

**Christa McAuliffe Award  
For Exemplary Programs in Teacher Education**

**Final Proposal**

**Name of Program:** Indiana State University Professional Development Schools Partnership

**Name and Address of College or University:** Indiana State University  
217 North Sixth Street  
Terre Haute, IN 47809

**Contact Person:** Dr. Lloyd W. Benjamin, III, President

**E-mail:** lwb@isugw.indstate.edu

**Phone:** 812-237-4000

**Fax:** 812-237-7948

**Award Category:** Leadership in School-University Partnerships

**Abstract**

The Indiana State University Professional Development Schools Partnership is designed to link renewal in schools to renewal in educator preparation. The Partnership promotes enhanced learning for all pupils, provides exemplary experiences for preservice teachers, engages school and University faculty in continuous learning, and contributes to the knowledge base of teaching and learning.

## The Indiana State University Professional Development Schools Partnership

### Please restate the mission, goals, objectives, and description of your program.

The Indiana State University Professional Development Schools (ISU PDS) Partnership is guided by the overarching purpose of *linking renewal in schools to renewal in educator preparation*. To meet this purpose, the partnership has projected the following four goals: (1) increase learning for all youngsters in PDS sites; (2) provide optimal learning environments for preservice educators in schools committed to restructuring and continuous professional development for faculty; (3) provide meaningful professional development for university and school faculty based on their needs; and (4) support school/university collaborative inquiry.

The vision of the ISU PDS Partnership rests on three interlocking assumptions and beliefs. First, the partnership believes that reform and renewal activities must be *systemic*. The intent of the partnership is to create a seamless educational system from preschool to graduate schools and to promote the development of new roles and relationships between the members of the partnership so that all are focused on the common goal of learning. Second, the partnership believes that a *symbiotic relationship*, built on trust and parity between its members and existing institutions, is necessary to achieve systemic change. The partnership must value the contributions of each member. Thus, the partnership builds ownership and a sense of self-worth. Third, the partnership needs a *critical study* process to inform and guide its work. Problem solving and decision making require crucial and accurate data if the partnership is to continue to develop, grow, and respond to emerging challenges. The interplay of these three components forms the foundation for the vision of the partnership.

Resting on this foundation are the twin institutions of the schools and the University coupled with the communities they serve and by whom they are supported sharing the common goal of promoting learning. Each of the schools and the University, at root, is composed of students, faculty, and programs. The school communities are crafting organizational, curricular, and instructional programs guided by the concepts of equity (all students can learn) and excellence (high and rigorous standards of performance for students). The University faculty have envisioned and are implementing a program for professional educators which: (1) contains a broad basic core of general liberal education designed to promote critical thinking, to foster individual development and respect for cultural diversity, and to promote understandings that lead to a lifetime of learning; (2) encourages bridging of theory and practice by deepening understanding of content and the link to pedagogy; (3) contains a professional development core that emphasizes the study of child and youth development, learning theory and its application to practice, instructional environments within and beyond the school, and the effectiveness of alternative instructional approaches including technology that may be adapted to changing demographics in classrooms and to changing social realities; and (4) ensures continuous field experiences in schools organized to promote high and rigorous learning for all students. Further, each partner is committed to formalized standards of performance. For the schools, state proficiency guides that have been informed by the learned societies are followed; while at the University, the standards of the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) serve as the conceptual frameworks for its programs. Both the schools and the University have created their plans together promoting multiple points for systemic renewal and reform while at the same time promoting symbiotic relationships based on trust and parity.

The Indiana State University Professional Development School (ISU PDS) Partnership is shaped by the diversity of the students, schools, and school districts involved. In the fall of 1992

following a year of intense discussions, the program began with 10 schools (five elementary, one middle, and four high schools) in four school districts in west central Indiana. Today, the Partnership is composed of 20 schools (11 elementary, three middle, and six high schools) in five school districts, including the Indianapolis Public Schools. These rural and urban sites cover all grade levels and include high percentages of students living in poverty. The urban sites, in particular, offer preservice professional education students many opportunities to work with children and youth of highly diverse cultural backgrounds.

The partnership is guided by the Administrative Council composed of the five district superintendents, the dean of the School of Education, and the partnership director who serves as an assistant dean in the School of Education. The Administrative Council establishes policies for the partnership and operates under a formal contract of agreement approved by the University Board of Trustees and the school boards of the five partner districts. Operation of the partnership is coordinated by the PDS Steering Committee, which is composed of representatives from each of the PDS sites and the educator programs within the University.

In support of the PDS concept, the university provides substantial resources to the partnership. They include: (1) \$900 annual block grants to each site to support program development around the school's goals; (2) 13 semester hours of fee waivers per site to support faculty development; (3) \$6,000, allocated by the PDS Steering Committee, to support collaborative inquiry; and (4) \$25 per practicum student to each host teacher up to a maximum of \$200 per semester for clinical supervision in support of the PDS concept. Each district matches the block grants and fee waivers for each PDS School within the respective district's boundaries. Additionally, each district supports a faculty liaison from each of the PDS sites. The liaison serves as the PDS site's representative on the PDS Steering Committee, as well as performing other duties.

Operationally, the partnership conducts many "simultaneous" activities that distinguish the program. The partnership has established effective structures for enhancing dialogue and collaboration among the stakeholders. For example, the program is governed by a steering committee composed of representatives from each of the PDS sites and faculty from the University. In addition, each site has established a site-based planning committee of teachers, parents, students, community members, and university personnel. University faculty members volunteer to serve as liaisons to specific PDS sites. These boundary spanners promote collaboration by serving on school improvement teams, helping to plan and implement powerful professional development programs, offering specific workshops on topics selected by school-based faculty, coordinating early field experiences of University students, and serving as a conduit to other University faculty.

The ISU PDS Partnership has also helped to close the gap between theory and practice and makes it possible for practice to inform theory in teacher preparation. Preservice students are able to discuss concepts like active learning, project-based learning, service learning, and/or interdisciplinary curriculum, and then experience them firsthand at PDS sites. In some instances campus courses are delivered, either entirely or in part, on site, promoting greater involvement by school-based faculty in the delivery of course content. Currently, over 70 percent of the early field experiences of preservice students occur at PDS sites. Thus, preservice students are guaranteed multiple experiences in schools where teachers are leading learner-centered reforms. What better models for the next generation of professional teachers can be found than those engaged in continuous professional development and serving as stewards for school improvement activities.

In still another way in which the ISU PDS Partnership is distinguished is that school and university faculty alike have experienced expanded professional development opportunities. Visiting exemplary schools, sharing professional literature, forming study teams across and within partnership sites, and setting up faculty initiated in-service programs are fast becoming standard operations in the partnership. To date, the PDS Steering Committee has allocated by proposal over \$590,000 from external and internal sources to support faculty professional development activities. Further, the PDS Steering Committee has approved over 50 collaborative inquiry proposals designed to contribute to the knowledge base of teaching and learning. These projects were conducted or are being conducted by over 135 PDS site faculty with over 56 of their colleagues from the university.

In sum, the ISU PDS partnership is not an experiment wherein ideas are tested in schools with limited participation by school and university faculty. Instead, the ISU PDS Partnership is an integral part of the preservice program and is a catalyst for the simultaneous renewal of schools and the preparation of educators who will work in them, as well as the continued professional development of all educators.

**What evidence do you have that supports the program's positive impact on the learning of program graduates?**

Since 1994 the School of Education (SOE), with assistance from its ISU PDS partners and colleagues from the College of Arts and Sciences and other professional schools, has been at work transforming the teacher preparation program, utilizing the guiding concepts of *standards-guided, performance-assessed* programming. These key concepts have promoted significant shifts in the approach and thinking of the work for program redesign by the SOE and its Partnership. Beginning with the primary and fundamental shift from programs of "licensure by credit" based on completion of prescribed courses and credit hours to programs of "licensure by performance" based on the meeting of **standards-guided, performance-based assessments**, faculty across the University and from partner schools have come together to plan curricular, instructional, and organizational changes designed to fulfill the promise of the new conceptual framework. Starting with the selection of the most stringent national and state standards through the study and review of the practical knowledge and expertise of our school-based colleagues and research-based instructional and assessment strategies, the partnership guided its work with a set of questions about preservice teacher learning: What should our students know to become effect teachers for all children and youth? What do they know? What can they do to promote PK-12 pupil achievement? Are they learning what we intend? How do we ensure that? How can the experience be improved? Thus, our plan was not to just build an assessment system to evaluate our graduates, but to build a system capable of assisting the partnership in continual self-renewal and improvement. The data we are gathering is helping us to accomplish that mission.

As a first step to program redesign, the Partnership adopted the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) principles as the global standards for all initial teacher preparation programs and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) standards as the conceptual framework for all continuing graduate teacher education programs. Guided by these standards, the Partnership then incorporated the Indiana Professional Standards Board (IPSB) developmental standards, organized by age and grade levels served, and the content standards, organized by disciplines such as mathematics, English/language arts, and sciences and broad teaching specialties such as elementary education and teachers of students with special needs. Matrices containing these standards and the learning experiences and performance indicators have been developed to determine if the standards have been adequately addressed for each teacher education program.

Analysis of Title II reported data for academic year 2000-2001 indicated that 201 program completers or 96.6 % of the 208 candidates passed the state mandatory examination (Praxis II test) in content and content pedagogical knowledge. Areas such as mathematics (8 candidates), English language (11 candidates), social studies (6 candidates) general science (5 candidates), special education (10 candidates), music education (9 candidates), and physical education (10 candidates) all had 100% pass rates, while elementary education had a pass rate of 99% with 108 of the 109 program completers meeting state established criterion score.

Survey data of the 2000 graduates in teaching positions provide further evidence of the quality of the preparation program and also highlight areas requiring further program improvement. For example, when asked how well prepared the graduates felt they were in “knowing your subject matter” 86% answered well or very well prepared. For the questions “knowing how to teach your subject matter” and “preparing lesson plans” they responded well or very well prepared at 77% and 88% respectively. In terms of interacting with students 80% felt well or very well prepared, in using cooperative learning strategies 79% felt well or very well prepared, and in preparing professional portfolios 81% felt well or very well prepared. Areas of concern were discovered in “using standardized test scores in their teaching” with only 36% feeling well or very well prepared and in understanding the IPSB’s developmental standards only 29% felt well prepared. Yet over 66% felt well or very well prepared in understanding the INTASC standards. Thus, the survey not only helps identify the perceptions of our graduates in areas they feel they are performing well; it helps us identify areas for improvement. Already the survey and Title II data are being used by university and school teams to target improvement strategies.

At the program level, departments have selected unique strategies to assess preservice student performance in the capstone experience of student teaching. Elementary Education has developed a portfolio requirement in the areas of literacy and numeracy, while the all-grade, middle and high school programs have developed a modified teacher work sample strategy referred to as the Report on a Student Teaching Unit. The Unit Report is reviewed by both faculty in the professional education program and faculty in the content areas represented in the College of Arts and Sciences and other professional schools. Both of these strategies are standards-based and require the student to provide evidence through artifacts and reflective analysis of pupil outcomes of the impact of their teaching and strategies they would employ to improve the unit and the teaching in the future. A three-point rubric, representing the categories of “Proficient,” “Satisfactory,” and “Unsatisfactory,” is used by both programs.

Analysis of the elementary portfolios in the spring of 2002 indicates that 70 students or 80% were rated as proficient and 17 students or 20% as satisfactory. Within the evaluation form covering the INTASC standards which is completed by the clinical faculty supervising the student teacher, 64 (74%) student teachers received proficient in all INTASC and IPSB standards, while 23 (26%) student teachers received a satisfactory mark in one or more of the standards. Again, these data will be used for program refinements and improvements. In the secondary and all grade programs 33 (47.8%) of the students received a proficient rating on the Unit Report, while 36 (52.2%) received a mark of satisfactory. Interestingly, the number receiving a proficient rating represents an increase of 18 students over the performance of the student teachers in the previous spring semester an increase from 31.2 % to 47.8% of the total. Program quality is being impacted by the new assessment system, as the data from these assessment processes are reviewed, analyzed and employed to make program improvements.

Awards and honors received by graduates of our programs also highlight the quality of our programs. For two of the last three years, the Indiana Teacher of the Year has been a

graduate of our programs. This year, one of the 25 All America Teachers identified by the USA Today is a graduate as well. This year, Indiana's Minority Teacher of the Year, Indiana's English Teacher of the Year as recognized by the National Council of Teachers of English, and Indiana's Computer Technology Teacher of the Year are all graduates of our programs. These recognitions become even more significant when one considers that there are 34 accredited teacher education programs in Indiana.

**What evidence do you have that supports the program's positive impact on the learning of pupils in the P-12 schools?**

From the very beginning, the first goal of the ISU PDS Partnership has been to enhance the learning of all children and youth in the PDS sites. To meet this goal the Partnership has designed and implemented many collaborative initiatives. In fact, the first year of full operation was devoted to the promotion of school renewal activities in each PDS site. The vehicle selected for this action was the Indiana Department of Education's Indiana 2000 program, now called the Indiana School Academic Improvement Program (ISAIP). This is a statewide competition grant in which the participating school is to submit a proposal that presents the vision for the school, a professional development plan to achieve the vision, and an evaluation plan that will guide the process. Each participating school was to form a school improvement committee composed of teachers, administrators, parents, and community patrons, including University personnel. In short, the design of the ISAIP program was to flatten the hierarchy of decision making in a school and empower teachers and parents to assume stewardship of the school. Further, professional development programs were to be job-embedded and linked to pupil achievement. As a result of the partnership's early efforts, all ten of the original schools achieved ISAIP designation. Today, 16 of the 20 schools have achieved this designation and the remaining four have adopted the infrastructure demands of the program as standard operating procedures.

Simultaneous to the development of a school-operating infrastructure, the Partnership initiated a unique professional development program. The Partnership wanted to respect the unique context of each partner school, yet at the same time promote a program that would move the Partnership forward collectively and collaboratively. The PDS Steering Committee took on this challenge and structured a call for proposals soliciting from each of the PDS sites a yearly professional development plan that would be reviewed and approved by the Steering Committee. In this way, the Steering Committee could structure the broad parameters of a professional development program while also meeting the unique needs of member schools by encouraging and allowing the context of each school to shape the plan. Further, the Steering Committee could serve as a clearinghouse of ideas and help schools with similar agendas join together to stretch precious resources. Each year the PDS Steering Committee reviews the "call" and makes appropriate changes in the selected broad goals and other proposal features, while retaining the long-standing commitments to job-embedded professional development linked to student achievement and permitting the context of the school to shape the plan.

Given the interaction of the operations infrastructure with the professional development process and other program features, the Partnership has experienced many positive successes regarding PK-12 pupil achievement. Two specific case studies help illustrate how the Partnership enhances the learning of the children and youth it serves.

**Chauncey Rose Middle School (CRMS)**, one of the 10 original PDS sites, serves an inner city attendance district in the Vigo County Schools. Pupil enrollment is 643 students in grades six through eight with 342 or 53% of the pupils eligible for the free lunch program. The school also serves one of the more diverse student populations in the district with 82.7% white, 11.4% African-American, .8% Hispanic, and 5% multiracial. In 1992 as the partnership was

beginning its work, the school was making a transition from grades 7 through 9 junior high school to grades 6 through 8 middle school. The focus for the first year of the Partnership was to study and incorporate as much of a middle school philosophy as the school could manage. By the second year with new curricular and organizational features in place, the faculty began to examine pupil achievement data as a part of the planning process. Pupil performance in mathematics quickly became an area of concern.

Using data from the Indiana Statewide Test of Educational Progress (ISTEP) the faculty noted that pupil performance had dropped dramatically over the previous two years reaching a low in 1992 of  $-0.5$  in math concepts and applications and a  $-0.2$  in math computation at the eighth grade level. These figures represent the difference between the achievement test scores for the school and the predicted score for that school. A value of zero (0) means that the actual score was the same as the predicted score. Scores above or below the predicted score are reported as standard deviations. Achievement test scores are predicted from Average Cognitive Ability (measurement of student's ability to learn) and Socioeconomic Status (percent of students not participating in the free lunch program). Predicted score data are used in making comparisons to schools of similar types.

School-based faculty met with University faculty to review the data and to examine the literature on middle school mathematics. Outcomes of the Algebra Project, originating in the Boston Public Schools, caught the attention of the team. Study groups were formed and before long a plan was produced. Basically, the plan called for all eighth graders to take algebra that would be presented through a concrete reasoning process. University faculty in mathematics offered workshops for the CRMS math faculty and the program was launched in the fall of 1994. That spring's ISTEP scores revealed a dramatic increase to  $+0.8$  in math concepts and applications and an increase to  $+0.5$  in math computations. The following table shows the dramatic growth on these two measures in math achievement for eighth graders at CRMS from school year 1991-92 to school year 1999-00.

Table 1  
CRMS Eighth Grade Students Math Predicted Outcomes

	91-92	92-93	93-94	94-95	95-96	96-97	97-98	98-99	99-00
Math Concepts and Applications	-0.8	-0.5	0.3	0.8	0.6	1.9	3.1	2.2	3.1
Math Computations	-0.7	-0.2	-0.2	0.5	0.3	1.3	2.5	1.9	1.7

Perhaps equally significant was the improvement in student self-concept and student behavior as a result of being placed in an algebra class and having success.

**Paul I. Miller Elementary School** (IPS#114) joined the Partnership in school year 1994-95 and is one of five partner PDS sites in the Indianapolis Public Schools. The school served 469 pupils in grades PK-5 in 2001-02 with 341 or 73% of the pupils eligible for the free lunch program. Like other urban schools in the Indianapolis district, it serves a diverse pupil population with 50.7% white, 45.8% African-American, 0.9% Hispanic, and 2.6% multiracial. The first task the Partnership addressed was providing assistance to the school to begin to employ a site-based managed process, empowering teachers and parents in school decision-making. Because of the distance to the school from the campus (over 75 miles one way), progress was not as fast as with local schools. However, by school year 1996-97 a site committee was in full operation and study groups were at work reviewing pupil performance data and reviewing promising practices for urban school curricular and instructional programming, as well as parent engagement.

Review of pupil performance indicated that only 37.5% of the third grade pupils were meeting the state minimum performance standard in math and in language arts. Thus, the faculty in discussion with University partners decided to launch a multi-pronged school renewal program. Language arts would be addressed through a district-wide initiative with augmentation provided through the ISU PDS professional development program. Mathematics program development would come from internal school resources with a collaborating University elementary math methods faculty member's assistance. A request from the University for the additional placement of student teachers within the school was readily approved, increasing both the numbers of University faculty visiting the school and the increasing the frequency of visits. In 1995-96 school year only six student teachers were placed in the school. By 1998-99 between 10 and 15 student teachers were being placed in the school. These extra "instructional hands" were purposefully used to meet instructional program changes. Impact of the multi-pronged initiatives on pupil performance has been striking. Table 2 illustrates the dramatic improvements in pupil achievement as compared to predicted performance in mathematics and language arts.

Table 2  
Miller Elementary Third Grade Pupil Performance in Predicted Outcomes

	96-97	97-98	98-99	99-00	00-01	01-02
Language Expression	.25	.08	-.93	.95	3.53	3.57
Language Mechanics	-.43	.29	-.94	.87	2.63	4.12
Reading Comprehension	.59	.40	-.26	.75	2.06	1.55
Math Concepts and Applications	-.35	0.00	-1.04	.97	2.62	3.88
Math Computation	.63	.73	-.45	.57	2.48	2.93

Further, during this time period the percent of pupils meeting state minimum proficiency standards in math and language arts went from a low of 28.4% to a high of 64.8%. And this was accomplished by the school with Partnership support, while the percent of pupils eligible for the free lunch program went from a low of 60% to a high of 73%.

While these results are highlighted in two of the Partnership schools, other sites were achieving equally dramatic outcomes. For example, Terre Haute South Vigo High School led the state in 2000-01 in the number of pupils enrolled in and scoring a 3 or higher in Advanced Placement courses. West Vigo High School improved its graduation rate from 83% in 1996 to 94% in 2001. Further, the Corporation for National and Community Service recently recognized the school as a National Service Learning Leader School and the Alliance for Youth recognized it as an America's Promise School. Finally, Deming Elementary School which just joined the Partnership two years ago raised its third grade ISTEP reading comprehension score from -0.3 in 99-00 to +1.1 in 01-02 and its language mechanics score from -1.8 in 99-00 to +0.9 in 01-02. What is also significant about the partner school's impact on pupil achievement is the fact that these schools provide over 70% of all field experiences for the preservice teacher education students at the University. What wonderful modeling is being provided to the next generation of teachers to interact with veteran professionals as life long learners and stewards of their schools.

In brief, this Partnership is not an experiment conducted by a limited number of university faculty in selected classrooms. Instead, it is a partnership of significant proportions. In any given semester the Partnership touches the lives of over 14,500 children and youth, 950 professional educators in 20 schools, 60 University faculty, and 850 preservice teacher education candidates. And it is a Partnership of significant proportions in enhancing the learning of children and youth, as well as those who teach them.