

# **Academic Program Review**

**for**

## **STUDENT TEACHING**



Office of Student Field Experiences (OSFE)  
Department of Teaching  
College of Education  
University of Northern Iowa  
Cedar Falls, Iowa

**Submitted by Faculty of OSFE**

**Committee Members:**

Dr. Christine Canning, Chair  
Dr. Roger Kueter  
Dr. Janey Montgomery  
Dr. Richard Hawkes  
Cheryl Timion  
Tom Blaine

**November 2001**

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

This report represents the contributions of the total OSFE faculty under the guidance and leadership of Dr. Christine Canning, Chair of the OSFE faculty and also chair of the Academic Program Review Committee. Hours of data gathering, compiling, and analyzing over a span of months followed by numerous small group meetings and faculty group discussions resulted in this consensus document.

Office staff, with student assistants help, were instrumental in the organizing of the many appendix and exhibit items.

The faculty realizes that the CARP committee, college and university administrators, and external reviewers will read and offer comments. The group looks forward to their input and subsequent dialogue. The introspection and reflections to date have been beneficial. The on-going APR process will continue to be valuable in making, what we feel, a quality program exemplary.

Roger Kueter  
Department Head

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

- I. TITLE PAGE.....i
- ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....ii
- II. TABLE OF CONTENTS.....iii
- III. INTRODUCTION.....1
  - A. Campus Unit Responsible for Delivery of Program.....1
  - B. Department, School, and College Administering the Unit.....1
  - C. Brief History of the Program.....1
  - D. Summary of Last Program Review and Resulting Program Improvements.....2
  - E. The Program’s Relationship to the Missions of the College and the University.....3
  - F. Program Goals and Objectives.....4
  - G. List of Similar Programs in Iowa Regent Institutions and Other Institutions in Iowa.....5
- IV. CURRICULUM.....5
  - A. List of Courses Currently Offered with Catalog Descriptions.....5
  - B. Schedule of Rotations.....6
  - C.....6
  - D. Requirements for Completing Program.....6
  - E. Rates of Program Completion and Average Time to Complete.....6
  - F. Anticipated New Courses or Changes in Program Requirements.....6
  - G. Discussion: Should Any Part Of This Program’s Curriculum Be Located In Some Other Program? Should Any Part Of Another Program’s Curriculum Be Located In This Program?.....6
  - H. Description Of Any Non-Degree and/or Service Curricula in Terms of Their Value to Other Programs, Including College-Wide and/or University-Wide Interests.....7
  - I. Description of External/Distance Delivery of Courses. Possibilities for Future Program Expansion Via Distance Education.....8
  - J. Description of Opportunities Provided for Undergraduate or Graduate (as appropriate) Research...8
  - K. Description of Experiential and/or Service Learning Opportunities for Students in the Program.....8
  - L. Strengths of the Program Curriculum.....8
  - M. Unique-Distinctive Features of Program Curriculum.....9
  - N. Weaknesses of Curriculum.....10
  - O. Recommendations for Improvement of Program Curriculum.....10
- V. STUDENTS.....11
  - A. Ways in Which the Program Recruits Qualified Students.....11
  - B. Description of the Strengths and Weaknesses of Students Entering this Program.....11
  - C. Description of the Diversity of Students in the Program.....12
  - D. Ways in Which Student Achievement is Recognized.....12
  - E. Enrollment Statistics for the Preceding Seven Years; Number of Majors and Minors in Program Represented by Class Year.....12
  - F. Registrar’s Third-Week Class Size Reports for All Courses in the Program for the Past Two Semesters and Summer Session.....12
  - G. Analysis of Enrollment Patterns for Past Seven Years and Discussion of Planned/Projected Changes in Enrollment.....13

- H. Mean GPA Awarded to all Students in the Program Over the Past Seven Years, Compared Mean GPA for All University Courses; Represented by Class Year.....13
- I. Number of Degrees Granted in Past Seven Years, By Class Year.....13
- J. Ways in Which the Program Places Students Including Graduate School, Employment, Other.....13
- K. Ways in Which Students are Counseled/Advised.....13
  
- VI. FACULTY/STAFF.....14
  - A. List of Faculty/Staff who Participate in the Program.....14
  - B. List of Members of any Program Advisory Board or Similar Entity.....14
  - C. List of Support Staff for Program.....14
  - D. Discussion of the Balance in Research and/or Clinical Interests Among Program Faculty and the Desirability for Maintaining or Changing that Balance.....15
  - E. Analysis of Balance Between Senior and Junior Faculty.....15
  - F. Analysis of Balance of Faculty According to Gender and Minority Status.....16
  - G. Analysis of Teaching Loads, Including Both the Number of Sections and Their Enrollments, Over the Past Seven Years.....16
  - H. Analysis of Morale of Faculty and Staff Within the Unit, Including any Morale Challenges or Problems.....16
  - I. Analysis of the Collegiality/Organization./Governance Within the Unit.....17
  - J. Changes Anticipated in Faculty and Staff Composition in the Next Seven Years, in the Course of Events or Through Targeted Hiring.....18
  - K. Faculty Recruitment Procedures/Approaches.....18
  - L. Ways in Which the Program Promotes Quality Teaching, Research and Service on the Part of its Faculty.....18
  - M. Ways in Which Faculty/Staff achievement is Recognized/Rewarded (Note: List Any Significant Awards Earned by Faculty or Staff in the Program During the Past Seven Years).....18
  - N. Summarize Major External Grants Awarded to Faculty in the Program During Past Seven Years. (Note for Each Grant Include Name of Grant, Principal Investigator(s), and Maximum One-Paragraph Summary in Text of the Report; Executive Summary(s) of Grant Applications as Appendix).....19
  - O. Faculty Assessment Procedures.....19
  - P. Relationship of Program Governance to the Administrative Units Within Which the Program Functions.....19
  - Q. Summary Vitae.....19
  - R. Recommendations for Strengthening Faculty/Staff.....19
  
- VII. FACILITIES AND RESOURCES.....20
  - A. Physical Resources.....20
  - B. Library Resources and Support.....20
  - C. Computing Resources and Support.....20
  - D. Media and Equipment Resources and Support.....20
  - E. Research Support Both Within and Outside the Department.....20
  - F. Teaching Support.....20

G.	Analysis of Strengths and Weaknesses of Facilities and Resources.....	21
H.	Recommendations for Strengthening Facilities and Resources.....	21
VIII.	BUDGET AND FINANCE.....	21
A.	Faculty Salaries.....	21
B.	Staff Salaries.....	21
C.	Student Budget.....	21
D.	Fringe Benefits.....	21
E.	Equipment.....	21
F.	Support and Services.....	22
G.	Travel.....	22
H.	Outside Sources of Funding that Supports Program Objectives.....	22
I.	Analysis of Overall Program Budget Emphasizing Strength and Weaknesses.....	22
J.	Budget Recommendations.....	22
IX.	STUDENT OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT.....	23
A.	Benchmarks for Student Outcome Assessment.....	23
B.	Procedures.....	23
C.	Findings.....	23
D.	Results.....	24
E.	Planned Modifications.....	24
X.	Program Highlights.....	24
XI.	Summary.....	24
A.	Program History and Development.....	24
B.	Nature/Focus/Intent of Current Program.....	25
C.	Nature/Focus Intent of Program for the Future.....	25

## **ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW SELF-STUDY LIST OF APPENDICES**

- A. *Compass*
- B. Regional Student Teaching Centers
- C. Organizational Charts for the College and Division
- D. History of the OSFE “Reconceptualization,” 1988-1993
- E. Mildred Middleton Cadre Conference Programs
- F. Summary of Last Academic Program Review
- G. *Defining the Relationship*
- H. INTASC Standards
- I. OSFE Web Page Examples
- J. OSFE Mission and Goal Statement
- K. Human Relations Outcomes
- L. UNI Strategic Plan
- M. Teacher Education Institutions in Iowa
- N. OSFE Course List with Descriptions
- O. Completion Rates Data, Office of the Registrar
- P. Withdrawal Rates Data, Office of the Registrar
- Q. Work Sample Methodology Brochure
- R. Results of Analysis of OSFE Qualitative Survey Data about Curriculum
- S. Round-Up Package
- T. Minority Graduation Data, Office of the Registrar
- U. Minorities in Teaching Brochure
- V. Seven-Year Report of OSFE Center Enrollment

W. Degrees Granted in Last Seven Years, Office of the Registrar

X. Grade Distribution Data, Office of the Registrar

Y. Notification of Concerns Form

Z. Cadre Membership, 2001-2002

AA. Student Advisory Membership, 2001

BB. Requirements for Cooperating Teacher Remunerations, Code 262.74

CC. Accreditation Documents

DD. Recent OSFE Position Announcement

EE. Individual Adjustment Data

FF. Department of Teaching PAC Document

GG. Faculty and Staff Vitae

HH. UNI Library Resources

II. AY 2001-02 OSFE Budget

JJ. OSFE Student Outcomes Assessment Plan

KK. Eleven-Point Evaluation Instrument

LL. Fourteen-Point Evaluation Instrument

MM. Student Teaching Assessment Rubrics

NN. Outcome Assessment Data

OO. Teacher Education Assurance Program

PP. Certificates of Value

Exhibits

### III. INTRODUCTION

#### A. CAMPUS UNIT RESPONSIBLE FOR DELIVERY OF PROGRAM

The Office of Student Field Experiences (OSFE) administers and delivers the university-wide teacher education student teaching program at the University of Northern Iowa (UNI). The student teaching program is described in the context of the university's teacher education program in the *Compass* (Appendix A). All student teachers, regardless of major or college affiliation, are placed, supervised and evaluated by the staff of the OSFE Division throughout its network of fifteen student teaching centers (Appendix B). The program curriculum includes the various student teaching courses for the various majors and Human Relations, a course in multicultural education required for Iowa licensure.

#### B. DEPARTMENT, SCHOOL, AND COLLEGE ADMINISTERING THE UNIT

The OSFE Division, is part of the Department of Teaching, one of six departments in the College of Education. The unit is administered by a Director of Field Experiences who is also the Head of the Department of Teaching. Organizational charts for the College and the Division are in Appendix C.

#### C. BRIEF HISTORY OF THE PROGRAM

The University of Northern Iowa has long enjoyed a tradition and reputation of excellence for its teacher education program, and the student teaching component has been especially strong. With relatively large numbers of student teachers each semester, there have never been enough placement opportunities in the districts surrounding the University. Many student teachers have always been assigned to various areas across the state, and most OSFE coordinators have lived and worked in these off-campus locations.

In 1988-89, the unit adopted a "reconceptualized program" which formalized regional student teaching centers. In each regional center, the program was to be directed by a faculty coordinator and was to include local district personnel to serve as a clinical supervisor, who would assist with supervision, and several cadre members, who would support the program in locally identified ways. Each center was to become "center specific" such that student teaching procedures and program offerings would be aligned with UNI student teaching curriculum and at the same time highlight and accommodate local conditions and strengths. (The history related to the "reconceptualization" is described in Appendix D.) By 1993, OSFE had eleven student teaching centers, each with its own faculty coordinator. Each center had a cadre, but not all centers had a clinical supervisor.

Since 1993, the number of student teaching centers has grown from eleven to fifteen, including the center for out-of-state/international student teaching. Each center has evolved in its own uniqueness while also maintaining a strong relationship to the campus and its program goals and procedures. Local conditions as well as UNI program priorities and budget restraints have accounted for several changes. In three centers, coordinator positions are held by adjunct or term appointment personnel. Some centers do not have a clinical supervisor. Some have one or more adjunct persons who help with supervision. Not all clinical supervisors are employed in a center school district; some are retired educators or adjunct or term personnel who are compensated by the University. Not all cadre members are teachers; some are community resource persons who can mentor students with regard to diversity.

There have also been changes with regard to center locations. Four new Iowa centers have been established: North Iowa Cedar League (NICL), Northeast Iowa, Northwest Iowa, and Out-of-State/International. Most centers have become truly "regional" and encompass wide geographical

areas and numerous school districts. The Out-of-State/International Center places student teachers in locations throughout the nation and throughout the world. Supervision of these students is done by traveling faculty or by local personnel by special arrangement with the center's two coordinators.

To improve communication among cadre members as well as with campus faculty, there have been several annual or biannual cadre conferences. Some have been held on campus and others have been held in various host centers. In 1996, Mildred Middleton became an honorary member of the unit, and her enthusiastic participation and support for what have become known as the "Mildred Middleton Cadre Conferences" have been critical to the success of these conferences (Appendix E).

To improve the coordination of pre-student field experiences and the links between these experiences and student teaching, a faculty/coordinator position was created in the unit for pre-student teaching. The role of this professional is to coordinate placements for the one-week participation experience completed as part of a Curriculum and Instruction course for elementary majors, to facilitate and provide council with regard to other field experiences, and to monitor progress before the student teaching semester. Since 1993, sites for the one-week participation experience have increased to include many of the student teaching center locations.

To improve its communication with students and faculty as well as with interested others, the unit has developed a web page on the UNI web site, [www.uni.edu/stdteach](http://www.uni.edu/stdteach), and several centers have created their own pages which are linked to that site. As the technology has become available, more and more of the work of the unit is done electronically.

#### **D. SUMMARY OF LAST PROGRAM REVIEW AND RESULTING PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS**

Delivering a program of high quality, facilitating collaboration between the University and the various school sites with which it works, and providing a wide range of opportunities for student teachers were cited as strengths in the last program review (Appendix F). Since the program is evolving in response to national, local, and University needs and constraints, some recommendations in the last program review are no longer pertinent. Some improvements, however, have been accomplished.

Curriculum: Rubrics for assessing performance in student teaching have been developed by program staff, published in *Defining the Relationship*, the handbook for student and cooperating teachers (Appendix G), and implemented in all centers. The performance outcomes incorporate the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) standards (Appendix H). A faculty committee has developed performance outcomes for Human Relations, and all coordinators are currently involved in developing assessment and documentation procedures for these outcomes.

With regard to aligning the student teaching outcomes with pre-student teaching courses in other departments, the student teaching performance outcomes have been shared with all teacher education faculty. In addition, OSFE faculty have worked with UNI Teacher Education faculty in a series of Faculty Involvement meetings to explicate the teacher preparation curriculum. Several meetings have also been hosted by OSFE to raise issues and discussion among OSFE and other teacher education faculty. In addition, OSFE holds a meeting for all teacher education advisors and department heads each fall on the Friday prior to the commencement of classes. The purpose of this meeting is to explain any program changes and to solicit input and suggestions for program improvements

Students: Two areas of concern were raised with regard to students entering the program. One concern was a lack of exposure to diversity. The population in Iowa is becoming more diverse and opportunities for placement in diverse school settings in various centers for pre-student teaching as well as for student teaching have increased. The second concern has been a persistent one and remains a concern. Secondary student teachers lack preparation in classroom management.

Faculty and Staff: Full staffing of all centers was recommended. To be fully staffed, a center would have a faculty coordinator, a clinical supervisor, and a cadre of five or more members. While “full staffing” has not been accomplished, the program has accomplished “diversified” staffing to implement the model of university-school collaboration in a variety of ways. Cadre members, for example, have taken on more of the role of the clinical supervisor in some centers. Each center is currently staffed in a way which budget limitations allow and in a way which works for that center.

Since the last review, diversity on the faculty has been increased by two, and diversity has increased somewhat among center cadre members who work with student teachers.

While faculty have been involved in several study and/or grant projects, there remains a desire on the part of faculty for more time for research activity.

Facilities and Resources: Office space was raised as a concern. Since the last review, the program office was relocated to the Schindler Education Center, where many teacher education classes are held. In the various center communities, designated office space to increase the university’s visibility is not always feasible, and visibility in the schools is maintained by supervision visits. Coordinators in Iowa centers now have university vehicles, which they say become their offices. These marked cars also increase UNI visibility around the state.

Continued development and implementation of technological resources were recommended, and electronic communication has been utilized to connect program staff to each other and with the campus. The program has created its own web pages and uses mail-serves. Students make electronic application for student teaching. OSFE distributes its electronic newsletter, OSFE Network Messenger, to all program constituents. (Examples of web pages are in Appendix I.) There is a computer expert in the OSFE office in Schindler who has been critical in the program’s increased use of electronic communications.

The use of other technologies has also proliferated. A toll-free telephone number is available for students to call campus, and coordinators have cell phones to increase their accessibility. The Iowa Communication Network (ICN) and the Center for Educational Technology (CET) have been used to facilitate distance communication for several groups, and video technology has been utilized to link the campus to the various centers.

Budget: The previous self-study report recommended providing for budgetary needs with a student fee. A subsequent proposal for such a fee was not approved, but another proposal for a \$75 student teaching fee for 2002-03 is currently under consideration. Compensation to cooperating teachers has been increased from \$60 to \$75 for each eight- or nine-week placement. Additionally, cooperating teachers have the option of tuition reduction in lieu of payment.

#### **E. THE PROGRAM’S RELATIONSHIP TO THE MISSIONS OF THE COLLEGE AND THE UNIVERSITY**

The mission of both the University and the College of Education guides the OSFE Division in planning, implementing and evaluating its program.

### **University Mission Statement**

The University of Northern Iowa is a comprehensive institution committed to providing a diverse, dynamic learning environment, founded on a strong liberal arts curriculum and characterized by excellence in teaching, research and service.

(<http://www.uni.edu/pres/2001-2006strategicplan/>)

### **College of Education Mission Statement**

The mission of the University of Northern Iowa College of Education is three-fold. First, the College exists to prepare educational and human service professionals for a variety of direct service and leadership roles in schools and non-school settings. Second, faculty members in the College conduct applied and basic research in the area of teaching and learning, human behavior, human growth and development, and educational policy.

Third, the College of Education provides service on the local, state, regional, national, and international levels. By so doing, the College of Education effectively serves the profession by assuming a leadership role for the improvement of education and human services. (<http://www.uni.edu/coe/strat-plan-draft-01/draft.html>)

### **OSFE Mission Statement**

The Office of Student Field Experiences offers field experiences to UNI's teacher education students in a variety of settings in which students will confront current issues challenging educators and in which students will have high quality, personalized supervision.

OSFE coordinators have strong backgrounds in liberal arts curricula and among them have academic preparation in curriculum and instruction, school administration, elementary and secondary teaching, school improvement, and a variety of disciplines. Clinical and adjunct supervisors are selected for their exemplary achievements as teachers. Students have extended access to district teachers and administrators who model educational excellence and leadership. Field experience placements for day-to-day work in accredited public schools—or in private/parochial if requested by students—enable students to confront current, challenging issues and to observe a variety of educational practices in today's P-12 classrooms.

Students in the teacher education program at the University of Northern Iowa have a diverse choice of locations for field experiences with personalized supervision. They may select to complete field experiences in several student teaching centers in Iowa, in San Antonio, Texas, in Omaha, Nebraska, or in any number of other out-of-state sites. To further support the University's mission to increase international opportunities for students and faculty, OSFE has many opportunities for international experiences. Student teachers can elect international student teaching sites, and UNI faculty have been involved in their supervision at those sites. For the past two years, a section of Human Relations was taught in London, England, during the summer. These offerings involved UNI students from all majors and from all colleges as well as UNI faculty and cooperating teachers.

## **F. PROGRAM GOALS AND OBJECTIVES**

The goal of the UNI teacher education program is to prepare teachers who will be responsible, reflective decision maker in a rapidly changing world (Appendix A: *Compass*, page 8). In its work contributing to progress toward this goal, the student teaching program offers teaching/learning opportunities with systematic support in diverse, field-based settings (Appendix J).

Program objectives are: (1) to provide information about student teaching and application procedures to future student teachers; (2) to process applications and assign students to centers; (3) in each center group, to interview student teachers before making placement assignments; (4) in each center, to make two placements for each student teacher and to provide cooperating teachers with introductory materials; (5) in each center group, to distribute placement information and orient students to the center's program and personnel; (6) in each center, to implement the program curricula and supervise the student teaching experience and performance evaluations; (7) to prepare and distribute student teaching evaluations; and (8) in each center, to be resourceful and supportive to beginning teachers from UNI who are teaching there.

The primary purpose for student teaching is for students to experience in depth the full role and meaning of teaching in "real-world" school settings. Student teachers are provided a time for learning, experimentation, critical analysis, reflection, and practice in the planning, delivery, and assessment of instruction and management. The program has two sets of performance-based outcomes that constitute objectives for student teachers, one set for teaching (Appendix G: *Defining the Relationship*, pages 43-80) and another for Human Relations (Appendix K: Performance-Based Outcomes for Human Relations).

Faculty members identify their own goals and objectives at the beginning of each academic year. These objectives are related to the University's strategic plan (Appendix L). In April, faculty members submit activity reports to document achievement of their individual objectives for that year. A notebook containing faculty goals and activity reports is available in the department office.

#### **G. LIST OF SIMILAR PROGRAMS IN IOWA REGENT INSTITUTIONS AND OTHER INSTITUTIONS IN IOWA**

There are a total of thirty-one Iowa institutions which prepare teachers in one or more licensure areas for the PK-12 Iowa schools (Appendix M). All have comprehensive student teaching programs. The UNI program is the largest of the three public Regents institutions and by far larger than any of the other twenty-nine private institutions.

UNI maintains a professional relationship with other Iowa teacher education institutions. The directors of student teaching and members of their staffs meet at least once a year to discuss issues common to student teaching in Iowa. The Iowa Board of Regents provides a Regents Exchange program, which allows students to student teach at other Regents institutions.

### **IV. CURRICULUM**

#### **A. LIST OF COURSES CURRENTLY OFFERED, WITH CATALOG DESCRIPTIONS**

To be aligned with Iowa licensure categories, student teaching courses have numbers which correspond to licensure categories, i.e. elementary teaching, secondary teaching, special area teaching, etc. The human relations course required for Iowa licensure is offered concurrent with student teaching for most students and is taken prior to student teaching for students in the Out-of-State/International Student Teaching Center. A seminar studies course, Preparation for Urban/International Student Teaching, is another prerequisite for these students and is taken the semester before student teaching. Other courses offered as electives include various individual field experience courses; a one-hour studies course usually taken concurrent to student teaching, Studies in Latino Culture for Teachers; and a course in supervision for cooperating teachers. Specific courses with descriptions are listed in Appendix N.

## **B. SCHEDULE OF ROTATIONS**

All courses are offered every semester in order to accommodate the various needs of over 350 candidates every semester.

## **C. REQUIREMENTS FOR COMPLETING PROGRAM**

Student teaching is a full semester program. To complete the program, students must earn credit in their respective student teaching course(s) and the three-hour human relations course.

## **D. RATES OF PROGRAM COMPLETION AND AVERAGE TIME TO COMPLETE**

Students complete the student teaching program in one semester with two exceptions. Students in the Out-of-State/International Student Teaching Center complete the program over two semesters, and students with an early childhood major may take two semesters to complete the program if they elect to have three student teaching placements instead of the required minimum of two. For a report of program completion rates in the last five years, see Appendix O. Most students who enter the program complete the program. The withdrawal or failure rate is minimal. Appendix P contains withdrawal data from Office of the Registrar.

## **E. ANTICIPATED NEW COURSES OR CHANGES IN PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS**

There are no new courses or changes in program requirements planned.

## **F. DISCUSSION: SHOULD ANY PART OF THIS PROGRAM'S CURRICULUM BE LOCATED IN SOME OTHER PROGRAM? SHOULD ANY PART OF ANOTHER PROGRAM'S CURRICULUM BE LOCATED IN THIS PROGRAM?**

Including the human relations course in the student teaching program has been an issue for discussion. The faculty of the OSFE Division believes this part of the program should not be located in some other program. As it is currently offered by OSFE faculty in their student teaching centers, the forty-five contact hours required for this three-hour course occur during the week before student teaching begins, during an interim week between the two student teaching placements, and as an addition to some student teaching seminar meetings during each placement. Taken with the twelve hours of credit for student teaching, the three-hour human relations course gives students a load of fifteen credit hours for the semester, a typical semester load.

That students may not have space in their program for the three-hour human relations course before the student teaching semester is one reason to offer this course concurrent to student teaching. The faculty continues to believe, however, that there is an even more important reason for offering this course with student teaching. Taken in the student teaching center while students are working in the schools and living in their center's community, student teachers are more likely to feel the challenges associated with diversity in their classrooms, and they can explore over time their own reactions to these challenges while they are under the guidance of their supervisors and in the company of other student teachers experiencing like challenges. In this context, they have many opportunities to reflectively try and test teaching practices designed to enhance human relations and each of their student's motivation and learning. They are also challenged by actually putting into practice the ideas of human relations to which they have subscribed.

In other teacher education programs, the human relations course may be taught at a lower level and/or prior to student teaching. James Banks (1994) agrees with this approach if the emphasis is on race relations and/or ethnic studies. At UNI, however, the emphasis is not exclusively on race relations and/or ethnic studies; the emphasis is on inclusion of all the diversities teachers can find in their classrooms. The emphasis is on multicultural education as it is defined by Pamela and Iris Tiedt (1999): "Multicultural education is an inclusive teaching/learning process that engages all students in: (1) developing a strong sense of self-esteem; (2) discovering empathy for persons

of diverse cultural backgrounds; and (3) experiencing equitable opportunities to achieve to their fullest potential” (p. 18).

Christine Bennett (1999) contends: “Multicultural education in the United States is an approach to teaching and learning that is based on democratic values and beliefs, and affirms cultural pluralism within culturally diverse societies and an interdependent world” (p. 11).

The important aspects of both definitions relate to the placement of multicultural education within student teaching, where students are involved in both teaching and learning. Throughout the undergraduate teacher education programs, the concepts of multiculturalism are introduced, identified and discussed in methods classes. In taking Human Relations during student teaching, students expand their own awareness in the context of schools, and they can have ample practice in application. They learn how to learn from their students as they identify, implement, and reflectively evaluate strategies for their own multicultural teaching. They can also examine the models they themselves are for democratic values and advocates of cultural pluralism.

#### **G. DESCRIPTION OF ANY NON-DEGREE AND/OR SERVICE CURRICULA IN TERMS OF THEIR VALUE TO OTHERS PROGRAMS, INCLUDING COLLEGE-WIDE AND/OR UNIVERSITY-WIDE INTERESTS**

For students prior to student teaching, student organizations such as Iowa Student Education Association (ISEA), sponsored through the Department of Teaching, initiate mentoring and tutoring projects in the local schools. ISEA membership is open to all students in the university, and each year the organization averages over 300 members. During student teaching, students are encouraged to take advantage of opportunities to help with before and after school activities.

#### **H. DESCRIPTION OF EXTERNAL/DISTANCE DELIVERY OF COURSES. POSSIBILITIES FOR FUTURE PROGRAM EXPANSION VIA DISTANCE EDUCATION**

The Iowa Communication Network (ICN) connections are utilized for the sharing of some seminar presentations among selected centers and the campus.

The Out-of-State/International Student Teaching Center delivers the student teaching program at a distance. Arrangements are made for student teaching sites in a variety of locations. Students are assigned to cooperating teachers and administrators at those sites for local supervision. UNI supervisors may make visits to the sites. UNI supervisors communicate with student and cooperating teachers via e-mail, telephone, fax, and U.S. Mail. UNI has taken leadership in making national and international placements for the Renaissance Group institutions as well as for UNI. The Renaissance Bureau of Indian Affairs Student Teaching Program, the result of federal grant activity now completed, places student teachers in Indian schools across the U.S.

The Out of State and International student teaching program is coordinated by two full time faculty members who interview student teachers, make the placements with cooperating teachers and arrange for their local supervision. After Roundup each semester, informational meetings are held to inform student teachers of opportunities in out of state and international sites. The student teacher generates the request to student teach in an out of state or international site. Then, a series of screening interviews examines the student teacher’s academic background, rationale, and site selected. A series of seminars are conducted to help the student teacher prepare for the out of state or international student teaching semester, including study components of UNI student teaching, a search of information about their state or country and preparation of a pre-departure portfolio. Placement by UNI faculty are facilitated by Directors of Student Teaching in Renaissance Group Universities and by administrators of American, International and DoDDS Schools, who attend the UNI Overseas Recruiting Fair each year in March. A local supervisor is

located in the state or country that is usually affiliated with a local university or college, the local school, or a retired administrator or teacher in the community. These placements are facilitated through email, fax, and telephone.

### **I. DESCRIPTION OF OPPORTUNITIES PROVIDED FOR UNDERGRADUATE OR GRADUATE (AS APPROPRIATE) RESEARCH**

As a part of the student teaching curriculum, all student teachers complete an action research project. The focus of the action research is usually centered on the improvement of teaching by the student teacher, who is both the researcher and the topic of the research. The student teacher identifies a classroom problem that is important and possibly changeable. She/he then analyzes the problem through personal reflection and formulates a research question. Procedures are defined, data collected, and results reported in the project's final reflection. Student teachers share the results of their action research projects with other student teachers.

In some centers in Iowa, student teachers are using the "work sample methodology" as their action research option. With leadership and mentoring from Dr. Victoria Robinson, who coordinates the UNI partnership in a large Title II grant sponsored by the Renaissance Group institutions, student teachers are learning how to document the learning outcomes of their pupils in a unit of instruction. The work sample methodology is an adaptation of the portfolio format to document a unit of instruction and contains the pre and post data collection associated with action research. It is a significant way to show the influence of teaching on learning (Appendix Q).

For the last four years, undergraduate research grants have been awarded competitively within the College of Education. A number of these grants have been awarded to students for research during their student teaching. These grants have enabled undergraduates to interact with a faculty mentor in conducting a research project they have proposed. Results have been shared and exhibited in the College of Education regularly each year.

### **J. DESCRIPTION OF EXPERIENTIAL AND/OR SERVICE LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES FOR STUDENTS IN THE PROGRAM**

During student teaching many regional centers encourage and/or supervise service learning projects in the schools and/or in the school's community. In a few selected centers several years ago, service learning projects were done in conjunction with a University of Iowa grant project which emphasized curricular connections. In a few other centers, students have worked with community agencies in school settings for service learning projects; some received academic credit for this work. These opportunities build a sense of community and develop leadership skills within the school setting

In the last four years, experiential learning and research grants, which are awarded on a competitive basis to undergraduates in the College of Education, have given a few selected student teachers funds to support the experiential learning projects they proposed. Learnings from these projects are shared formally with peers and faculty when they are showcased in the College of Education.

### **K. STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM CURRICULUM**

Excellence in teacher preparation is a hallmark of the University of Northern Iowa. The student teaching program curriculum reflects the University's commitment to preparing highly competent, responsible, and reflective teachers. The Office of Student Field Experiences is proud to offer and supervise student teaching, the culminating experience in the teacher education program. Program faculty, graduates, and school personnel who work with student teachers as well as those who receive graduates as beginning teachers, agree that the program is well-designed, sound, and significant to the development of excellent practitioners. Program faculty,

others who supervise and work with student teachers, graduates, and school administrators agree on the many strengths of the program. A discussion of these strengths appears in Appendix R.

- Excellence in supervision is the hallmark of the program.
- The student teaching program has a specified curriculum which includes content and supervised practice in areas deemed important in teacher preparation. The curriculum consists of five student teaching components (teaching, supervisory conferences, reflection, action research, and seminar) plus Human Relations.
- The curriculum—and its delivery—is student-centered while it includes content affirmed by University faculty as critical to successful teaching.
- The preparation for student teaching involves the students in advance planning and communication with the student teaching coordinator and other supervisors with whom they will work.
- The length of the student teaching experience is sixteen weeks or a full-semester, usually with two placements in the semester.
- *Defining the Relationship*, the student teaching handbook, offers clear, concise guidance for both student and cooperating teachers.
- Assessment of student teachers is performance-based, and several supervisory persons are involved in giving feedback to student teachers throughout the semester.
- Students have the opportunity to achieve placements in out-of-state and international settings as well as the opportunities for other placements which feature diversity.
- An OSFE faculty Human Relations Committee has worked over the past several years to draft a set of performance-based outcomes for Human Relations. The work of this committee is seen by the program faculty as having the potential to dramatically strengthen the curriculum.

#### **L. UNIQUE-DISTINCTIVE FEATURES OF PROGRAM CURRICULUM**

The University of Northern Iowa student teaching curriculum has several distinct features, which are discussed in detail in Appendix R. These distinctive features have also been seen as strengths.

- Student teaching centers
- Five-part student teaching curriculum and Human Relations
- Sixteen-week student teaching in two school placements
- Performance-based evaluation and rubric evaluation tool
- *Defining the Relationship*, the student and cooperating teacher handbook
- Use of technology: World Wide Web/Internet and ICN resources
- University-school partnerships for curriculum delivery
- Diverse school and community settings
- Out-of-state and international placements
- Form and procedure for documenting concerns
- Coordination of some pre-student teaching field experiences

#### **M. WEAKNESSES OF CURRICULUM**

Most school-based personnel who have been asked to assess the student teaching curriculum have recorded their beliefs that the program is excellent, and many say: “There are no weaknesses. Keep up the good work!”

Interestingly, most areas of strength named by many who have been involved in the program over the last seven years (cooperating teachers, student teachers, supervisors, cadre members, and administrators) are also named by a few others as weaknesses. These perceived weaknesses, when they occasionally occur, exist not in the curriculum itself but in the delivery and implementation of the curriculum.

- Former student teachers and cooperating teachers identify as weak those curriculum components they perceive as activities which take time away from the student teacher’s concentration on teaching.
- While supervision is most frequently cited as the most important strength by those in all roles of the student teaching program, supervision is strongly felt as a major weakness when local supervision does not live up to what UNI constituents have come to expect.
- While delivering the curriculum in two placements is seen as a strength by virtually all student teachers and most school personnel, it is seen as a weakness by a few cooperating teachers, especially by those in secondary settings, who would like student teachers to be in their classrooms for the entire semester.

New program faculty have expressed some confusion about the Human Relations curriculum. Agreement on a set of performance-based outcomes has been achieved in the last year, and work is currently in progress under the direction of a faculty committee to address the need for collegial professional development so that the Human Relations curriculum in all the centers is focused on the performance-based outcomes.

“There is just so much to do!” Program faculty and supervisors, student teachers, and school-based supervisors all admit to feeling overwhelmed at times with all there is for student teachers to do. At the same time, it’s also been said that having so much to do is the “real world of teaching” and is therefore excellent preparation.

#### **N. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF PROGRAM CURRICULUM**

Recommendations for improvement include continuing to do what is done well and to work in several areas to maintain the program’s reputation of excellence in each center.

- While supervision practices are generally perceived as being of high quality, all supervisors need to be sure that they are visible and accessible, that they are consistently on time for appointments, that they make explicit the connections between each assignment and teaching, and that they attend to public relations/communication in their various school sites.
- More and more students are using web sites for information and reference. Center coordinators need to continue to develop and maintain web pages that are resourceful to student teachers. As more and more students have computer technology in their student teaching sites, electronic communication can be more fully utilized.

- Curriculum development and improvement is an on-going interest to which the faculty is committed. Work needs to continue on the Human Relations curriculum as faculty develops assessment procedures for the outcomes identified for this course. Also there is a need to provide more professional development for new faculty members who are teaching Human Relations. Scheduled time is needed to accomplish this work as well as to share ideas related to developing and refining the delivery of any of the curriculum components in the respective centers.

## V. STUDENTS

### A. WAYS IN WHICH THE PROGRAM RECRUITS QUALIFIED STUDENTS

The OSFE student teaching program provides a service to the teacher education academic majors on the UNI campus. Eligibility for student teaching is based on requirements established and approved by the UNI Council on Teacher Education. These requirements are listed in the *Compass* (Appendix A, page 4). Teacher education candidates are recommended by their major advisors to OSFE for the student teaching semester. A list of majors served and their respective advisory faculties are also listed in the *Compass* (Appendix A, page 7).

During the first two days of each semester, a Student Teacher Round-Up is held. Eligible student teaching candidates gather to learn about the procedures and process for student teaching, for the preparation of student teaching applications and background papers which will later be sent to their cooperating teachers, and for requesting a particular student teaching center assignment. Students are informed of the many options available for student teaching placements in Iowa, the U.S., and around the world. Round-Up meetings are offered over a two-day period at various times to avoid conflicting with students' various class or work schedules. The Round-Up presentation is also videotaped so that those who cannot make any of the meetings can still receive the information. A complete Round-Up package appears in Appendix S.

Student teaching representatives are also present at other campus events to inform and educate students and parents about the student teaching semester. The OSFE presence is notable at family weekends, at homecoming, on the web, in various classes, informational sessions for teacher education advisors, and other meetings where teacher education students might be.

### B. DESCRIPTION OF THE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF STUDENTS ENTERING THE PROGRAM

UNI students entering student teaching have many strengths which are appreciated by all who work with them. Above all, student teachers are enthusiastic, energetic, sincere, and committed to their own professional development and growth. They are willing to work hard, and they ask for and are receptive to constructive feedback. Students enter the program with increasing capabilities and interest in utilizing technology. Special education and elementary majors generally have had many previous field experiences and enter with excellent preparation for both instruction and classroom management. They emphasize hands-on strategies which promote active student participation.

While students entering the program are generally known for being well prepared for student teaching, there are several areas of weakness for some students. Grammar in both writing and speaking are problems students typically do not themselves recognize. Correct use of pronouns and irregular verbs are especially troublesome. While students have positive attitudes about multicultural education, many lack experience with diversity and knowledge of perspectives other than their own. Other weaknesses have to do with preparation in methods classes. Elementary majors who do not have a minor or an endorsement in reading need more background in the teaching of reading. Those who are seeking an endorsement in middle school teaching often are

not knowledgeable enough to teach science, math, and social studies. Many secondary student teachers need more preparation in classroom management, instructional strategies, and lesson planning. English teachers do not demonstrate adequate preparation in English grammar and usage. Technology education students have skills with computer technology but lack background in the traditional shop skills, i.e., woodworking, electricity, and metalworking. Social studies and technology education student teachers are generally not prepared to use a variety of instructional strategies. All students who are not special education majors or minors need more preparation for including and teaching students with special needs.

### **C. DESCRIPTION OF THE DIVERSITY OF STUDENTS IN THE PROGRAM**

The numbers of minority student teachers between AY 1994-95 and AY 2000-01 are recorded in Appendix T. Minority student teachers can be a part of the Minorities In Teaching (MIT) program (Appendix U) and/or are given support by their home school districts. OSFE serves minority students by making placement assignments to accommodate their requests as MIT participants or recipients of support from their back-home schools.

### **D. WAYS IN WHICH STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT IS RECOGNIZED**

All those responsible for program implementation favor recognizing student achievement in ways which support intrinsic motivation and which facilitate a spirit of cooperation and mutual support rather than a spirit of competition. Recognition in the form of affirmation and positive reinforcement is given to all student teachers. The most common method of recognizing achievement is individual feedback, and it is used frequently. Written and oral comments are given to student teachers following observations, and positive comments from cooperating teachers and administrators are passed along to student teachers by UNI supervisors. In seminar, students share and celebrate their own success stories. In some centers food is brought to seminars as a treat, and in some centers there is a celebration event at the end of the semester. In some centers, students receive certificates in recognition of their successful completion of student teaching, and some local newspapers report names of student teachers in their area schools. Getting letters of recommendation and a teaching job are other forms of recognition that are highly prized by student teachers.

### **E. ENROLLMENT STATISTICS FOR THE PRECEDING SEVEN YEARS; NUMBERS OF MAJORS AND MINORS IN PROGRAM REPRESENTED BY CLASS YEAR**

Enrollment for the OSFE Division reflects the number of students approved for student teaching by the various majors. Appendix V shows the total number of student teachers in each semester by student teaching region. In the total number, about two-thirds are elementary and one-third are secondary majors. A breakdown by specific majors is included in data reported from the Office of the Registrar in Appendix W.

### **F. REGISTRAR'S THIRD-WEEK CLASS-SIZE REPORTS FOR ALL COURSES IN THE PROGRAM FOR THE PAST TWO SEMESTERS AND SUMMER SESSION**

The third week class size report for student teaching is not an indicator of actual class size since any changes or drops of student teachers usually occur beyond the third week, usually at the end of the first nine-week placement or even during the second nine-week placement. Drops from student teaching usually occur because of the lack of performance or a recommendation from supervisors. When a student is withdrawn, a special report, called a Recapitulation Form (Appendix G, pages 39-40), is completed. This is kept on file in the OSFE office. Before a student is allowed to continue or to receive a new placement, the requirements, recommendations, and/or remediation outlined on the Recapitulation Form must have been completed.

#### **G. ANALYSIS OF ENROLLMENT PATTERNS FOR PAST SEVEN YEARS AND DISCUSSION OF PLANNED/PROJECTED CHANGES IN ENROLLMENT**

Changes in enrollment in the student teaching program are directly related to enrollment increases and decreases in the various teacher education programs at the University. As enrollment increases or decreases, or as teacher education programs are added or dropped, the number of student teachers will subsequently vary.

#### **H. MEAN GPA AWARDED TO ALL STUDENTS IN THE PROGRAM OVER THE PAST SEVEN YEARS, COMPARED TO MEAN GPA FOR ALL UNIVERSITY COURSES, REPRESENTED BY CLASS YEAR**

Student teaching is a “pass/no credit,” 12 credit-hour experience. All students who complete student teaching are given credit. The small percentage who are withdrawn receive a “W.” Occasionally a “no credit” is issued. If a “no credit” is assigned, the candidate must then appeal to the Council of Teacher Education before being eligible for a second student teaching opportunity.

The Human Relations course (280:070 & 280:170g), a corequisite with student teaching is graded. Faculty tend to weight the grades on the basis of participation in experiential activities and successful completion of assignments. Consequently, the tendency is for the grades to be higher than they are in other University courses. Grade distribution data from the Office of the Registrar are summarized in Appendix X.

#### **I. NUMBER OF DEGREES GRANTED IN PAST SEVEN YEARS, BY CLASS YEAR**

Awarding degrees is not a responsibility of the student teaching program. A completion of student teaching is a requirement for students seeking a Bachelor of Arts in Teaching degree with Iowa licensure. The number of degrees granted by major and year are included in Appendix W. The total number by semester may vary from the number of student teachers per semester by center in Appendix V because students may take student teaching a semester in advance of graduation. Students who elect that option return to campus to complete other required or elective courses.

#### **J. WAYS IN WHICH THE PROGRAM PLACES STUDENTS INCLUDING GRADUATE SCHOOL, EMPLOYMENT, OTHER**

Students completing the program are assisted in placement by the UNI Career Center, the unit which receives copies of each student teacher’s final evaluations and maintains credential files for students who apply for them. Candidates who student teach at any school become prime applicants for open positions in those schools and are supported by their UNI student teaching supervisors. The Office of Student Field Experiences has not kept data on placement statistics of student teachers, but center coordinators often do so informally.

#### **K. WAYS IN WHICH STUDENTS ARE COUNSELED/ADVISED**

There are a number of ways students in the program are advised. Before student teaching, they are routinely advised by faculty in their respective programs and the College of Education Advising Center. Once in the program, they are advised directly by their center coordinators. In cases where problems become apparent, coordinators may use the Notification of Concern process in counseling the student and in recommending actions for any needed remediation (Appendix Y). On rare occasions, a student is advised to withdraw from student teaching. The process and form for withdrawals appear in the published handbook, *Defining the Relationship* (Appendix G, pages 37-40). Faculty may also refer students for additional counsel to UNI’s Student Services, Disability Services, Vocational Rehabilitation, and/or to their major department advisors. If students are involved in any personal crisis situation while they are away from campus during student teaching, personal counseling may be provided in the center community.

## **VI. FACULTY/STAFF**

### **A. LIST OF FACULTY/STAFF WHO PARTICIPATE IN THE PROGRAM**

There are currently (AY-2001-2002) fourteen tenured or probationary faculty. The time of one of these is shared with the College of Business, and one is on phased retirement. There are three full-time term appointees, one full-time adjunct appointee, and eight staff members who assist with supervision on a part-time basis. These personnel are configured into roles as identified in Appendix B. Each of the fifteen centers has a coordinator, three centers have clinical supervisors, and six centers have full or part-time assistance with supervision.

Faculty/Staff whose responsibilities include teaching, coordination, and supervision in AY 2001-02 are: Thomas Blaine, Kathy Blecha, Dianna Briggs, Christine Canning, Ph.D., Richard Fehlman, Ph.D., Richard Hawkes, Ph.D., James Kelly, Ph.D., Roger Kueter, Ed. D., Robert McCormack, Ph.D., Frances Miller, Janey Montgomery, Ph.D., Nick Pace, Beverly Riess, Linda Rosulek, Diane Simmons, Richard Stahlhut, Ph.D., Cheryl Timion.

Clinical supervisors are staff who have supervision responsibilities under the direction of a center coordinator and for whose time the University compensates the school district. For Fall 2001, they are: Rebecca Abbas, Doreen Knuth, and LaDonna Lines. Additional adjunct staff who provide assistance with supervision for Fall 2001, again under the direction of a center coordinator, include: Carol Bowen, Larry Bowen, Susan Craig, Lee Hanzelon, Lou Ann Landholm, Julio Noboa, Trish Stouffer, and Tekeste Teclu, Ed.D.

### **B. LIST OF MEMBERS OF ANY PROGRAM ADVISORY BOARD OR SIMILAR ENTITY**

The program maintains a cadre of eighty-five members (Appendix Z). This is a group of master teachers and/or community resources located in each center. Membership is voluntary, but members are selected by the center coordinator in conjunction with any policies and procedures of the local district.

The program also has a student advisory board composed of sixteen students who meet twice a year (Appendix AA). Members of this student advisory committee are selected from a group of individuals who volunteer at the time of Student Teaching Round-Up. They serve until they complete student teaching.

### **C. LIST OF SUPPORT STAFF FOR PROGRAM**

Nora Janssen serves as the administrative placement assistant for the program. She is a resource to incoming students, is responsible for making center assignment proposals, monitors student eligibility and progress, serves as an administrative assistant to center coordinators, and coordinates OSFE records and data bases. Anne Nordquist serves as the budget supervisor and is responsible for the program's financial accounting. She is also the unit's computer expert and the OSFE web master. The campus office relies on student staff to assist with general reception and clerical duties.

The unit employs contract employees for the purpose of typing the final student teaching evaluations. Most typing is done in the Cedar Falls/Waterloo metro area, but on occasion one of the other centers will use temporary help to prepare final evaluations for the center.

The individual classroom licensed practitioners are critical to the success of the student teaching program. UNI contracts with ± 1200 cooperating teachers every year to serve in this important

role. For their work UNI pays them \$75, or a certificate for reduction in graduate credit tuition. Requirements for remuneration are outlined in Code 262.74 (Appendix BB).

#### **D. DISCUSSION OF THE BALANCE IN RESEARCH AND/OR CLINICAL INTERESTS AMONG PROGRAM FACULTY AND THE DESIREABILITY FOR MAINTAINING OR CHANGING THAT BALANCE**

OSFE faculty have struggled with ambivalence in their discussions of this issue. Given that the primary responsibility of the program is clinical supervision, the faculty would identify “clinical interests” as being dominant in the program in terms of time and energy. Much of the teaching done by faculty is done on a one-to-one basis in clinical settings. The demands of day-to-day supervision as well as the physical isolation from campus and University colleagues some faculty experience have worked to diminish time and energy for research activity. However, given the mission of the program and its commitment to quality supervision, there is, on one hand, satisfaction with the imbalance that exists in favor of clinical interests.

On the other hand, there is also a degree of dissatisfaction with the imbalance when faculty look to the practices in other programs in the College and across campus. There is some dissatisfaction that research activity for OSFE faculty has had to be relegated to a lower priority in terms of the availability of designated, uninterrupted time. Newer faculty members especially are challenged by the multiplicity of roles they have to enact and are concerned with regard to the University’s expectations for them with regard to scholarship. All are challenged by the reality that if they do not deliver quality supervision in a unit whose purpose is to serve other teacher education programs, survival may be at risk.

At the same time, as evidenced by program vitae, faculty have been productive. Some faculty have their own research interests and are pursuing them, others have been involved in collaborative projects taking place outside the Division, and there has been interest in collaborative work among OSFE colleagues on projects which are focused on clinical supervision. Numerous data collections occur throughout the centers each year, and one of the most senior members has encouraged his colleagues to analyze these data and write about what they have done and what they discover in data collections.

Ernest Boyer (1997) has proposed enlarging the traditional perspective of scholarship to include alongside the scholarship of discovery the scholarships of integration, application, and teaching. He also proposes a scholarship-as-service orientation while he affirms the value of public sharing. OSFE faculty are considering this perspective as a paradigm for their approach to scholarship. What remains for OSFE faculty is the need for time and energy for reflective engagement in such work of scholarship.

#### **E. ANALYSIS OF BALANCE BETWEEN SENIOR AND JUNIOR FACULTY**

Among tenured/probationary faculty in the student teaching program, seven are senior and seven are junior faculty. One senior faculty member is currently on phased retirement, and other senior faculty are closer to retirement than are the junior faculty. The most recent new faculty entered as senior faculty, transferring from another college in the University. Other new faculty in the last seven years have entered without a terminal degree. One of these is at the dissertation stage of a doctoral program and may not finish, one has plans to begin a doctoral program, and two others may be considering beginning one. Since there has not been success in recent years in attracting candidates with terminal degrees to new faculty positions in this program, senior faculty will most likely be added as junior faculty achieve terminal degrees or as faculty in other programs request to be transferred into the student teaching program. Again, however, there is some ambivalence on this issue. Given that the priority of the Division has been and will continue to be high quality supervision, having higher numbers of junior members who do deliver high

quality supervision can most effectively support the Division's work as a service unit. Working on a doctorate takes time and energy that could erode supervision quality. Still it has been a traditional aim for the unit to present itself as competitive members of the academy, i.e., more than a service unit, and to have a number of senior faculty to provide leadership in scholarly activity as well as in College and University governance.

#### **F. ANALYSIS OF BALANCE OF FACULTY ACCORDING TO GENDER AND MINORITY STATUS**

The OSFE unit has eight female and six male tenure/probationary faculty. One female and three males are term or full time temporary staff. Among the clinical/part time staff, there are seven females and three males. There are three minority staff members: one Black female (probationary faculty), one Latino male (term appointment), and one Black male (adjunct appointment). Past searches have failed to identify qualified minorities willing to accept offers of employment with off-campus, i.e., center, assignments in lieu of alternative offers from other universities for on-campus positions.

#### **G. ANALYSIS OF TEACHING LOADS, INCLUDING BOTH THE NUMBER OF SECTIONS AND THEIR ENROLLMENTS, OVER THE LAST SEVEN YEARS**

Faculty load in OSFE is determined by the number of students assigned to each coordinator (Appendix V). The course load for each coordinator includes all student teaching courses for which her/his center's students are enrolled and Human Relations. All the courses for any given coordinator, i.e., center, are assigned the same section number. The goal has been to maintain teaching/supervision loads in concert with accreditation standards. Both state and national accreditation guidelines encourage "moderation" when assigning candidates to faculty for supervision. Specific wording of the guidelines are highlighted in accreditation documents contained in Appendix CC. OSFE's goal is to assign from fifteen to twenty students for supervision and Human Relations instruction to each faculty/coordinator. When more than this number is assigned to a center, adjunct personnel are utilized to assist with supervision. A review of the data for the last seven years (Appendix V) supports that faculty loads have remained within this Division guideline.

#### **H. ANALYSIS OF MORALE OF FACULTY AND STAFF WITHIN THE UNIT, INCLUDING ANY MORALE CHALLENGES OR PROBLEMS**

Morale in the unit has improved in recent years and is generally high. Members of the unit like each other, share a commitment to quality supervision in the preparation of future teachers, and respect each other's role in the process. A faculty/staff retreat in 2000 resulted in revitalized morale. The department head gives enthusiastic and supportive leadership to all centers as well as to the program in general, and the spirit in each center is one of confidence, pride, and team work to accomplish the work of the center, i.e., delivering a high quality student teaching program.

Bringing theory and practice orientations together is an achievement of the unit, but it can also be a source of several tensions. Faculty members who supervise student teachers have to "wear two hats." While they must work in the public school culture, they are also members of the academy and are expected to follow the academy's traditions and cultural norms. Except for the few faculty who have office locations on campus, program members are located in off-campus sites and spend little time on campus among University colleagues. Enacting university responsibilities is difficult for them, and becoming active members of the University community on campus is a challenge.

Generally, however, a positive atmosphere exists within the unit. As technology is used more and more for university communication, faculty members get information in a more timely way, and they can participate in projects using electronic communication. The annual Mildred Middleton

Cadre Conference, unit retreats, the friendly atmosphere for sharing and discussion, the team spirit among center personnel, the esteem in which the University is held in the various centers, and the enthusiasm and commitment of all the program members for delivering a program of high quality all enhance morale. The spirit that emanates from the campus unit office also enhances the morale of the unit. The office support staff is highly competent, efficient, responsive, and friendly. The Head is enthusiastic, affirming, and supportive, and his leadership has been critical to the building of morale in the unit.

#### **I. ANALYSIS OF THE COLLEGIALITY/ORGANIZATION/GOVERNANCE WITHIN THE UNIT**

Each center coordinator reports directly to the department head. Assessment and evaluations of faculty are conducted in accordance with the University's master agreement. Within the centers, the coordinator is responsible for the productivity, assignment, and yearly assessment of the clinical supervisor, adjunct personnel, and/or cadre members. Each center has identified the assessment procedures for her/his members and copies of assessment documents are provided to the individuals with copies to both the Division and school district if applicable.

The promotion of collegiality is a refined skill of the unit head. He is open to discussion and willing to listen to all voices. He is not defensive in conflict, encourages expression of disagreement, and is respectfully responsive in conflict situations. In addition, he makes many efforts to support the inclusion of faculty members in campus activity. In addition to the leadership of the department head, a faculty chair position was created in 2000-01. The person in this role has contributed to the sense of collegiality among faculty by working on articulating the various responsibilities of the faculty role and facilitating the enactment of those responsibilities. The faculty chair has also maintained a routine communication link between department administration and faculty with the result being greater participation and ownership by faculty with regard to decisions made in the unit. That there are OSFE faculty meetings has also enhanced collegiality among faculty.

Because most faculty are not campus-based, it is difficult for them to be involved in faculty governance at the College or University level. For the most part, such involvement is through the few faculty who have offices on campus, i.e., those whose centers are on or near campus. These members represent the unit with excellence on campus and are effective in communicating with their colleagues, both in and outside the unit, such that the unit is perceived as a contributing member of the campus community. It is notable that one of the unit's members served as University Faculty Chair for two years of the last seven and has also actively served on the Council on Teacher Education for several years.

Unit faculty are actively involved in various projects within the Division. All tenured members are involved in Professional Assessment Committee (PAC) work so that all probationary faculty have members from the unit involved in their assessments and mentoring. The Human Relations Committee has been exemplary in its work to develop an outcomes-based assessment for that course, all members contributed to the development of the student teaching evaluation rubrics, all members had leadership roles in the 2000 Fall Retreat, and all unit members have been involved in various activities related to this Academic Program Review.

Various activities which involve all members of the unit, i.e., faculty, term appointees, and adjunct clinical supervisors, build a sense of collegiality, despite the limited time there is for interaction on campus. There is high interest in sharing successful practices and ideas for problem solving among center personnel. Cadre conferences, retreats, social gatherings, dinner meetings, collaborative decision making in the program, and the autonomy members have to make decisions in their respective centers all contribute to the sense of collegiality. Again,

electronic communication is becoming an important tool for the building of collegiality and involvement in campus-based activity. There is a continuing need, however, to find opportunities for in-person professional sharing and personal relationship building among all faculty and staff.

**J. CHANGES ANTICIPATED IN FACULTY AND STAFF COMPOSITION IN THE NEXT SEVEN YEARS, IN THE COURSE OF EVENTS OR THROUGH TARGETED HIRING.**

Budget implications have a major impact on the field network. A recent retirement and a present phased retirement have involved coordinators of long-established centers. OSFE's objective is to replace these vacancies with probationary lines. If budget reduction should cut these positions, a center realignment will be necessary. The age of the unit staff would suggest the probability of retirement for three to four faculty members during the next seven years.

**K. FACULTY RECRUITMENT PROCEDURES/APPROACHES**

In recruiting new faculty, OSFE follows the university procedures for recruitment and employment of new academic personnel. There is a preference for filling probationary lines with faculty with terminal degrees and experience in higher education. An example of a recent position announcement is included in Appendix DD.

**L. WAYS IN WHICH THE PROGRAM PROMOTES QUALITY TEACHING, RESEARCH AND SERVICE ON THE PART OF ITS FACULTY**

Four times a year, all faculty/staff meet on campus. At these times information is shared and support is provided for maintaining and improving the quality of teaching, research, and service. The 2000 Fall Retreat provided excellent support, and time at each faculty meeting is given to faculty support. When funds are available, the department supports travel to professional conferences on a limited basis, and there is a growing spirit of collegial support for research among the faculty of the unit. Service opportunities are plentiful in the centers and in the Department and College. Individualized assistance and support for grant-writing remains a need. Workshops offered on campus for professional development rarely are attended by faculty located at a distance from campus.

**M. WAYS IN WHICH FACULTY/STAFF ACHIEVEMENT IS RECOGNIZED/REWARDED [NOTE: LIST ANY SIGNIFICANT AWARDS EARNED BY FACULTY OR STAFF IN THE PROGRAM DURING THE PAST SEVEN YEARS.]**

At the beginning of every year, faculty outline their yearly goals and objectives related to University, College, and Department goals and objectives. At the end of the year, they report on their accomplishments. The Department Head has a faculty portfolio notebook in the Department office containing the beginning and end-of-year reports for each year. These notebooks are available on request. Recognition of faculty achievement is made by awarding individual adjustments. Appendix EE lists individual adjustments by percent of money available for individual adjustment, using letters rather than faculty names to protect confidentiality. At every campus faculty meeting, effort is made to publicly share faculty successes and accomplishments, which range from articles published, conference presentations made, and grants received to recognition from students and for community involvement. Faculty vitae are indicators of faculty achievements. Faculty activities are also recognized by being featured in the OSFE's electronic newsletter.

**N. SUMMARIZE MAJOR EXTERNAL GRANTS AWARDED TO FACULTY IN THE PROGRAM DURING PAST SEVEN YEARS. [NOTE FOR EACH GRANT INCLUDE NAME OF GRANT, PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR(S), AND MAXIMUM ONE-PARAGRAPH SUMMARY IN TEXT OF THE REPORT; EXECUTIVE SUMMARY(S) OF GRANT APPLICATIONS AS APPENDIX.]**

Grants to faculty have been mostly from University sources, i.e., computer grants, Provost summer research, and Schindler Endowment grants. A few faculty members have been participants in larger, external grants, i.e., Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality, Title II (work sample methodology) and U.S. Office of Education InTIME Pt3 Catalyst grant on use of technology. One faculty has received a large (\$315, 000) three-year FIPSE grant, Preparing Elementary Teachers for Rural Schools. This grant was a College of Education grant rather than a grant to the OSFE Division.

**O. FACULTY ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES**

Faculty on continued probation or candidates for promotion go through the regular University assessment procedures and are assessed by the Professional Assessment Committee (PAC) in the Department of Teaching. (A copy of the Department of Teaching PAC document is included in Appendix FF.) A PAC subcommittee for each OSFE member is made up of OSFE faculty. Faculty performance is assessed on the student assessment form used for the University. Assessment of tenured faculty and is done in accordance with Master Agreement every 3 years.

**P. RELATIONSHIP OF PROGRAM GOVERNANCE TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS WITHIN WHICH THE PROGRAM FUNCTIONS**

The student teaching program functions as a Division of the Department of Teaching in the College of Education. The OSFE Director is also the Department of Teaching Head and reports directly to the Dean of the College of Education. The OSFE unit serves all teacher education majors within the university and therefore works in collaboration with the Associate Dean of the College of Education/Director of Teacher Education.

**Q. SUMMARY VITAE...**

Vitae for faculty and staff appear in Appendix GG.

**R. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STRENGTHENING FACULTY/STAFF**

The Council Bluffs/Omaha coordinator position has been filled by a term appointment for the last fourteen years. A search has been conducted, and a probationary appointment for that position is pending. One coordinator line is open, and one is expected to come open in the next two years. There will be an effort to attract faculty with terminal degrees and experience in teacher preparation at the university level to these positions. In addition, current junior faculty will be encouraged to accomplish terminal degrees so the unit can maintain or increase its numbers of senior faculty. In all positions to be filled, there is a need to increase the diversity on the faculty/staff, to maintain a balance with regard to gender, and to maintain diversity with regard to institutions represented in academic preparations.

In recent years, there has been movement toward curriculum decisions being made more and more by faculty under the direction of a faculty chair. Strengthening the voice of the faculty in the unit is expected to continue

Having time and support allocated for collaboration for joint research efforts will also improve faculty morale and productivity. Having time for sharing and professional development is also cited by faculty as critical to on-going improvement.

## **VII. FACILITIES AND RESOURCES**

### **A. PHYSICAL RESOURCES**

The program's organization mandates physical facilities in each center. These are provided by the regional centers' school districts, area educational agencies, or community colleges. Some faculty have offices in their homes. Faculty in Iowa have university cars, to which they refer as their offices given the amount of travel in their workdays. Occasionally class meeting space is rented in an appropriate local facility.

The program offices, which have just been remodeled, are located in 509 Schindler Education Center on campus. Coordinators whose centers are close to campus have offices in this complex.

### **B. LIBRARY RESOURCES AND SUPPORT**

Since most student teachers are away from campus during the student teaching semester and since they are encouraged to use local school and community resources or Internet resources, it is not typical for student teachers to utilize campus library resources. Information with regard to library resources which are available, however, appears in Appendix HH.

### **C. COMPUTING RESOURCES AND SUPPORT**

Faculty resources have improved in the last seven years. The technical support provided to faculty by Anne Nordquist in the program office is excellent. Computer resources for students who are away from campus during their student teaching semester have not improved as dramatically, except that more and more student teachers come into the semester with their own computers. Computer resources in the center school districts are often limited. While some schools are equipped with computer technology and Internet capability, many are not. Students who are assigned to centers near campus or students who have their own computers and arrange for their own local servers have access to electronic communication.

### **D. MEDIA AND EQUIPMENT RESOURCES AND SUPPORT**

Equipment to utilize media resources is provided locally in the centers. The Iowa Communications Fiber Optics Network (ICN) on occasion has been used for linking centers in Iowa to each other and to campus.

### **E. RESEARCH SUPPORT BOTH WITHIN AND OUTSIDE THE DEPARTMENT**

Several grants have provided support for faculty participation in research activities. In addition, limited funds for faculty to travel to make presentations at state, national, and international conferences have been available from the Graduate College and as well as, until this year, from the Division.

### **F. TEACHING SUPPORT**

The greatest elements of teaching support are the human resources in each center. School and other local personnel assist in providing information and in supporting student teachers' professional growth. These resources are supported by the local districts in the center or, on occasion, are supported by the program.

*Defining the Relationship*, the newly published handbook (Appendix G) is made available to all students and cooperating teachers. Other print materials used in each center are currently provided by the program. Student teachers are assessed for the cost of some of the print materials they receive.

To support the travel for supervision in each center, the program provides University cars to faculty in Iowa locations and travel reimbursement to other faculty and staff. The program also provides mobile telephones for faculty whose teaching/supervision involves travel.

#### **G. ANALYSIS OF STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF FACILITIES AND RESOURCES**

One strength is also a weakness. The centers are dependent on local resources for facilities and in some cases resources. This makes each center unique but at the same time allows inequities among them. At the present time, coordinators are satisfied with their facilities and resources. All have phones, telephone voice mail, and computer technology with access to the Internet. On campus, the program office is in the Education Center, where most UNI teacher education students have many classes. There are display spaces in the hallway, OSFE campus faculty have offices in the same location, there are conference rooms nearby for small-group or individual work, and there is a large group meeting room on the same floor. In addition, excellent space in the Commons and Maucker Union is used for large group events, i.e., student teacher interviews.

#### **H. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STRENGTHENING FACILITIES AND RESOURCES**

While all faculty coordinators have computer technology for electronic communication, other staff members do not. On campus, a larger faculty meeting room would be welcome, as would extra workspace for use by off-campus faculty when they are on campus. Providing computer communication technology for students while they are away from campus is a continuing need. The Out-of-State/International Center in the Education Center would be well served by expanded space for a few student computer stations, and additional work/study space would allow better cataloging and displaying for improved access to a wealth of materials and data from school placements worldwide.

### **VIII. BUDGET AND FINANCE**

#### **A. FACULTY SALARIES**

Salaries are equitable and comparable to other faculty salaries for rank, performance, and time at UNI with other COE colleagues. Salaries are assigned and earned in accordance to Master Agreement requirements.

#### **B. STAFF SALARIES**

Staff are University employees and are paid according to the pay schedule of their classification and earn raises like their appropriate counterparts around the University.

#### **C. STUDENT BUDGET**

The program office relies on available students with work-study allocation and employs students to assist with department tasks in accordance to available budget resources.

#### **D. FRINGE BENEFITS**

All University faculty, staff, and affiliated employees receive fringe benefits compensation according to regular university guidelines.

#### **E. EQUIPMENT**

Faculty regularly apply for computers through the faculty computer grant program. A minimum budget allocation is designated for equipment. This allocation is usually spent on appointing office equipment needs.

## **F. SUPPORT AND SERVICES**

Most of the OSFE Support and Services (S/S) budget is designated for fixed operational expenses. Local travel expenses of university supervisors, faculty/staff travel to/from campus meetings and related over night expenses, cost of communication (mobile phone, internet connections, ICN distribution charges), the payment of adjunct supervisory faculty, and the mandated payment to cooperating teachers are all paid from this category.

A summary sheet of S/S budgeting expense categories are available to faculty, staff and anyone interested. A copy of the AY 2001-2002 budget is in Appendix II.

## **G. TRAVEL**

Two categories of travel funds are identified in OSFE. The first is travel cost of supervision. This is included with supervision costs referred to in Section F above. The second is travel for faculty professional development. While limited funding has been available for professional travel in the past, current University budget reversions may alter the availability of these resources.

## **H. OUTSIDE SOURCES OF FUNDING THAT SUPPORT PROGRAM OBJECTIVES**

The program is the recipient of “in kind” contributions by some school systems where centers are located. This comes in the form of contributed space, access to copying, printing, classroom and office space, network linkage and phone access. Even though this is limited, it is always appreciated.

The program has an external donor that supports the yearly Cadre Conference, making it possible to conduct the conference and pay for travel, room/board, substitute teachers for attending Cadre members, and other program expenses. Without this generous yearly contribution, a significant annual networking event would not be possible.

## **I. ANALYSIS OF OVERALL PROGRAM BUDGET EMPHASIZING STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES**

Up until the final writing of this report in October, 2001, funding for the program was adequate and plans were in place for several fund generating and/or saving activities. The OSFE program has always enjoyed having the support to deliver a quality program, but with the recent budget reductions and reversions, a more critical situation exists. OSFE’s budget is large because of fixed and mandated costs, which increase due to inflation and market variables and which increase with additional numbers of student teachers. Without regular “cost of living” increases to supplies and services accounts and with possible reductions, quality will be affected. Implementation of “cost saving” measures in field supervision translate into reductions in adjunct staff, more students for larger regional centers, and consequentially reduced supervision of student teachers. Another result of possible budget reductions may be the elimination of some campus meetings for faculty/staff.

One of the greatest budget limitations is on professional development travel for faculty. The OSFE faculty usually must rely on travel support from the Graduate College, external grants, and only a small amount, less than \$200, from OSFE for their yearly needs.

## **J. BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS**

Two recent activities, one implemented and another proposed, have the potential of off setting inflationary increases. First, the implementation of the “Certificate of Values” for cooperating teachers has the potential of saving the unit the expense of paying a small number of cooperating teachers who elect the tuition reduction option instead of cash payment ( Appendix PP describes the procedure). Second, a proposal for a \$75 student teaching fee is at the University Cabinet

level awaiting action. Approval of this minimal fee would be designated to help offset the cost of the \$56,000+ annual automobile/travel expense for supervision.

## **IX. STUDENT OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT**

### **A. BENCHMARKS FOR STUDENT OUTCOMES ASSESSMENTS**

Most Student Outcome Assessment (SOA) measures reside in the plans of the students' various academic programs. OSFE's responsibility is for only fifteen hours of a candidate's total academic program and typically occurs in the last year of undergraduate teacher preparation. OSFE assessment focuses on the candidate's performance only during the student teaching semester.

OSFE's Student Outcome Assessment (SOA) plan was developed by the faculty and approved by the University SOA Committee in 1991-1992 (Appendix JJ). The benchmark for student outcome assessments was the eleven outcomes identified on the performance evaluation instrument used by faculty and cooperating teachers to determine student teacher's level of performance (Appendix KK). In 1999-2000, the faculty implemented a revised version which separated three of the skill areas to make a total of fourteen outcomes (Appendix LL).

To clarify behaviors and expectations for performance and to work towards standardization of the assessment process, assessment rubrics were developed and implemented by the OSFE faculty (Appendix MM). OSFE faculty, cooperating teachers, and students say they believe the rubrics have helped clarify expectations. Additional feedback is needed from cooperating teachers in order to substantiate these beliefs.

In addition to data from the student teaching assessment instrument, additional periodical surveys of cooperating teachers, administrators, and students have been administered during recent years. Reports on the findings of these surveys are summarized in Appendix R.

### **B. PROCEDURES**

For a midterm formative assessment in each placement, cooperating teachers and student teachers rate the student teacher in each of the fourteen skill areas on the assessment instrument and discuss these data together with the UNI faculty/staff supervisor. At the end of each placement, the UNI faculty/staff supervisor and cooperating teacher collaboratively complete a summative assessment and discuss it at a final conference with the student teacher. Since 1992, assessment data have been compiled annually to identify average performance ratings for each semester in each of the fourteen skill areas. These data are also compiled by major teaching areas, i.e., elementary, secondary, special areas, etc., and are shared with the appropriate departments in the College and across campus.

### **C. FINDINGS**

The major finding is that UNI teacher candidates are very well prepared and perform extremely well during student teaching in all outcome areas. There is some variance, but the lowest overall average is in the 4.30 area on a 5.0 scale. A summary chart of the outcomes averages since 1992 appears in Appendix NN. While performance ratings are generally high, the SOA data have identified areas where students can use additional work: communication strategies; home-school community relations; use of management/discipline strategies; assessing, diagnosing, evaluating strategies; and use of technology. Student teachers appear to have weaker skills in these areas than in other assessment areas: knowledge of content; knowledge of learners and learning process; planning strategies; use of instructional strategies; use of motivational strategies; problem-solving strategies; human relations skills; and professional characteristics. Even though the differences in average ratings are small, the differences are apparent.

## **D. RESULTS**

The greatest revelation provided by the SOA data has been the level of readiness for licensure which candidates achieve in student teaching. The data reported in the yearly SOA reports is further substantiated by regularly collected feedback from school cooperating teachers and administrators (Appendix R). Assessment data, it should be noted, is biased in that only the assessment results of students who complete the program are reported. Student teachers who would not have completed the program were withdrawn.

## **E. PLANNED MODIFICATIONS**

The greatest modification with regard to the assessments conducted by OSFE will be to continue working with faculty in other teacher education programs on campus. As departments move more toward performance-based programs of their own, student teaching outcomes and assessment rubrics may need to be changed to reflect the performances required for program completion by the various majors.

## **X. PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS**

The OSFE faculty is most happy with the caliber, stability, and cohesiveness of the unit and the respect among themselves as professionals. Dedication and enthusiasm among the staff is remarkable, and supervisors are proactive advocates for their student teachers. There is diversity in the unit with each center being unique and with various faculty having unique expertise. Students have choices among the centers for their student teaching experiences, and coordinators have the flexibility in their own centers to make decisions to meet their students' needs. What is common among centers is the spirit of reflectivity and thoughtfulness in supervision which prompts student teachers to think about what they are doing and why. The curriculum prepares student teachers for what "real" teaching is, and student teachers are concerned with the effect their teaching is having on student achievement. Other sources of pride include the curriculum development work which has been accomplished, the contributions faculty have made to College and University life, the publishing of *Defining the Relationship* with the evaluation rubrics included, providing out-of-state and international student teaching placements, and the continuing evolution of the concept of university-school collaboration. That the program has clarity is the result of a multitude of decisions made collaboratively within the unit. Faculty and staff are knowledgeable professionals who model what they want student teachers to become: independent, reflective decision makers. The source of the most pride, however, is the continuing high satisfaction of students, cooperating teachers, and administrators with the quality of the student teaching program.

## **XI. SUMMARY**

### **A. PROGRAM HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT**

The Office of Student Field Experiences (OSFE) shares a history and reputation of excellence with the University of Northern Iowa's teacher education program. OSFE continues to serve all teacher education majors as they complete their programs in the semester of student teaching. In the last several years, OSFE faculty have not only provided high quality student teaching coordination and supervision, they have worked to offer instruction of equally high quality in Human Relations, the course which they teach along with student teaching.

In over seventy years, the unit has grown from a group of individual faculty coordinators into a formalized, collaborative network of University faculty and exemplary practitioners who enact the university-school collaboration with sensitivity and skill. The unit has changed its procedures from reimbursing districts for portions of selected teachers' time to compensating many

supervisors directly; thus fewer supervisors are concurrently in the active employ of a school district. With this change the quality of OSFE supervision remains high. Each regional center is under the direction of a faculty coordinator or a highly qualified term appointee. Regional centers, which are located in areas which best meet the priorities of the teacher education program, have generally expanded with regard to the number of districts involved in their student teaching programs. The cadre concept has grown stronger through the local efforts of OSFE coordinators and with the continuing support of OSFE's honorary member, Mildred Middleton, an esteemed Iowa educator, consultant, and author. The OSFE unit has continued to function in the Department of Teaching. OSFE faculty have been productive with regard to curriculum development in the creation of the student teaching evaluation rubrics, the publication of *Defining the Relationship*, and the identification of performance-based outcomes for Human Relations. Faculty members have been involved in a number of other research and service activities on campus and in their centers.

The most important thing, however, is that students, cooperating teachers, and administrators continue to report high satisfaction with the OSFE student teaching program.

### **B. NATURE/FOCUS/INTENT OF CURRENT PROGRAM**

The focus of the current program is to serve the teacher education program at the University of Northern Iowa and its teacher education majors by continuing to offer high quality, personalized teaching and supervision. In preparing student teachers to be independent, reflective decision makers who are able and willing to confront the complex issues which challenge today's educators, OSFE is serving the profession as well as the University. Along with the commitment to teaching/supervision, OSFE faculty share a commitment to continue their many contributions of service to the University as well as to their respective center communities. An example of a recent request for OSFE's involvement is the teacher education assurance program. (Appendix OO). At the same time, faculty are engaged in collaborative inquiry to enhance their own scholarly productivity in the context of a unit dedicated to service and personalized attention to its students. OSFE is determined to meet the demands with which it is currently confronted. Budget limitations, reversions, and the uncertainty that now characterizes the state's economy are presenting challenges the unit is committed to meet in this academic year as well as in the near, uncertain future. The intent of the unit in the current fiscal crisis is to protect the faculty and term appointees and to make changes that will not seriously erode the essence of quality in our supervision and instruction. Some realignment of assignments may be necessary in the short term. While funds are not available for professional travel and development, the intent of the tenured faculty is to continue in all ways possible to mentor probationary faculty with regard to their professional development in the academy. All in the unit are ready for several semesters of "doing more with less." In the words of Thomas Switzer, Dean of the College of Education, "In the face of reduced resources, there is no choice but to go forward." OSFE has made the choice to go forward.

### **C. NATURE/FOCUS/INTENT OF PROGRAM FOR THE FUTURE**

The intent of the unit for the future is to restore any services and procedures that will in the short term be suspended or stressed. Maintaining faculty who deliver high quality coordination, supervision, and instruction is important as is the continuation of the unit's curriculum development work which is now underway. Hopefully, newer faculty will remain and experience professional growth in the academy, open positions will be filled with highly qualified faculty who will also increase the diversity in the unit, and OSFE faculty will continue to be involved in College and University governance, teacher education curriculum/program development, and appropriate scholarly and service activity.

## REFERENCES

- Banks, James. 1994. *An introduction to multicultural education*. Allyn and Bacon: Boston, MA.
- Bennett, Christine. 1999. *Comprehensive multicultural education theory and practice*. Allyn and Bacon: Boston, MA.
- Boyer, Ernest L. 1997. Enlarging the perspective. In *Scholarship reconsidered/priorities of the professoriate*. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco, CA.
- Tiedt, Pamela L., and Iris M. Tiedt. 1999. *Multicultural teaching/a handbook of activities, information, and resources, 5<sup>th</sup> edition*. Allyn and Bacon: Boston, MA.