall positive tone and many affirmations found in the BOE report. We obviously agree with those findings and affirmations of the Unit at Purdue University, and with the comments about the high quality of our institution, our programs, our faculty, staff and candidates.

The Unit for Purdue University teacher education programs is exceptionally large and extremely complex. Also, teacher education at Purdue is a collaborative enterprise. The School of Education (SOE) serves as the Unit and encompasses programs across the university, within the Schools of Agriculture, Consumer and Family Sciences, Liberal Arts, Science, and Technology, as well as the Graduate School.

The purpose of this rejoinder is to provide reflection on the BOE report. More specifically, this rejoinder: (1) provides explanations to clarify areas that we believe were not clearly or fully explained in the BOE Report; (2) provides evidence which we believe was not used, was overlooked, or that existed but was inadvertently not provided to the team when they were on-site; and/or (3) describes why we believe the team did not apply a correct interpretation of the NCATE standard to the Unit.
Purdue University Rejoinder to the Board of Examiners Report

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

New: The unit does not ensure ongoing assessment and monitoring of dispositions for all candidates.

Rationale: Although there are checklists in some programs, the deficiency model currently in use is not sufficient to encourage candidates to reflect on their development of professional dispositions.

We believe that this should be removed as an area for improvement.

Teacher education programs at Purdue University take seriously their obligation to help candidates reflect on and develop appropriate professional dispositions. Candidates’ dispositions are systematically assessed in both initial and advanced programs, and candidates have the opportunity to reflect on and adjust their dispositions at multiple points in their programs. According to the NCATE standards, in a unit at the acceptable level with respect to Dispositions for All Candidates, “Candidates are familiar with the dispositions expected of professionals. Their work with students, families, and communities reflects the dispositions delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards” (NCATE, 2002, p. 16). At Purdue University, we believe that all of our programs meet this criterion. In addition, discussions already were underway at the time of the BOE visit to provide candidates with additional opportunities to reflect upon and develop plans to enhance their own dispositions. These activities reflect the target level of performance for assessing candidate dispositions.

The Board of Examiners Report focuses much attention on a “deficiency”-oriented Dispositions Assessment Form (Appendix A) in use at Purdue. This document, and the corresponding exception reporting and remediation process associated with its use, is only one aspect of a comprehensive dispositional assessment system in the Unit. Dispositions and knowledge are incorporated into our conceptual framework and reflected in candidate performances, which are monitored continuously throughout all programs. As the NCATE standards note, “Dispositions are not usually assessed directly; instead they are assessed along with other performances in candidates’ work with students, families, and communities” (NCATE, 2002, p. 19). The Indiana Professional Standards Board takes a similar stance in asserting that “It is the Board's belief that dispositions cannot be assessed independently; rather, they must be demonstrated through habitual performance over time and that these judgments can only be made by professionals who themselves have demonstrated that they recognize, understand, and value identified dispositions” (http://www.in.gov/psb/standards/preface.html).

Consistent with this view, we regard dispositions as an integral component of candidates’ performances, which are assessed throughout their programs of study. The Board of Examiners Report seems to be agreement with this position when it states, “All programs integrate into their professional education methods coursework the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that enable candidates to effectively teach in diverse classrooms and respond to the academic, social and emotional needs of diverse learners.” (p. 52). For example, all elementary and secondary education initial program candidates take EDCI 205 – Exploring Teaching as a Career. For the electronic portfolio assignment in this course, candidates create an artifact consisting of three assignments from the course: an educational autobiography, a field experience journal, and an educational philosophy. Dispositions are clearly integrated in each of these component
assignments, and assessment through the artifact rubric focuses on the relevant Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) principles, which include knowledge, dispositions, and performances. Similarly, during the student teaching experience, candidates are assessed by cooperating teachers and supervisors on their performances, including knowledge and dispositions. Thus, from the beginning of the teacher education programs to the end, dispositions are part of the systematic assessment of candidates.

In addition to course assignments that require candidates to reflect upon dispositions, a Professionalism Agreement (Appendix B), now in use in both elementary and secondary education courses, alerts candidates to dispositional expectations and requires them to reflect on these dispositions prior to field experiences. The Professionalism Agreement was designed using the same dispositional framework as the exception reporting and remediation process that uses the Disposition Assessment Form, but it takes a positively worded and proactive approach that expects and encourages candidates to develop and display appropriate dispositions. Candidates sign the Professionalism Agreement, which is aligned with institutional, state, and professional standards, in advance of all field experiences. This provides a systematic method for helping candidates to understand and reflect on the expectations that the unit, and our cooperating schools, have for conduct, professionalism, and attitudes.

Advanced programs also address and assess dispositions as part of the performances expected of advanced candidates. Each advanced program is designed to address the six competencies depicted in the outer ring of Purdue’s Model for Professional Preparation (Appendix C). All of these competencies (Appendix D) have dispositional elements, and one, Engage in Professional Development, specifically states that advanced candidates will, “demonstrate the disposition for life-long learning and continuous professional development.” While the specific methods of assessment vary by advanced program, all assess the performances of candidates, including dispositions, as aligned with and mapped to standards.

Finally, while we believe that dispositions are already assessed and monitored through all programs, additional steps to make the focus on dispositions more overt are already planned. Implementation of candidate dispositional self-assessments, with appropriate feedback from the faculty to validate the self-assessments and make recommendations for additional professional growth opportunities, have been discussed by both the Elementary and Secondary Education Committees in meetings this academic year. Tentative plans call for the use of such forms in at least two places in the initial preparation programs, prior to admission to teacher education and prior to student teaching. Advanced programs have similar plans.

It is for these reasons that we respectfully request that this item be removed as an area for improvement.
Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

New: The unit assessment plan does not specify the timeline points at which each data source will be analyzed, nor does it specify who is responsible for analysis, interpretation, and application of the data for program improvement.

Rationale: Although the unit has a UAS and has begun the implementation of many components of its UAS, it does not have an over-arching nor consistently implemented plan with time lines, feedback loops, and responsible parties to clearly establish and monitor the full implementation of their UAS at the unit level and in all programs and offices.

We believe that this should be removed as an area for improvement.

The Unit does, in fact, specify timeline points for data source analysis and identify responsibility for these with regard to program improvement. There is a decision-making process and calendar already implemented. The unit highly values a continuous improvement process, of which the unit assessment system is an integral component.

Organizational Structure
The Unit for Purdue University teacher education programs is exceptionally large and extremely complex. We understand and recognize that we need to do a better job in communicating this complexity and organization to an outside audience. In addition, teacher education at Purdue University is a collaborative enterprise. The School of Education (SOE) serves as the Unit and encompasses programs across the university, within the Schools of Agriculture, Consumer and Family Sciences, Liberal Arts, Science, and Technology, as well as the Graduate School. Teacher education is governed by a Teacher Education Council, which is chaired by the SOE Dean, with official representatives from the Schools of Agriculture, Education, Consumer and Family Sciences, Liberal Arts, Science, and Technology. In addition, candidates at both the initial and advanced levels are represented, as are K-12 school personnel, and the Purdue North Central and Purdue Calumet campuses. This governance structure and decision-making body have been well-established at Purdue University. Assessment issues are fundamental to this Council and data are reported annually for discussion among members and for subsequent faculty discussion in the program areas. Curriculum is under the purview and responsibility of faculty in the respective program area wherever that program is housed. Revisions to the program may be initiated by faculty for action through the governance structure.

One of the major accomplishments of this past year was the hiring of a new dean who began restructuring the School of Education to better organize and communicate issues in teacher education. Searches have been underway since earlier this academic year to fill two redefined Associate Dean positions. The position of Associate Dean for Learning and Engagement will provide leadership for teacher education. This reorganization is anticipated to provide more focus for teacher education at Purdue University and thus, assist with communication efforts. All teacher education issues and subsequent program improvements are under the purview of the dean and are initiated by the dean via the Teacher Education Council and/or the department heads, currently a very “flat” organizational structure. This structure places all assessment system issues under the dean, which was clearly established at the time of the visit. Likewise, the Associate Dean for Learning and Engagement will have authority to carry out and lead changes in teacher education as needed. The dean will continue to improve unit operations with the two associate dean searches that have been underway since fall 2003. The support for unit operations is engrained in the culture of the university. As stated in the BOE Report “the SOE leadership shows great promise in moving this unit forward.” (p. 76)
Similarly, an Assessment Coordinator and Database System Administrator were recently secured as permanent positions and hired to assist with overseeing the assessment system and technical aspects of the system. The underlying assumptions and goals are to strengthen what already is in place. Adding faculty and staff assists with this effort.

Processes and Calendar
As stated earlier, there are data-based decision-making processes in place and these are ongoing. The Purdue University Strategic Plan and the supporting Schools Strategic Plans serve as high level organizers for the Unit Assessment System. A disciplined and pragmatic operational assessment and decision making system is in place. Calendars for reports and requirements for the university and schools encompass a specific timetable for assessment activities. A schematic of the decision making system, calendar schedule for assessment timelines and electronic portfolio rollout are included in Appendix E. This information already existed and was available to team members in other formats, documents, reports and meeting minutes, such as those of the Teacher Education Council (TEC). This annual reporting cycle to the TEC and other groups, for example, ensures a systematic review of pertinent reports in order for those groups to provide appropriate recommendations based upon data.

As stated earlier and reflected in the BOE Report, the Unit and its programs at Purdue University are extremely complex. We understand that it is difficult to assimilate large amounts of information in a short amount of time and that we need to do a better job in communicating to an outside audience. As an example of a miscommunication, the BOE Report states, “The 2001-2002 survey, and the only one for which results were provided, resulted in a response rate of 17.1 percent (85 out of 498).” (p. 33) In fact, survey data was provided in the Office of Professional Preparation and Licensure annual reports for the academic years of 1998 through 2003. The response rate for 2002-03 was 20.5 percent and most years it was approximately 20 percent. However, we are taking measures, such as working with university supervisors, to increase this rate of response.

Candidate Assessment
Given the complexity and culture of teacher education at Purdue University, the component of the assessment system under most revision, i.e., assessment of candidate standards-based performance, was the focus of our assessment plan, particularly since unit operations have been well-established. The preparations for the site visit focused on emerging elements rather than established elements. As the BOE Report states, “The School of Education has a system for collecting and reporting annually information regarding candidate proficiencies, competence of graduates, and most aspects of unit operations.” (p. 40)

As stated in the institutional report, pages 40-41, following is a brief chronology of the candidate performance component of the assessment system roll out:

- Block implementation began Fall 1999.
- Most components of the gate system were implemented beginning in Fall 2001.
- Although piloting of electronic portfolios began with Block I Fall 2001, faculty adopted a portfolio assessment roll out schedule of Gate A in Fall 2002, Gate B in Spring 2003, Gate C in Fall 2003, and Gate D in Spring 2004.
- The portfolio assessment component began implementation in Fall 2002. Subsequently, the Elementary and Secondary Education Committees decided to incorporate gate portfolio assessments within courses rather than have this process occur outside of courses. Portfolio assessment rubrics are included within courses. This action was due to
logistical considerations and to emphasize the importance of gate assessments to the candidates as well as provide consistency for these assessments within courses.

- The Purdue Electronic Portfolio administration established a roll out schedule for the electronic portfolio in Blocks as initial portfolio Block I (Gate A) in Fall 2002, beginning portfolio Block II (Gate B) in Spring 2003, developing portfolio Block III in Fall 2003, Block IV in Spring 2004, Block V in Fall 2004, and Block VI in Spring 2005. The secondary program areas will roll out PEP for methods courses between Fall 2003 and Fall 2004, and student teaching during Spring 2005. Keep in mind that this schedule is for electronic portfolios and the portfolio assessment follows the gate roll out schedule noted above.

- Beginning in the fall of 2002, the Assessment Council was formed from the School of Education Block Council and the Unit Assessment System Task Force. This Council along with an Assessment Coordinator manages the data system and coordinates assessment initiatives. The Assessment Council will continue as an advisory body until Spring 2005. At that time a decision will be made to determine the need to continue the Council or to forward its duties to another entity such as the School of Education Leadership Team or Teacher Education Council.

- As part of the Title II grant received, an integrated electronic portfolio pilot project was implemented. The elementary student teaching pilot tested the use of the PEP and the Documentation of Indiana’s Academic Standards (DIAS). The Elementary and Secondary Education committees approved the use of DIAS as part of portfolio assessment. The Elementary Committee adopted the pilot design for Gate D portfolio assessment. The Secondary Committee will review the Elementary model for possible adaptation.

- Faculty approved a disposition exception reporting process. This process may be used by faculty, staff, and classroom teachers to bring a deficiency with regard to professional conduct to the attention of faculty and the TEC Special Cases Committee. This process is in addition to the already implemented function of the TEC Special Cases Committee which hears testimony in cases of the following types: 1) candidates who have not met criteria for proceeding in a teacher education program and who desire a hearing; 2) issues of judgment that cannot be resolved by OPPL; 3) issues related to dispositions of candidates, as required by state and national licensing standards; and 4) issues related to University-approved fitness criteria that may be identified, advertised, and documented for individual students. Faculty also approved a Professionalism Agreement that is signed by the candidate each semester prior to field experiences.

Other Assessment Elements
The following documents and data sources are examples of elements in the unit assessment reporting system that were available at the time of the accreditation visit:

- The Office of Professional Preparation and Licensure (OPPL) annual reports and Office of Field Experiences annual reports

- The Purdue University School of Education Title II reports

- The Purdue University First Year Teacher Performance Assurance Program provides a guarantee of support and assistance within the State of Indiana to Purdue University graduates performing below standards during the first year of teaching. The program provides faculty and staff to collaborate with school or agency personnel by: 1) reviewing the first year teacher’s evaluation reports; 2) working with the teacher and supervisor in planning a program of assistance, and 3) offering consultation and professional services to both the teacher and supervisor. It also offers an opportunity for first year teachers to participate in additional course work or non-credit professional development opportunities at no cost during the graduate’s first year of teaching or the
subsequent summer. Data for this program is under the jurisdiction of the dean who then is able to aggregate the data by program area in order to analyze and address program weaknesses.

- Data are utilized from the Indiana Professional Standards Board Beginning Teacher Internship report. This information communicates to institutions the success of their graduates during this state beginning teacher program. Information from this report also is utilized to contact the principal where the Purdue University beginning teacher completed the induction period for further details regarding the beginning teacher and his/her preparedness to teach.

- Other data include Purdue University course surveys, faculty/staff observation forms, graduate/employer surveys including longitudinal graduate surveys, faculty evaluation instruments, and data from the Center for Career Opportunities. Data are reported to faculty and staff within the program areas and to various entities such as the Teacher Education Council and Assessment Council.

With regard to program improvement, faculty in the program area review data and may initiate change in the curriculum as needed through the governance structure. Many of the program areas consult with advisory boards primarily comprised of K-12 colleagues. It is through this collaboration by which faculty are kept informed of K-12 needs. Possible conceptual framework changes are discussed by faculty via retreats and meetings.

The Teacher Education Council (TEC) and the Assessment Council review data from the Gate system. If change is warranted, these entities discuss and approve any revisions to the Gate system. The TEC also reviews program data and approves program revisions.

Faculty and course evaluation process are ongoing. During each course, evaluations of the course and the instructor are conducted. Information from the evaluations is then shared with the course instructor. The faculty evaluations also are included in the individual merit and tenure promotion process. The department head meets with faculty to review their performance and to discuss plans for course improvements and professional development.

Thus, mechanisms and timelines were established at the time of the accreditation visit. Some of these decision making processes have been well established, while others are just recently implemented and/or emerging. It is anticipated that, based upon data, future revisions to these processes may be warranted in order to further enhance the unit assessment system.

It is for these reasons that we respectfully request that this item be removed as an area for improvement.
Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

New: The unit does not specify clear criteria for performance in all programs at the initial and advanced levels.

Rationale: Although the elementary blocks have developed sets of rubrics for the assessment of performance at gates, other programs vary in the degree to which they have designed and implemented rubrics or other instruments to judge performance. There is uneven understanding about what constitutes a rubric or statement of criteria to judge performance, how criteria are used in the production of rubrics, and for what kinds of performances rubrics may best be used at the initial and the advanced levels.

We support retaining this area for improvement.

Although we believe the Unit has specified and communicated clear criteria for performance in all programs at the initial and advanced levels in terms of mapping syllabi and assignments to professional, state, and institutional standards, we concur that our implementation in the production and use of rubrics to assess these criteria has been uneven.

The Unit recognizes the importance of having a clearly articulated set of criteria that address appropriate professional, state and institutional standards. These criteria are embedded in a candidate’s course of study, communicated in course materials, demonstrated through course assignments and assessed through properly designed and implemented rubrics and feedback mechanisms. Although we recognize our implementation of this total approach requires further improvements, we believe we have a solid foundation upon which to strengthen existing elements, a clear path to the next level of refinements, and a proven track record of successfully building and operating complex and large-scale systems.

All Programs
As noted in the Institutional Report and as part of the reform faculty mapped the respective standards to their curriculum. A mapping specialist was hired to analyze the mapping guides and report the results to the faculty. Faculty completed a final review of closing gaps and eliminating unintended redundancies in their curriculum during the fall of 2001. As new standards are approved and previous standards revised, faculty will continue to review and revise their curriculum as needed. The mapping guides include all Indiana Professional Standards Board (IPSB) developmental and content standards and have provided assurance of the inclusion of relevant national (professional) standards and Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) principles.

Faculty matched curricula to the Unit’s Conceptual Framework Model for Professional Preparation. In addition, four strands weave throughout the program as core experiences and emphases, including diversity, technology, field experiences, and portfolios. A summary of the model and the strands is presented in Appendix F.

Initial Teacher Preparation
Initial teacher preparation programs incorporate curricula that integrate the pedagogical knowledge, dispositions, and skills set forth in the INTASC principles and the IPSB developmental and content standards. They are communicated to candidates by faculty via classes, field experiences, and syllabi and by the Office of Professional Preparation and Licensure via written materials, electronic messages, orientations, and a website with complete standards information. The Teacher Education Program Guide is an example of communication
efforts (see Appendix G). Although initial teacher preparation programs may vary in how they
developed and are using rubrics as gate assessments, they are in place, they reflect standards, and
they are communicated to candidates within the context of their programs of study.

Advanced Preparation

Although we recognize the task is not yet fully complete, much work has been put into the
development and implementation of rubrics at the advanced level as well. The Board of
Examiners concurred with this perspective in their report, “At the advanced level, rubrics have
been created that reflect the advanced Conceptual Framework in the Educational Leadership
Program, the School Counseling Program, and the Speech Pathology Program. Other advanced
programs are in various stages of creating and implementing rubrics and assessments that reflect
the advanced conceptual framework.” (p.29)

At the advanced level, all programs have adopted graduate competencies aligned to the
conceptual framework and standards. The general competency areas include: synthesize
knowledge, create knowledge, communicate knowledge, think critically and reflectively, engage
in professional development, and participate actively in their profession. In addition, many
advanced programs, such as Educational Leadership, Gifted Education and School Counseling,
have adopted competencies related to the standards of their professional organizations.

Each program area determines and documents the alternative ways that candidates may
demonstrate the general and program area competencies. The program areas are responsible for
monitoring the satisfactory progress and attainment of competencies of candidates in their
programs. A variety of procedures, experiences, and products to satisfy the competencies are
possible. The program areas are flexible and sensitive to individual candidates’ prior
experiences and future goals. Variations among program areas and candidates are desirable and
acceptable, reflecting our commitment to diversity.

Upon completion of an advanced program of study, advanced candidates are expected to be
accomplished educators whose practices are consistent with the IPSB content and developmental
standards as in initial practitioner programs, but at a higher level of proficiency. Advanced
candidates also are expected to adhere to applicable professional association standards or the five
core propositions of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). For
example, educational leadership candidates adhere to the Interstate School Leaders Licensure
Consortium (ISLLC) standards, school counseling candidates adhere to the Council for
Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) standards, speech
pathology candidates adhere to the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA)
standards, and gifted education candidates adhere to the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC)
Professional Standards, Performance-Based Standards for Gifts/Talents. Advanced teacher
candidates in the content areas adhere to the NBPTS standards.

In terms of rubric development and implementation, rubrics are in place for the Educational
Leadership Program, the School Counseling Program, and the Speech Pathology Program.
Because professional standards only recently were adopted for the Gifted Education program,
rubrics are in the process of being developed and implemented for that program. The advanced
teacher programs have developed models for using NBPTS standards to train mentors and assess
candidates through clearly articulated rubrics. These rubrics will be operationalized as part of
the TaskStream implementation schedule presented in the Appendix H.
Electronic Portfolios

Although it was originally planned, the current Purdue Electronic Portfolio (PEP) system does not yet include adaptable rubric development and reporting modules, and the project’s funding has expired. Because of this, and as communicated during the accreditation visit, the unit will implement a commercial electronic portfolio system that includes modules to develop and disseminate rubric templates, and produce reports within and across programs. Since the time of the visit, the School of Education Leadership Team has approved TaskStream as the product to replace PEP beginning the Fall 2004 semester. The TaskStream implementation schedule, which is based on the PEP implementation schedule, is included in Appendix H.

The use of an electronic portfolio system with structured yet flexible rubric development and reporting modules has several advantages. For example, such a system will allow for reflecting the true diversity and complexity of the Purdue University educator preparation programs while, at the same time, consistently providing important design features through the use of basic rubric and report templates. The accuracy, fairness and consistency of applying these rubrics also will be enhanced through training on the development and use of electronic rubrics by faculty and candidates.
Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

New: Plans are not in place for assuring the accuracy, fairness, and consistency of assessment procedures and other key assessments.

Rationale: Although individuals and specific groups have initiated informal or qualitative means to assure inter-rater reliability and to increase rates of returns for surveys, there is uneven implementation of or understanding about how to initiate either qualitative or quantitative means to assure greater consistency. Only a small number of small qualitative or quantitative processes have been taken to deal with these issues in a substantive way at the initial and advanced levels.

We support retaining this area for improvement.

Although we believe the unit is committed to and has taken effective steps to eliminate all potential sources of bias in its policies and practices at all levels, including assessments of candidates, programs and operations; we concur that our written plans and implementation for assuring the accuracy, fairness, and consistency of assessment procedures and other key assessments have been uneven.

Because Purdue University is a research extensive institution, the Unit is immersed in a culture that fosters and supports adhering to the highest standards for conducting disciplined inquiry and protecting the rights of individuals and groups at all stages of the assessment enterprise. For example, faculty are strongly committed to ensuring the fairness, accuracy, and consistency of candidate assessments. As demonstrated during the accreditation visit, these assessments are based in standards. Syllabi and assignments specify what performances are to be demonstrated and by what criteria they will be assessed. Rubrics articulate developmental levels of performance related to criteria, and they are shared with candidates in conjunction with assignments. When courses involve multiple sections with multiple instructors, course coordinators conduct training and revise procedures, when necessary, to improve the quality of candidate assessments.

Because the fairness, accuracy, and consistency of candidate assessments are dependent upon a clearly articulated program of study that properly integrates performance assessments with standards-based assignments within an underlying conceptual framework, efforts to make improvements in this area cannot stand alone. Operationally, this means such efforts will be framed within the context of transferring unit assessment system performance assessments from the Purdue Electronic Portfolio (PEP) to TaskStream. Important features of TaskStream that will assist in this effort include modules to develop and disseminate rubric templates, and produce within and across program reports. The use of clear, comprehensive and consistently applied, standards-based rubrics will be greatly enhanced through the use of this tool. Training for faculty and candidates on the development and use of accurate, fair and consistent assessments will be included in the TaskStream rollout timetable, as summarized in the Appendix H.

The topic of fairness, accuracy, and consistency of candidate assessments also is a part of the ongoing reporting and decision-making system for improving programs and the unit as a whole. Beginning Fall 2003, program conveners were asked to submit End of Semester Gate Portfolio Assessment Summary Reports to the Assessment Coordinator. Although implementation of this first round was uneven, most of the initial teacher preparation reports were available at the time of the accreditation visit. Among other topics, conveners were asked, “What procedures were used to ensure the assessment of candidates was fair, accurate and consistent?” Responses to this
question supported the need for more systematic attention to this area. Consequently, in addition to the TaskStream training noted above, the Assessment Coordinator will survey program conveners on this topic, and then include the findings and recommendations in the annual Fall 2004 report to the Teacher Education Council. Thereafter, program conveners will be required to include related status updates as parts of their own annual reports beginning Spring 2005.

Improved rates of return for surveys also are important to the Unit. Where practicable, surveys have been integrated into the established communication channels for candidates and other constituents. For example, surveys of student teachers and their cooperating teachers have been folded into the regular feedback procedures during the student teaching experience. In recent years, response rates have improved from between roughly one-quarter and one-third of the participants to nearly one-half. Another approach the Unit is pursuing to improve return rates for constituents such as graduates and employers is to secure support for non-respondent follow-up procedures conducted by support staff and/or graduate assistants.
**Standard 4: Diversity**

**New:** Not all advanced programs ensure adequate opportunities for candidates to interact with diverse P-12 students.

**Rationale:** *If a candidate’s field experience and clinical practice occur entirely within his or her own worksite, the unit may not be providing adequate opportunities for advanced candidates to interact with diverse P-12 students.*

The Unit agrees that this is an area for improvement and found this feedback helpful.

In light of our strong commitment to diversity, as reflected in our conceptual framework, we believe it is important for all of our programs to provide adequate opportunities for candidates to interact with diverse P-12 students. We agree that this is not currently happening in a few of our advanced programs. Consequently, the Unit will move forward to strengthen its commitment to diversity through increased exposure of advanced program candidates to diverse P-12 students.

**Background**

Most of our advanced programs serve in-service teachers who are pursuing advanced preparation on a part-time basis in order to add a new license to their existing license. Therefore, we have attempted to structure our advanced programs in ways recommended in the staff development literature on the characteristics of adult learners by making the programs as relevant as possible to the candidates’ current teaching situation. Feedback on course evaluations suggests that this approach is appreciated by our candidates and seen as one of the most positive aspects of our programs. However, the BOE feedback has helped us to see that an inadvertent effect of our pragmatic approach to advanced programs has been difficulty ensuring that all of our candidates have exposure to diverse groups. For example, some districts have primarily high or low socioeconomic status (SES) students. Others have few special education students. Still others have a substantial Hispanic population but few African American students and so on. Although we have stressed all of these types of diversity in our advanced program curricula, we have not systematically structured our programs to ensure that advanced teacher education candidates will have the opportunity to interact with diverse P-12 students. We believe that it is important to provide advanced candidates with experiences with exceptional students and students from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups. The issue then becomes how we accomplish this fundamental commitment to diversity while retaining an approach of designing instruction for advanced programs that takes the learning needs and characteristics of adult learners into account.

**Action**

The Interim Associate Dean for Academic Programs has developed a plan for addressing this area for improvement. All program conveners of advanced programs will be surveyed to determine which ones currently meet this standard and which ones do not. The advanced programs that are ensuring candidates opportunities to interact with diverse P-12 students will provide brief descriptions of how they are doing so. These descriptions will be shared with the remaining programs. Next, the advanced programs that are not currently providing adequate opportunities for interaction with diverse P-12 candidates will develop specific, written plans for providing such interactions in their programs. Finally, collaboration with the Teacher Education Assessment Coordinator will occur to monitor implementation of the plans and support efforts to achieve the intended results, that is, systematically ensuring opportunities for all advanced level candidates to interact with P-12 students.
Standard 4: Diversity

Continued:  (Formerly Standard II.B. Composition of Candidates):  The unit has not successfully recruited and retained a sufficiently diverse student population.

Experiences working with diverse candidates: The unit continues to have difficulty recruiting and retaining undergraduates from underrepresented groups.

Rationale: The university and School of Education clearly delineate strategic goals to increase the number of underrepresented groups, and there have been many university and school-level initiatives to attract and retain minority candidates. However, the number of minority undergraduates in teacher education has decreased over the last five years.

The Unit agrees that this is an ongoing area for improvement.

This area for improvement of our undergraduate teacher education programs is due largely to contextual/geographical issues that form the baseline from which continued efforts must proceed. The Unit has a clear commitment to diversity, which is reflected in our conceptual framework for teacher education and in the Purdue University and School of Education strategic plans. As noted in the BOE Report, “The Unit has enacted this commitment by engaging in many efforts to recruit and retain minority candidates.” Thus far, these efforts have met with some success but not as much success as we anticipated. The recruitment and retention of candidates from underrepresented groups will continue to be an emphasis for the Unit. Following, we describe our commitment to diversity, discuss some of the challenges we face in increasing the number of undergraduate teacher education candidates who are from underrepresented groups, and describe our plans for the future.

Commitment to Diversity

Both the Purdue University and the School of Education strategic plans include goals related to increasing the diversity of the student body. For example, the University plan includes an overarching goal to “build a student body, faculty, and staff that reflect our society” and the School of Education includes an overarching goal to “encourage and support an environment that represents and values diversity as defined in accordance with NCATE Professional Standard 4.” The University and the School are continually expanding their infrastructure in support of these goals. As noted in the BOE Report, positive results have already been achieved for increasing the diversity of the School of Education faculty and for increasing the number of underrepresented groups in School of Education graduate programs. Undergraduate teacher education programs have proved to be more challenging for contextual reasons which are outlined below, not as an apologia, but as a rational explanation of the factors that challenge us. Understanding of these contextual factors is essential to the construction of new, strategic initiatives that will increase the number of candidates from underrepresented populations in initial licensure programs at Purdue.

The Target Population for Undergraduate Teacher Education at Purdue University

The issue of “underrepresented groups” immediately leads to the fundamental question. “What is the target population for teacher education at Purdue?” Many undergraduate programs at Purdue, such as those in engineering, business, and agriculture, draw their students from international, national, and regional prospect pools. Teacher education programs, on the other hand, have a more local prospect pool. Teacher education candidates tend to select preparation programs in their own state that are close to their home communities. Thus the demographics of the prospect pool for teacher education are weighted toward the regional prospect pool. Because
of this natural inclination toward regional and local programming, the target population for undergraduate teacher education at Purdue University resides primarily in Tippecanoe County and its contiguous county region.

**Contextual Challenges**

By far the biggest challenge we face in recruiting more teacher education candidates from any groups beyond the immediate area is **geography**. Unlike graduate education, undergraduate teacher education is largely a local enterprise. Most of our teacher education applicants are from Indiana. In Indiana, there are few Native Americans and, until recently, few Hispanics. There is a fairly substantial population of African Americans, but these individuals are concentrated in urban areas far from Purdue (see Appendix I). Most teacher education candidates in Indiana want to teach in their home communities when they complete their degrees. The typical aspiring teacher wants to go to school close to their home to ensure that their field experiences will occur in schools in their community where they hope to ultimately find their first teaching position. These trends are even more pronounced in underrepresented groups as these students are very community-oriented and strongly connected to their home environments. In addition, many of these students are likely to want to live at home in order to reduce the costs of a university education. Thus geography creates a substantial barrier to the recruitment of teacher education candidates from underrepresented groups.

The second biggest challenge is **funding**. Surveys of minority students who apply but choose not to attend Purdue teacher education programs suggest that costs are one of the biggest barriers to attendance. Many potential applicants from underrepresented groups can’t afford a Purdue education. In fact, the reason for the decrease in numbers of teacher education candidates from diverse groups over the last three years may be due in part to the escalating costs of a Purdue degree. A Purdue education today is simply out of the reach of many teacher education students from underrepresented groups. Unlike students in engineering, sciences, or business elsewhere on campus, education students are often unwilling to take on large amounts of debt to finance their education because they are aware that the teaching profession does not provide sufficiently high salaries to assure them of capacity for debt repayment at the conclusion of their education. Unlike graduate students, undergraduate students cannot secure assistantships to help defray the costs of their education. We are a new School of Education (14 years old), with limited scholarship funds for undergraduate students. The School’s scholarship program presently grants scholarships to approximately 25 students through 16 named awards, each of which provides students only $1000. Currently available scholarship funds are simply insufficient to overcome the financial challenges of recruiting students from underrepresented groups.

**Opportunities**

As noted in the BOE Report, there are many programs already in place that target the recruitment of underrepresented groups, “The unit has a history of working toward attracting minority students into teacher education.” (p. 54) Some minority recruitment programs, like Project SET and SOE program invitation letters, are specific to teacher education; others, like Explore Purdue and Destination Purdue, are teacher education components of university-wide recruitment efforts. The Unit also has programs in place that focus on the retention of minority candidates such as Learning Plus and targeted scholarship awards. Looking forward we see several opportunities for ongoing and new initiatives that have the potential to increase the diversity of our undergraduate student population in spite of the strong contextual challenges noted above.

1. **Development.** Under the leadership of President Jischke, Purdue University has created a very strong development infrastructure. Giving to the School of Education is up more than 500% in the current year, due to this increased emphasis on development and the development skills of the SOE Director of Development. These efforts have already created 10 new endowed
and annual scholarships for undergraduate teacher education in the past 12 months. Although current interpretations of affirmative action law prevent us from soliciting funds for scholarships that could be offered exclusively to students from underrepresented groups, we can create scholarships that target low SES students, urban students, and/or first generation college students. We also can continue to give preference to qualified minority students when selecting scholarship recipients through our new holistic process. We believe that development initiatives focused on providing more substantial support for low SES students from diverse backgrounds who want to participate in our teacher education programs provide an opportunity for overcoming the funding barriers we face to diversifying our undergraduate student body.

2. Changing Local Demographics. For the first time in the history of teacher education at Purdue University, there is a growing local population of underrepresented students for whom geography would not be a barrier to attendance. The Latino population of the five county area surrounding Purdue is increasing rapidly. We face other challenges in recruiting this population such as limited English proficiency and patriarchal beliefs that discourage women from pursuing advanced education. In addition, less than 1% of Indiana teachers were Hispanic as of 2002, which suggests that none of the teacher education units in Indiana have been successful in recruiting and retaining Hispanic teacher education candidates. Purdue initiatives targeting this population might increase the diversity of undergraduate teacher education programs, while simultaneously building the capacity of Indiana schools to effectively instruct the growing number of Latino students in Indiana schools.

3. Pipeline Projects. A third opportunity is funded projects designed to promote the value of the teacher education program at Purdue among underrepresented K-12 students. One of the most promising categories of such projects are the so called “pipeline projects.” Purdue’s current Science Bound project is an example of a pipeline project already underway that should begin yielding teacher education candidates in 3-5 years. Science Bound targets 7th grade students from the Indianapolis public schools who are interested in science in 7th grade and provides them with a series of developmentally appropriate enrichment activities throughout middle school and high schools. Students who successfully complete the program and meet Purdue entrance requirements are promised free tuition at Purdue in science related programs, including science and technology education. Pipeline projects require massive amounts of external funding and considerable patience, but we believe they offer one of the most promising potential solutions to our geographical and financial challenges in recruiting from urban underrepresented groups to teacher education programs at Purdue.

Accountability and Continuous Improvement
The new strategic planning emphasis at Purdue is on planning with accountability. The diversity goals in the Purdue University Strategic Plan have created a university-wide emphasis on monitoring enrollment statistics by gender and by race/ethnicity. The race/ethnicity categories that are monitored and reported annually in the Purdue Data Digest include African American, Asian American, Hispanic American, and White. In 2003, we began reporting race/ethnicity enrollment statistics for teacher education programs in the Purdue Data Digest. Thus we have become publicly accountable for reporting the number and percentage of students from underrepresented students enrolled in our teacher education programs. We plan to expand this effort to degree completers in coming years and so we can closely monitor and celebrate the success of our efforts to increase the number and percentage of minority students enrolled in our undergraduate teacher education programs at Purdue.

In addition, refinement of demographic analyses of our teacher education candidates in light of our target population will help us continuously improve our recruitment and retention efforts. We plan to conduct stratified demographic analyses of our candidates from regional, state, national, and international pools and then compare their characteristics to those of similarly
stratified general and professional educator populations. Discrepancies in these comparisons will help us more accurately identify underrepresented groups and better focus our efforts. For example, one such analysis showed that the professional educator population in Indiana was actually less diverse than the teacher education candidates at Purdue. While 5% of Indiana teachers were from underrepresented populations in 2002, 6.3% of the teacher education candidates at Purdue were from underrepresented populations that same year. Tracking these two sets of demographics will enable us to determine if we are increasing the diversity of the teaching force in Indiana. We also will compare our results to those of our benchmark institutions that share similar geographic challenges. Finally, we will continue to seek to identify and adapt approaches that have been successful for other research extensive institutions with similar geographic challenges.

In conclusion, we concur with the BOE finding that lack of diversity is an ongoing area for improvement in our undergraduate, initial teacher preparation programs. We reiterate our strong commitment to diversity, a commitment which is clearly reflected in our teacher education program curricula, the increasing diversity of our faculty, and our outstanding record of attracting diverse candidates to our advanced programs. At the initial level, we are committed to continuing to engage in the creation of innovative programs that show promise for enabling a “geographically challenged” institution like Purdue to increase the number of teacher education candidates from underrepresented groups.
Introduction:

All teacher education students, faculty, and academic counselors will be provided with a copy of the Dispositions To Be Assessed (Form D-1) and the Dispositional Assessment Form (Form D-2) via the Office of Professional Preparation and Licensure (OPPL). Students will be made aware that repeated violations of these dispositions will constitute grounds for a decision regarding separation from the Purdue University Teacher Education Program. This information will also be published in appropriate teacher education documents and reinforced throughout the program.

Procedure:

The Dispositional Assessment Form (Form D-2) may be utilized by all faculty, staff, and classroom teachers to bring a deficiency with regard to professional conduct to the attention of the Teacher Education Council Special Cases Committee. At the conclusion of each semester, course instructors will be asked to submit a Form D-2 for any student who has exhibited a deficiency with respect to the INTASC dispositions listed in Form D-1. The completed form will be distributed to the student, the student’s academic advisor, OPPL, and the Office of Field Experiences (OFE). The student’s academic advisor will monitor each student’s folder to ascertain if more than one D-2 form has been issued to the student.

If a student receives two D-2 forms, the academic counselor will notify the appropriate department head or program chair within 14 days of the filing of the second form. The department head or program chair will schedule a meeting with the student, the academic counselor, the course instructor/Coordinator of the course in which a deficiency was observed, and with the individuals submitting the Form D-2s within 14 days to discuss the specific concerns that need to be addressed. (If notification of the second form D-2 falls at the end of a term, the department head or program chair will schedule the meeting within 14 days after the beginning of the next full term in which the student is enrolled.) If the meeting determines that a dispositional issue does exist, a list of actions that the student agrees to follow will be prepared in memo form, and both the student and department head or program chair will sign the agreed course of action to be taken. A copy of the actions to be taken will be placed in the student’s file and sent to OPPL and OFE. The student may also submit any additional information that s/he wishes to include in the record.

If a student receives a third D-2 form, the academic counselor will notify the appropriate department head or program chair within 14 days of the filing of the form. The department head will notify the student and the Director of Teacher Education (Dean of the SOE) within 7 days of the third D-2 form. The Director of Teacher Education will
convene the TEC Special Cases Committee within 14 days of notification and will provide documentation regarding the three D-2 forms and the Course of Action Memo. (If notification of the third form D-2 falls at the end of a term, the department head or program chair will schedule the meeting within 14 days after the beginning of the next full term in which the student is enrolled.) The student will be asked to provide any information s/he wishes regarding the three D-2 forms in writing to the TEC Special Cases Committee. The Special Cases Committee shall meet to review the documentation provided and also meet with the student and his or her academic counselor. The Special Cases Committee shall provide one of three recommendations to the Director of Teacher Education within the 14-day period. The recommendations can be: continue in the program, removal from the program, or not enough evidence was provided to make a decision in which case the student continues in the program. Within 14 days of receiving the recommendation from the TEC Special Cases Committee, the Director of Teacher Education shall make a decision on the case and notify all parties involved including the student, academic counselor, department head, OPPL, OFE, and TEC. The student may appeal further to the Office of the Provost within 14 days of receiving the decision of the Director of Teacher Education.
Note: Specific dispositions for each licensing area that are tied to the dispositions on Form D-1 may be found at the following website: 
http://www.state.in.us/psb/ 

Numbers in parentheses refer to the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) principles addressed.

1. Is sensitive to community and cultural norms, and engages in and supports appropriate professional practices for self and colleagues. (3) (9)

2. Demonstrates a willingness to work with other professionals to improve the overall learning environment for students. (7) (9) (10)

3. Takes responsibility for establishing a positive classroom climate and recognizes the importance of peer relationships in establishing a climate of learning. (3) (5)

4. Respects students as individuals and respects students' privacy and confidentiality of information. (3) (10)

5. Treats all students fairly and equitably, valuing individual differences and experiences. (2) (3) (5) (6) (8) (9)

6. Demonstrates an awareness of all aspects of a child’s well being (cognitive, emotional, social, and physical). (3) (6) (10)

7. Shows commitment to adapting instruction to students’ responses, ideas, and needs in order to facilitate the development of students’ critical thinking, independent problem solving, and performance capabilities. (1) (4) (5) (9)

8. Demonstrates flexibility and is open to adjustment and revision based on needs and changing circumstances. (1) (4) (7)

9. Exhibits behaviors that show a commitment to planning, reflection, assessment, and learning as on-going processes. (1) (5) (7) (8) (9)

10. Demonstrates thoughtful, effective verbal and nonverbal communication and responsive listening. (6)

11. Demonstrates enthusiasm for the discipline(s) taught, keeps abreast of new ideas and developments in the field, and sees connections to everyday life. (1)
Purdue University
Teacher Education Council Form D-1, cont’d.
Assessment Categories and Examples of Deficiencies

The following categories of dispositions will be assessed. Examples of behaviors that might be consistent with dispositional deficiencies are given. This list is meant to be illustrative of possible dispositional deficiencies but is neither intended to be exhaustive nor prescriptive. (Numbers in parentheses refer to the eleven dispositions identified above.)

Legal/Ethical Conduct
- Engages in illegal or unethical conduct involving minor children or which would be grounds for dismissal from a teaching position. (1)
- Fails to maintain privacy and confidentiality of student information. (4)
- Violates the Purdue University Code of Student Conduct. (1)

Attendance/Punctuality
- Is frequently late or absent except when excused in advance. (1)

Professional Appearance and Demeanor
- Fails to act or dress according to the standards of the school where the candidate is placed. (1)
- Fails to maintain composure in the classroom. (1) (3)

Reliability/Dependability
- Frequently fails to complete assignments, duties, or tasks on time. (1) (9)

Interactions with Others
- Fails to interact in a positive and professional manner with students, peers, teachers, university personnel, and others. (2) (4) (5)

Fairness/Lack of Bias
- Shows overt bias, prejudice, or lack of fairness toward certain students or groups of people. (3) (4) (5)

Safety/Responsible Conduct
- Acts in a dangerous or irresponsible manner that might put students at risk. (1) (6)

Flexibility/Adaptability/Openness to Feedback
- Is unable to adapt teaching to changing classroom circumstances. (7) (8)
- Reacts defensively or antagonistically to feedback about performance. (1) (8)

Communicative Effectiveness
- Makes frequent errors in oral and/or written communications with students, peers, teachers, university personnel, and others. (10)

Commitment to Student Learning
- Makes negative comments about students' abilities to learn. (6) (7) (9)
- Unable to adapt instruction to meet varying needs and abilities. (7) (8)

Commitment to Improving Teaching Performance
- Makes no effort to improve instructional practices and teaching activities. (7) (8) (9) (10)

Commitment to Profession
- Exhibits poor attitude toward the discipline and/or teaching profession. (1) (11)
Purdue University
Teacher Education Council Form D-2
Dispositional Assessment Form

This form is to be used by faculty, staff or classroom teachers who observe a teacher education candidate's dispositional deficiency as related to their teacher education program of study. For a list of dispositions and possible deficiencies, please refer to Form D-1.

Please complete the entire form and submit it to the department or program area in which the candidate is majoring (e.g., elementary education-Department of Curriculum and Instruction) after you have discussed it with the student.

Candidate Name________________________  Student ID No.__________Date _______

Form Completed By___________________________    Phone Number ______________

Check any category for which a dispositional deficiency has been observed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>☐ Legal/Ethical Conduct</th>
<th>☐ Attendance/Punctuality</th>
<th>☐ Professional Appearance and Demeanor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Reliability/Dependability</td>
<td>☐ Interactions with Others</td>
<td>☐ Fairness/Lack of Bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Safety/Responsible Conduct</td>
<td>☐ Flexibility/Adaptability/ Openness to Feedback</td>
<td>☐ Communicative Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Commitment to Improving Teaching Performance</td>
<td>☐ Commitment to Student Learning</td>
<td>☐ Commitment to Profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Other, please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For any dispositional area identified as deficient above, please describe the context of this assessment in specific, observable terms (e.g., course number and name, where situation occurred, specifically what transpired, date) and relate it to the deficiency area(s) addressed. Use the reverse side of the page and/or attach additional sheets if necessary.
Appendix
B
Professionalism Agreement

During my field experiences, I am a guest at the school site or other educational or community setting. I understand that my task is to learn so that I can become a more effective educational professional. I agree to abide by the specific institutional values and policies as well as highest standards of professionalism at all times.

I agree to maintain professional, legal, and ethical conduct at all times. I will respect the privacy of children, families, and school personnel and protect the confidentiality of confidential academic or personal information that I encounter.

I agree to be on site when and where I am expected. In the event that I cannot attend or will be late, I will follow proper notification procedures to let the appropriate individuals know in advance.

I agree to maintain a professional demeanor and appearance, in accordance with the standards of the site where I am placed.

I agree to complete my assigned tasks, duties, and responsibilities on time.

I agree to interact and communicate in a positive and professional manner with students, peers, school and university personnel, and others. I will avoid bias, prejudice, or lack of fairness toward individuals or groups of people.

I agree to act in a safe and responsible manner, avoiding any action that might put students at physical and emotional risk.

I agree to remain committed to student learning at all times. I will not make offensive or demeaning comments about students/participants or their abilities to learn or about teachers or their abilities to teach.

I agree to remain committed to improving my own instructional practices and teaching activities. I will remain flexible and open to feedback from others.

I agree to demonstrate commitment to my field of study and to the teaching profession.

I understand that failure to comply with this agreement may result in the execution of a disposition assessment form (Form D-2) and/or placement termination. The accumulation of three disposition assessment forms will result in a disciplinary review that may result in removal from the teacher education program.)

________________________________________________________________________  ____________________________________________________________________
Course Instructor (printed)                          Course

________________________________________________________________________  ____________________________________
Signature of Candidate                                  Date

School of Education
Appendix

C
At the core of professional preparation at Purdue University is research and best practice. Initial (undergraduate) preparation emphasizes competencies in the seven areas depicted in the inner ring. Advanced (graduate) preparation extends initial preparation and adds emphasis on the six areas depicted in the outer ring.

**Initial and Advanced Preparation of Educators Based on Research and Best Practice**

- Focus on the Learner and Assess Growth and Outcomes
- Collaborate with Teachers, Parents, and Community
- Practice Inclusive Education
- Synthesize Knowledge
- Professional, State, and Institutional Standards
- Create Knowledge
- Understand Individual Development of Students
- Engage in Professional Development
- Teach Effectively by Integrating Content and Pedagogy
- Use Current and Emerging Technologies
- Adapt Instruction to Diverse Learners
- Participate Actively in Their Profession
- Communicate Knowledge

Adapted from 1992 Reaffirmed 1999 and 2003
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D
Focus on the Learner and Assess Growth and Outcomes: This element captures the philosophical perspective of focusing upon each child and his or her learning, rather than focusing upon teaching or simply acts of the teacher. It also stresses the importance of acquiring skills to assess cognitive, social, and personal development, as well as outcomes, for those children.

Understand Individual Development of Students: Focus on individual learners must include an understanding of their individual development. Consistent with IPSB developmental level standards, Purdue’s programs foster the development of skills and knowledge regarding learners’ development.

Adapt Instruction to Diverse Learners: In setting high standards for all children and believing that all children can learn, it is essential that teachers be able to adapt instruction to a wide variety of such things as learners’ abilities and achievement, previous experiences, learning styles, and motivation, as well as sociocultural contexts.

Practice Inclusive Education: Not only is inclusive education best practice, it is mandated by law. Teachers must be able to adapt curriculum to learners’ needs in a general education classroom in order to engage effectively in inclusive education.

Teach Effectively by Integrating Content and Pedagogy: In addition to the balance sought at Purdue in utilizing research and best practice, there also is valuing of the duality of content and pedagogy in effective teaching. Thus, emphasis is given to pedagogical content knowledge as a key to facilitating student learning.

Use Current and Emerging Technologies: The Information Age is inextricably linked to the Internet and the access it provides for communication, acquisition of knowledge, and problem solving. As facilitators of their students’ learning in this new age, teachers must be able to utilize a wide array of tools such as computers. They also must be skilled in assisting their students to acquire skills in using the new technology for their own responsible, independent learning.

Collaborate with Teachers, Parents and Community: Educators are members of a learning team that also includes colleagues, parents, and agencies in the community. Such collaboration is focused upon meeting the needs of students.

Graduate Competencies

Engage in Professional Development: Those who have completed advanced preparation programs should display dispositions to engage in further professional development and behaviors that express those dispositions. Engaging in professional development activities is an important element in continuous (lifelong) learning.

Communicate Knowledge: At the graduate level, communication of knowledge is qualitatively different from undergraduate skills in imparting information. It is essential that a graduate of advanced programs be able to communicate effectively the knowledge he or she has created. Such professional communication may include publication (written or electronic) or presentation to peers, students, clients, institutions, agencies, or learned societies.
Participate Actively in Their Profession: Advanced preparation is successful when those completing it participate actively in their professions. Such participation includes activity at the local, state, and/or national level that addresses important issues of the profession. Such activity often occurs in the context of professional organizations.

Think Critically and Reflectively: Higher order thinking skills are the hallmark of well educated people. As professionals in education, our graduates are able to reflect upon their own practice and to think critically about issues. They also demonstrate they can facilitate reflection, critical thinking, and problem solving in others.

Synthesize Knowledge: Those at the advanced level of preparation are able to gather information and organize it meaningfully, i.e., synthesize knowledge. This is an especially important skill in the Information Age.

Create Knowledge: Graduate work equips education professionals with skills of inquiry and documentation. These skills are utilized to create knowledge through observation, description, or experimentation that results in confirmation or disconfirmation of hypotheses.
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This chart depicts the way data is used to improve the Purdue Teacher Education Program.

Data Types:
Decision support data gathered include: stakeholder perceptions, candidate performances, demographic information, operational process information, etc.

Data Gathering Methods:
Methods used to collect and store this data include: surveys, course evaluation forms, portfolio assessments, operational performance metrics, grades, etc.

Data Storage:
This information is stored in office and departmental data repositories, both electronic and paper.

Key
- Data Collection
- Decision Point
- Reporting and Information Sharing
- Information on Request
- Flow of Post Decision Actions
# Purdue University School of Education Assessment Timeline

This information was available to the team in various documents and formats at the time of the visit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Administration Schedule</th>
<th>Review Schedule</th>
<th>Ownership report/audience</th>
<th>Feedback Mechanism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AACTE/NCATE/IPSB Continuing Accreditation Visits</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Every five years</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Purdue University* NCATE/IPSB</td>
<td>Self-study Accreditation Visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AACTE/NCATE/IPSB Annual Reports</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Purdue University* NCATE/IPSB</td>
<td>Self-study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Framework</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Purdue University*</td>
<td>Self-study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Portfolio Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Within Courses</td>
<td>Candidate, Program</td>
<td>Self-study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title II Institutional Report</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Purdue University* US DOE/IPSB</td>
<td>Self-study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title II State Report</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>Self-study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Enrollment Management Enrollment Report</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Each Semester</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>Self-study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Summary Report</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall and Spring</td>
<td>Fall and Spring</td>
<td>Reported by the President</td>
<td>Self-study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Digest</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Purdue University*</td>
<td>Self-study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACREP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Every seven years</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>Professional Association</td>
<td>Self-study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Every five years</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>Professional Association</td>
<td>Self-study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASHA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Every eight years</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>Professional Association</td>
<td>Self-study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Faculty, Dept. Heads, Dean</td>
<td>Individual, Merit, Promotion Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Evaluations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Each Semester</td>
<td>When compiled</td>
<td>Faculty, Dept. Heads</td>
<td>Individual and Dept. Heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gate Portfolio Assessment Reports</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Each Semester</td>
<td>When compiled</td>
<td>Assessment Coordinator</td>
<td>Self-study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Area Reports</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annually (beginning 2004)</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Assessment Coordinator</td>
<td>Self-study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Coordinator Report</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Teacher Education Council and Assessment Council</td>
<td>Self-study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Purdue University includes the Teacher Education Council and program area faculty*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Administration Schedule</th>
<th>Review Schedule</th>
<th>Ownership report/audience</th>
<th>Feedback Mechanism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Forum</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Administration-Dean, Assoc. Deans, Dept. Heads, Directors</td>
<td>Inquiry Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPPL Report (includes Admission/retention Licensure and Academic Services information)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Purdue University* Teacher Ed. Council Teacher Ed. Program Faculty and K-12 Colleagues</td>
<td>Self-study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFE Report (includes Field Experience and Student teaching information)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Purdue University*</td>
<td>Self-study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Advising/Recruiting</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>Self-study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Graduate Studies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Annually (Compiled report to begin June 2004 although components have been reported on an ongoing basis)</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>Self-study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block Working Group Surveys (includes student teachers and cooperating teachers)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Program Faculty</td>
<td>Self-study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys Program Completers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Each Semester</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Purdue University*</td>
<td>Self-study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys Employers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Purdue University*</td>
<td>Self-study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal Surveys Program Completers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Every five years</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Purdue University*</td>
<td>Self-study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal Surveys Employers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Every five years</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Purdue University*</td>
<td>Self-study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement Survey</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Center for Career Opportunities</td>
<td>Self-study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOE Annual Report</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>Self-study Communication to Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Plan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Purdue University* Teacher Ed. Council and Assessment Council including K-12 colleagues</td>
<td>Self-study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Purdue University includes the Teacher Education Council and program area faculty*
Purdue University  
Teacher Education Program  
TaskStream Implementation Schedule  

As of: 4/28/04

The Basic Approach

- If currently implemented in PEP: Fall 2004
- Otherwise: Spring 2005 or Fall 2005, based on existing or to-be-developed rollout schedules

Initial Teacher Preparation

Gate A (Before Admission to Program):
- Fall 2004

Gate B (Before Methods Courses):
- Fall 2004

Gate C (Before Student Teaching):
- If currently implemented in PEP: Fall 2004
- Otherwise: Spring 2005

Gate D (Before Program Completion):
- Spring 2005

Advanced Preparation: Teachers, School Counselors, Administrators

Detailed Implementation Schedule for All Specified Gates: Fall 2004

At Least First Gate: Spring 2005 or Fall 2005, as specified by each Program Area
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Purdue University Teacher Education Conceptual Framework Synopsis

Shared Vision. Faculty and administration of the School of Education developed a shared vision of teacher education at Purdue University in collaboration with colleagues in other academic schools, colleagues in P-12 education, and other stakeholders. This shared vision is rooted in the land grant mission of Purdue University and the mission of the School of Education to serve the citizens of Indiana, the United States, and the world through discovery, learning and engagement. The School is dedicated to the development of education professionals who are intellectual leaders; who are prepared to participate in professional, social, and technological change; who are committed to lifelong learning and continuing professional development through inquiry and reflection on practice; who bring a multicultural perspective to their professional practice; and who exercise the responsibilities of citizenship in a global society that is interconnected and interdependent.

Coherence. Teacher education at Purdue University is a large and complex enterprise. The Dean of the School of Education is responsible administratively for the preparation of all candidates in teacher education. While much of the responsibility for teacher education is vested in the faculty of the School of Education, which has a primary mission to prepare teacher professionals, teacher preparation is also a function of five other academic schools: Agriculture, Consumer and Family Sciences, Liberal Arts, Science, and Technology, as well as our P-12 colleagues. A campus-wide entity called the Teacher Education Council (TEC) serves as the curriculum review authority for all programs leading to licensure and as a policy advisory board to the School of Education. In addition, it is the sequencing of Blocks that provides for the orderly arrangement of courses in a logical manner, thus coherence.

Professional Commitments and Dispositions. Teacher education programs at Purdue view schools as complex social, political, cultural, and interpersonal organizations and teaching as a highly complex activity in which teachers apply knowledge to develop curriculum, carry out instruction, and assess learning. To become proficient at this complex activity, prospective teachers must develop subject matter knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and knowledge of context and from these form pedagogical content knowledge, the knowledge about how to teach specific subject matter that distinguishes teachers from subject matter specialists. An inquiry-oriented approach to teacher education, where teaching is made problematic and students of teaching engage in reflection to develop their understandings of teaching and learning, characterizes Purdue's programs. In addition to developing theoretical and practical knowledge, we expect that candidates will develop the dispositions to be caring and dedicated education professionals who are sensitive to community and cultural norms, demonstrate willingness to work with others, take responsibility for establishing a positive climate, respect students as individuals, treat students fairly, show concern for students' well-being, and demonstrate appropriate professional practice. These commitments and dispositions are reflected in institutional, state, and professional standards by which candidates are informed and assessed.

Commitment to Diversity, Technology, Field Experience, and Performance Assessment. Four strands, weaving throughout the programs, guide teacher education at Purdue:

- **Diversity** is a reality in today's schools, and we expect our candidates to be able to teach all students.
- **Technology** is a central strand of the program, because we want our candidates to participate in professional, social, and technological change as lifelong learners and to be able to use a wide variety of educational technologies for teaching and learning.
- **Field experiences** prepare future teachers for a broad view of teaching, the multiple roles of teachers, and the complexities of life in schools as well as for careers as inquiring professionals.
- **Portfolios** represent an authentic way for candidates to demonstrate knowledge, dispositions, and performance achievements.

Programmatic Emphases. In addition to the four programmatic strands, the emphases of the professional preparation programs are depicted in the model for professional preparation. Research and best practice are depicted as the core of professional preparation. Seven areas of competency represent foci of the initial preparation programs: understand individual development of students, teach effectively by integrating content and pedagogy, use current and emerging technology, adapt instruction to diverse learners, focus on the learner and assess growth and outcomes, collaborate with teachers, parents and community, and practice inclusive education. Advanced preparation extends initial preparation and adds emphases on six more areas: create knowledge, synthesize knowledge, communicate knowledge, think critically and reflectively, engage in professional development, and participate actively in their profession. Boundaries between initial and advanced preparation are permeable rather than sharply defined. All of the components of the model link to professional, state, and institutional standards.

Alignment with State and Professional Standards. Initial teacher preparation programs are based on performance-based standards including the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) principles, which form the basis of the Indiana Professional Standards Board (IPSB) content and developmental standards for teachers. Initial teacher education programs provide an articulated sequence of experiences, including frequent field experiences that emphasize the links between subject matter knowledge and teaching. In addition to these standards, faculty of the various program areas utilize professional standards in the development of the specific program.

Advanced Preparation Programs. Advanced programs are designed to help experienced practitioners move beyond the basic mastery of content and practice that characterizes initial licensure to develop deeper understandings, more sophisticated practice, and the knowledge and dispositions that characterize leaders in the educational community. Upon completion of an advanced program of study, candidates are accomplished educators whose practices are consistent with the standards of professional organizations or the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.
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Summary

The following information outlines the assessment of students completing a teacher education program at Purdue University. In order to complete the Teacher Education Program, students must successfully pass through Gates A, B, and C in order to meet all requirements for licensing at Gate D.

Students should attend the Teacher Education Orientation presented by the Office of Professional Preparation and Licensure during Block I or CDFS 100 classes in order to fully understand the requirements and procedures. Please note that an application to the Teacher Education Program is required to pass through Gate A for admission to the Teacher Education Program. An application is NOT required for Gate B or Gate C. In order to be licensed in the State of Indiana, a license application must be submitted for Gate D.

Required Criteria and Suggested Time Line

NOTE: Remain flexible. The length of time to complete the Teacher Education Program is determined by academic progress and career planning. Additional time may be necessary if you are: (a) changing your degree objective (CODO) or transferring, (b) overcoming a GPA below the required teacher education program standard, (c) pursuing an additional major or licensure area, or (d) encountering other unknown needs or circumstances.

Before the First Semester

(If a degree has already been earned through an accredited university, click here.)

1. Admission to Purdue University
2. Admission to the respective academic school, i.e., Agriculture, Consumer and Family Sciences, Education, Liberal Arts, Science, or Technology
3. Assignment to and guidance by an academic advisor

Consult with your academic advisor regularly to ensure that the required criteria are met and course
work is successfully completed in the sequence authorized by the Purdue University Teacher Education Council.

**Requirements for Passing through Gate A**
(An application and a signature form are required. See #8 below.)

1. Submit a signed Signature Form to the Office of Professional Preparation and Licensure. The student's signature acknowledges that s/he will read the teacher education information on this web site, referring to it regularly in order to remain informed of standards and responsibilities to the Teacher Education Program process. The signature also confirms understanding of the following:
   - Limited Criminal History Reports may be required throughout the teacher education program for field experiences, and a Report will be required for licensing.
   - Purdue University will check Zachary's Law Registry periodically.
   - The Indiana Professional Standards Board will review misdemeanor/felony convictions at the time of licensing.

2. Complete required courses for Gate A, with no grade lower than a "C":
   - Most program areas--Block I (EDCI 205, EDCI 285)
   - Early Childhood Education--CDFS 210
   - Special Education--Block I (EDCI 205, EDCI 285) and EDPS 260

3. Maintain a minimum overall GPA as established by the program area.

4. Maintain a professional education GPA of 3.0/4.0 with no grade lower than a “C” and no Incomplete (“I”) for any professional education course. Courses include EDCI, EDFA, and EDPS courses, in addition to courses designated by a program area as professional education courses.

5. Maintain a minimum content/major GPA as established by the program area.

6. Meet satisfactory assessment of the initial portfolio as defined by faculty.
   - (For Early Childhood Education (ECE) majors, see Unit Assessment Component Chart for ECE).

7. Meet Praxis I: Academic Skills Assessment -- Pre-Professional Skills Tests (PPST) or Computerized PPST with the following scores:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPST SCALE</th>
<th>Computerized PPST Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taken after 1/02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading:</td>
<td>176 or above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing:</td>
<td>172 or above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics:</td>
<td>175 or above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All scores must be officially submitted by the Educational Testing Service to Purdue University. For more details, please refer to the Purdue University Teacher Education Program Testing Requirements Sheets, included in this guide or from the Office of Professional Preparation and Licensure, BRNG 3229. These test scores also meet part of the state licensure requirements.

8. Submit a completed teacher education application to the Office of Professional Preparation and Licensure if all of the above requirements have been met or will be met by the end of the semester (or summer session if enrolled in summer classes). The application may be marked to hold for current semester grades or test score reports. See application for due dates. A student must be enrolled in the school that houses the teacher education major in order to apply for Gate A. The Signature Form (see #1) must be submitted by the time the application is submitted.

9. Receive written notification of status through Gate A from the Office of Professional Preparation and Licensure.
10. If denied admission, reapplication is required.

### Requirements for Passing through Gate B  
*No application is required.*

1. Complete **required courses** for Gate B, with no grade lower than a "C":
   - Most program areas--Block II (EDPS 235, EDPS 265)
   - Early Childhood Education--CDFS 212B (grade of "B"), CDFS 310, CDFS 318, and EDPS 260
   - Special Education--Block II (EDPS 235, EDPS 265), EDPS 270, and EDPS 460
2. Maintain a minimum overall **GPA** as established by the program area.
3. Maintain a professional education GPA of 3.0/4.0 with no grade lower than a “C” and no Incomplete (“I”) for any professional education course. Courses include EDCI, EDFA, and EDPS courses, in addition to courses designated by a program area as professional education courses.
4. Maintain a minimum content/major **GPA** as determined by the program area.
5. Meet satisfactory assessment of the *beginning portfolio* as defined by faculty.
   - For Early Childhood Education (ECE) majors, see Unit Assessment Component Chart for ECE.
6. Request a Limited Criminal History Report if required for field experiences throughout the teacher education program. The Zachary's Law Registry also will be checked periodically.
7. Failure to meet or comply with the above requirements will result in removal from methods courses.
8. Receive written notification of status through Gate B from the Office of Professional Preparation and Licensure.
9. Contact the **Office of Field Experiences** (OFE) by mid-September of the academic year preceding the student teaching semester (i.e., junior year) to receive a pass code in order to complete the online Student Teaching Application on the Internet by the first of November.
   *Note: A student must pass through Gates A and B before submitting the Student Teaching Application form to OFE. This application serves as a "letter of intent" and does not imply automatic placement.*

### Requirements for Passing through Gate C  
*No application is required.*

1. Complete **required courses** for Gate C, with no grade lower than a "C":
   - Most program areas--Specific methods courses
   - Early Childhood Education--CDFS 405, CDFS 406, and CDFS 408 with grades of "B"
   - Elementary Education--Block III (EDCI 361 and EDCI 362), IV (EDCI 363, EDCI 364, and EDCI 365), and V (EDCI 430 and EDCI 466)
2. Pass Praxis II:  Subject Assessments/Specialty Area Tests required by the Indiana Professional Standards Board for licensing. For information on required tests and passing scores, please consult a Teacher Education Program Testing Requirements Sheet and the PRAXIS Series Registration Bulletin for Praxis I/II available from the Office of Professional Preparation and Licensure, BRNG 3229.
   *Note: Praxis II must be passed before being allowed to student teach. Praxis II tests are only offered six times a year and must be registered for in advance.*
3. Maintain a minimum overall **GPA** as established by each program area.
4. Maintain a professional education GPA of 3.0/4.0 with no grade lower than a “C” and no Incomplete (“I”) for any professional education course. Courses include EDCI, EDFA, and EDPS courses in addition to courses designated by a program area as professional education courses. All professional education course work should be completed prior to student teaching.
5. Maintain a minimum content/major GPA as established by each program area. Most, if not all, content courses should be completed before student teaching.
6. Meet satisfactory assessment of the developing portfolio as defined by faculty.
7. Receive written notification of status through Gate C from the Office of Professional Preparation and Licensure.
8. Successful completion of requirements through Gate C of the Teacher Education Program allows the Office of Professional Preparation and Licensure to authorize the student to enter the student teaching semester. The Office of Field Experiences will confirm the student teaching placement for each student.
9. Request a Limited Criminal History Report if required for field experiences. The Zachary's Law Registry also will be checked periodically.
10. Begin job search through the Center for Career Opportunities--Education Careers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements for Passing through Gate D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(License application is required. See #9 below.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Student teach through the Office of Field Experiences.
   - Professional education courses, including methods courses, must be completed before student teaching.
   - You may student teach only after passing through Gate C.
   - A grade of "C" or above must be earned in EDCI/EDPS 496, 498, 499, or CDFS 450 Supervised Teaching.
2. Maintain a minimum overall GPA as established by each program area.
3. Maintain a professional education GPA of 3.0/4.0 with no grade lower than a "C" and no Incomplete ("I") for any professional education course. Courses include EDCI, EDFA, and EDPS courses, in addition to courses designated by a program area as professional education courses.
4. Maintain a minimum content/major GPA as established by each program area.
5. Meet satisfactory assessment of the proficient portfolio as defined by faculty.
6. Continue to meet all criteria for passing through Gates A, B, and C.
7. Request a Limited Criminal History Report for licensure. The Zachary's Law Registry also will be checked periodically.
8. Receive degree. Recommendation for licensure is contingent upon the posting of the degree on the transcript. All encumbrances must be paid.
9. Apply through the Office of Professional Preparation and Licensure for an Indiana Teaching License, even if leaving the state of Indiana. For more details, consult the Indiana Licensure instruction packet provided by the Office of Professional Preparation and Licensure at the Student Teacher Orientation. The license application may be submitted to the Office of Professional Preparation and Licensure two months prior to the last day of required courses. Do NOT send the license application to the Indiana Professional Standards Board since a recommendation from Purdue University is required.

Note: The following questions will be asked by the Indiana Professional Standards Board (IPSB) on the license application:
   - Have you ever had a credential, certificate, or license to teach denied, revoked, or suspended in Indiana or in any other state?
   - Have you ever been convicted of a felony?
   - Have you ever been convicted of a misdemeanor other than minor traffic violations since January 15, 1994?

If a conviction of a misdemeanor or felony (including a suspended sentence) is documented, the
applicant will be required to submit a written explanation and copies of court records with the license application. The IPSB is solely responsible for the review and response of misdemeanor or felony convictions.

10. Apply for licensure in other states, if desired. Contact the licensing office in the particular state and request application materials. Consult the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) for web sites, addresses, and telephone numbers.

Note: For additional licensing, apply for renewal or submit a request for an evaluation through the Office of Professional Preparation and Licensure if course work is to be completed through Purdue University.

02/04
## UNIT ASSESSMENT COMPONENT FOR INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coursework</th>
<th>Gate A</th>
<th>Gate B</th>
<th>Gate C</th>
<th>Gate D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Block I</td>
<td>Block II</td>
<td>Blocks III, IV &amp; V or Secondary Methods</td>
<td>Block VI Student Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPA</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Professional Education Content</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portfolio Assessment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standardized Tests</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Praxis I (PPST)</td>
<td>Praxis II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criminal History Check (+Zachary's Law)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature Form Required</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Requirements</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROGRAM COMPLETER**

**Purdue Degree**

**Recommendation for Initial License**

Please see *Explanation of Requirements to Pass Through the Gates* for further details.
UNIT ASSESSMENT COMPONENT FOR INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS
IN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION
(July 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coursework</th>
<th>Gate A</th>
<th>Gate B</th>
<th>Gate C</th>
<th>Gate D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDFS 210</td>
<td>CDFS 212B</td>
<td>CDFS 405</td>
<td>CDFS 450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDFS 310</td>
<td>CDFS 318</td>
<td>CDFS 406</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDPS 260</td>
<td>CDFS 408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDFS 405</td>
<td>CDFS 408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDFS 450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>Overall Professional Education Content</th>
<th>✔</th>
<th>✔</th>
<th>✔</th>
<th>✔</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portfolio Assessment</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standardized Tests</th>
<th>Praxis I (PPST)</th>
<th>Praxis II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criminal History Check (+Zachary's Law)</th>
<th>Signature Form Required</th>
<th>✔</th>
<th>✔</th>
<th>✔</th>
<th>✔</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Requirements</th>
<th>First Intro. Experiential Learning Component</th>
<th>Second Intro. Experiential Learning Component</th>
<th>✔</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please see *Explanation of Requirements to Pass Through the Gates* for further details.
Purdue University Unit Assessment Component

Courses Required at Each Gate

*Effective Fall 2002*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Gate A</th>
<th>Gate B</th>
<th>Gate C*</th>
<th>Gate D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture Education</td>
<td>Block I</td>
<td>Block II</td>
<td>Secondary Methods</td>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td>Block I</td>
<td>Block II</td>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer and Family Sciences Education</td>
<td>Block I</td>
<td>Block II</td>
<td>Secondary Methods</td>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>CDFS 210</td>
<td>CDFS 212B</td>
<td>CDFS 405</td>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CDFS 310</td>
<td>CDFS 318</td>
<td>CDFS 406</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDPS 260</td>
<td></td>
<td>CDFS 408</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Block I</td>
<td>Block II</td>
<td>Blocks III, IV, &amp; V</td>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Education</td>
<td>Block I</td>
<td>Block II</td>
<td>Secondary Methods</td>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language Education</td>
<td>Block I</td>
<td>Block II</td>
<td>Secondary Methods</td>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Safety Education</td>
<td>Block I</td>
<td>Block II</td>
<td>Secondary Methods</td>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics Education</td>
<td>Block I</td>
<td>Block II</td>
<td>Secondary Methods</td>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>Block I</td>
<td>Block II</td>
<td>Secondary Methods</td>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Education (Biology, Chemistry, Physics, Earth &amp; Atmospheric Science,)</td>
<td>Block I</td>
<td>Block II</td>
<td>Secondary Methods</td>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies Education</td>
<td>Block I</td>
<td>Block II</td>
<td>Secondary Methods</td>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Block I</td>
<td>Block II</td>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDPS 260</td>
<td>EDPS 270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDPS 460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Education</td>
<td>Block I</td>
<td>Block II</td>
<td>Secondary Methods</td>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All professional education course work must be completed prior to the student teaching experience. Please note some program areas require junior high/middle school methods during the student teaching semester.*

Note: Secondary Methods courses vary according to program areas and include but are not limited to: A&D 402, EDCI 421, EDCI 422, EDCI 423, EDCI 424, EDCI 425, EDCI 427, EDCI 432, EDCI 440, EDCI 444, EDCI 460, PE 330, and IT 375
Grade Point Average Requirements

Professional Education GPA is 3.0 at all gates for all areas (with no grade lower than a “C” for any single professional education course)

Agricultural Education
Overall and Content GPAs at all gates – 2.50

Art Education (All Grade)
Overall and Content GPA at all gates – 2.50

Consumer and Family Sciences Education
Overall and Content GPA at all gates – 2.50

Early Childhood Education
Overall and Content GPA at all gates – 2.80

Elementary Education
Overall GPA at all gates – 2.80
No Content GPA calculated.

English Education
Overall and Content GPA at all gates – 2.50

Foreign Language Education
Overall and Content GPA at all gates – 2.67
(French: No grade lower than a “C” in content courses)

Health & Safety Education
Overall GPA at all gates – 2.50
Content GPA at all gates – 2.75

Mathematics Education
Overall and Content GPA at all gates – 2.50

Physical Education
Overall GPA at all gates – 2.50
Content GPA at all gates – 2.75

Science Education (Biology, Chemistry, Earth & Atmospheric Science, Physics)
Overall and Content GPA at all gates – 2.50

Social Studies Education
Overall GPA at all gates – 3.00
Content GPA at all gates – 2.50

Special Education
Overall and Content GPAs at all gates – 2.80

Technology Education
Overall and Content GPA at all gates – 2.50
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Appendix
H
The Basic Approach

- If currently implemented in PEP: Fall 2004
- Otherwise: Spring 2005 or Fall 2005, based on existing or to-be-developed rollout schedules

Initial Teacher Preparation

Gate A (Before Admission to Program):
- Fall 2004

Gate B (Before Methods Courses):
- Fall 2004

Gate C (Before Student Teaching):
- If currently implemented in PEP: Fall 2004
- Otherwise: Spring 2005

Gate D (Before Program Completion):
- Spring 2005

Advanced Preparation: Teachers, School Counselors, Administrators

Detailed Implementation Schedule for All Specified Gates: Fall 2004

At Least First Gate: Spring 2005 or Fall 2005, as specified by each Program Area
Appendix I
# Clustering of Indiana’s Black Population

as of 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Black Population (000) County / Urban Center</th>
<th>Miles from West Lafayette</th>
<th>Teacher Preparation Institutions Within Commuting Distance *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marion (Indianapolis) 199</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>IUPU Indianapolis, Marian College, Butler University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anderson College, Franklin College, University of Indianapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake (Gary) 86</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>IU Northwest, Purdue Calumet, Calumet College,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valparaiso University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen (Fort Wayne) 36</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>IUPU Fort Wayne, Manchester College, St. Francis College,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grace College, Huntington College, Taylor University North Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph (South Bend) 27</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>IU South Bend, University of Notre Dame, Saint Mary’s College,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bethel College, Goshen College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderburgh (Evansville) 13</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>University of Evansville, University of Southern Indiana,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oakland City University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison (Anderson) 9</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Indiana Wesleyan University, Ball State University,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Taylor University, Anderson University, IU Kokomo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaPorte (Michigan City) 9</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Purdue North Central, Valparaiso University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware (Muncie) 7</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Ball State University, Indiana Wesleyan University,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anderson University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkhart (Elkhart) .2</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Goshen College, University of Notre Dame, Saint Mary’s College,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IU South Bend, Bethel College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigo (Terre Haute) 6</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Indiana State University, Saint Mary’s of the Woods,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DePauw University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*30 miles