

TECC-Curriculum Committee - University School Use Information Dec. 13, 1994

Respondent	Department	Response
Bieger, George Bianco, Joseph Corbett, Frank Ferro, Trenton Gerlach, Gail	Elementary Doctoral Program Office Systems & Bus. Ed. MED Elem. Ed. Adult & Community Ed. Professional Studies in Ed. Reports from individual faculty in Professional Studies includes: --Dr. George Bieger --Ms. Kay Chick --Dr. Rosalyn Gates --Dr. Gail Gerlach --Dr. Jacqueline Gorman (Math) --Dr. Barbara Kupetz --Dr. Vincent Mikkelsen --Dr. James Myers (Math) --Dr. Nedra Nastase --Dr. Mark Twiest --Dr. Linda Williams --Dr. Marilyn Willis --Ms. Nancy Yost	Enclosed No reported use No reported use No reported use Reports enclosed
Glisan, Eileen W. Hershman, Ken Larner, Jack Peard, Terry Rafoth, Mary Ann Reber, Clarice	Spanish Education Physics Secondary Social Studies Biology Education & School Psychology Special Education Reports from individual faculty in Special Education includes: --Dr. Joseph Domaracki --Dr. Jerry Fiddler --Dr. Richard Nowell --Mrs. Esther Shane --Dr. David Stein	Enclosed Enclosed No reported use See Hershman Enclosed Reports enclosed
Sutton, Connie J.	General Science	Enclosed

#6

7-DEC-1994 10:38:06.63

NEWMAIL

From: GROVE::GRBIEGER "George Bieger"
To: BARKER
CC: JWBUTZOW,GRBIEGER
SUBJ: EL Ed Doctoral Program and the University School

I am writing in response to Dean Butzow's request for information about "courses or program requirements that are tied in with the university school."

Several doctoral courses use the University School as a field-experience site.

Analysis of Effective Instructional Techniques (EL 725) is intended, in part, to familiarize doctoral students with new techniques for the observation and supervision of teachers. This course is offered during the summer session in order to allow doctoral students, most of whom are employed full-time, to have access to teachers to observe and supervise. Since the University School is both proximal and in session during the

Press RETURN for more...

MAIL>
Esc-ctrl: ^] help: ^]? port:1 speed: 9600 parity:none echo:rem VT320

#6

7-DEC-1994 10:38:06.63

NEWMAIL

summer sessions, the field component of this course can easily be accomplished there. It is unlikely that this valuable course component would be continued without the University School. In fact, the scheduling of this course is done to coincide with the schedule of the University School to make the observations possible.

Curriculum Analysis (EL 720) has regularly used University School curricula as the basis for doctoral student projects.

Doctoral Internship (EL 798) regularly uses the University School as an internship site for doctoral students, especially for international students.

Doctoral Dissertation (EL 950) Several (approximately 4-5) doctoral students, in the past 6 years, have used data collected at the University School as the primary source of data for their doctoral dissertations. Many doctoral students (approximately 15 during the past 6 years) have pilot tested their data collection

Press RETURN for more...

MAIL>
Esc-ctrl: ^] help: ^]? port:1 speed: 9600 parity:none echo:rem VT320

#6

7-DEC-1994 10:38:06.63

NEWMAIL

Instruments or methods at the University School.

Other courses (e.g., EL 710, EL 715, EL 643, EL 647) have used the University School on a less systematic basis than those mentioned above.

\$

NOTE: If you need this in another format, please let me know.

George R. Bieger
Department of Professional
Studies in Education
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
303 Davis Hall
Indiana, PA 15705

Telephone: (412) 357-4734
or (412) 357-2400
FAX: (412) 357-4734
Bitnet: GRBIEGER@IUP
Internet: GRBIEGER@grove.iup.edu
CompuServe: 71212,3461

MAIL>

Esc-ctrl: ^] help: ^]? port:1 speed: 9600 parity:none echo:rem VT320

TO: Bill Barker, Co-Chair, Curriculum Committee
FROM: Joseph Domaracki, Special Education
DATE: 12/5/94
SUBJECT: University School Utilization by ED of EX Program

There are no specific references concerning the utilization of the University School in any syllabi currently on record in the Education of Exceptional Persons Program.

The University school, however, is utilized as a site for field based observation of students in the regular classroom and learning support categories of our ED 242 observations. The observations conducted for this class, in these two specific areas, comprises only 40 % of the observations required for completion of this course. Also, approximately 50% of the students enrolled in ED 242, for any given semester, choose to use the University School for this purpose.

Students enrolled in ED 342, Pre-Student Teaching Clinical Experience 2, have also, on occasion, opted to use the University School as a site for the completion of their 35 hour experience.

UNIVERSITY SCHOOL DATA
EDUCATION OF EXCEPTIONAL STUDENTS UTILIZATION OF UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL
SCHOOL YEARS 1992-1993 & 1993-1994

ED OF EX STUDENTS WORKING AS TUTORS

ACADEMIC YEAR 92-93
FALL 1992

6 Students
1 - Graduate
5 - Undergraduate

SPRING 1993

6 Students
2 - Graduate
4 - Undergraduate

SUMMER SESSION 1993

4 Students
4 - Graduate

TOTAL FOR YEAR = 18

ACADEMIC YEAR 93-94
FALL 1993

6 Students
2 - Graduate
4 - Undergraduate

SPRING 1994

9 Students
2 - Graduate
7 - Undergraduate

SUMMER SESSION 1994

4 Students
4 - Graduate

TOTAL FOR YEAR = 19

ED OF EX STUDENTS CONDUCTING ED 242 & ED 342 HOURS

ACADEMIC YEAR 92-93
FALL 1992

8 Students

Spring 1993

6 Students

TOTAL FOR YEAR = 14

ACADEMIC YEAR 93-94
FALL 1993

8 Students

Spring 1994

8 Students

TOTAL FOR YEAR = 16

DATA FOR FALL OF 1994:

15 Students are working in the University School to get 40% of their Ed 242 Hours

*** The numbers of students using the university school for observation in ED 242 has been consistent over the years. Approximately 50% of all ED 242 students utilize the school as an observation site every semester. In using the University school facilities the students are able to complete approximately 40% of the requirements for ED 242

MEMORANDUM
PROFESSIONAL STUDIES IN EDUCATION

Date: December 6, 1994
Subject: Data Collection on University School Participation
To: PSE Faculty
From: Gail J. Gerlach
Assistant Chairperson

Dean Butzow has requested information on participation at the University School. This data will be used by the Curriculum Committee of the Teacher Education Coordinating Council in discussing the proposal to close the University School. His question is, "What specific courses or program requirements are currently tied in with the University School?"

If any of the courses that you have taught regularly (or this semester or last semester) have required students to participate at the University School, please complete the chart below and submit this data to me by noon on Monday, December 12. Thank you!

Course Number	Semester/Year of Participation	Approximate Number of Students	Brief Description of the Activity (e.g., collaborative journal writing)
---------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------	---

EL 425 Language Across the Curriculum

2 sections taught each semester on a regular basis

approximately 20-25 students each section

Activity #1: Dialogue Journal

Each college student dialogues via journal writing with one University School student for five weeks at the beginning of the semester.

Activity #2: Teaching a Lesson

(over)

Your name

Rosalyn A. Gates
12/12/94

MEMORANDUM
PROFESSIONAL STUDIES IN EDUCATION

Date: December 6, 1994

Subject: Data Collection on University School Participation

To: PSE Faculty

From: Gail J. Gerlach^h
Assistant Chairperson

Dean Butzow has requested information on participation at the University School. This data will be used by the Curriculum Committee of the Teacher Education Coordinating Council in discussing the proposal to close the University School. His question is, "What specific courses or program requirements are currently tied in with the University School?"

If any of the courses that you have taught regularly (or this semester or last semester) have required students to participate at the University School, please complete the chart below and submit this data to me by noon on Monday, December 12. Thank you!

Course Number	Semester/Year of Participation	Approximate Number of Students	Brief Description of the Activity (e.g., collaborative journal writing)
ED 441 (12 CR.)	SPRING '94	5	STUDENT TEACHING
ED 441 (12 CR.)	FALL '94	5	STUDENT TEACHING
ED 441 (12 CR.)	SPRING '95	5	STUDENT TEACHING
ED 421 (6 CR.)	SUMMER '94 (S.S.I)	17	STUDENT TEACHING

Gail J. Gerlach
Your name

**MEMORANDUM
PROFESSIONAL STUDIES IN EDUCATION**

Date: December 6, 1994

Subject: Data Collection on University School Participation

To: Faculty Teaching EL Courses *EL 313*

From: Gail J. Gerlach *GG*
Assistant Chairperson

Dean Butzow has requested information on participation at the University School. This data will be used by the Curriculum Committee of the Teacher Education Coordinating Council in discussing the proposal to close the University School. His question is, "What specific courses or program requirements are currently tied in with the University School?"

If any of the courses that you have taught regularly (or this semester or last semester) have required students to participate at the University School, please complete the chart below and submit this data to me by **noon on Monday, December 12**. Thank you!

Course Number	Semester/Year of Participation	Approximate Number of Students	Brief Description of the Activity (e.g., collaborative journal writing)
EL 313	Spring 95	72 (3 sections)	80 <u>teach</u> 20 min. math lesson *
<i>m. Enderson</i> → EL 313	Spring 95	42 (3 sections)	?
EL 313	Fall 94	78 (3 sections)	{ 60 <u>teach</u> 20 min. math lesson * 20 <u>observe</u> 2 math lessons
EL 313	Sum I 94	16 (1 section)	16 <u>observe</u> 2 math lessons
EL 313	Spring 94	66 (3 sections)	66 <u>observe</u> 2 math lessons
EL 313		58 (2 sections)	58 <u>observe</u> 2 math lessons

James R Myers

Your name

* part of Myers/Hecattman grant
(Spring 95 is projection)

University School Testimony
James R. Myers
Associate Professor
IUP Mathematics Department

I am the co-chair of the Elementary Mathematics Education Committee of the Department of Mathematics (EMEC). The EMEC is responsible for teaching the mathematics content and methods courses for elementary, early childhood, special, and hearing impaired education majors. I want to share the areas in which the University School has enhanced these programs.

1. Teaching Mathematics in the Elementary School (EL 313) is the mathematics methods course required for all elementary education majors. In addition some special education and hearing impaired education majors elect to take this course. The mathematics department offers 11 sections of this course a year (3 in the fall, 6 in the spring, and 2 in the summer). Each section has approximately 25 students in it.

Except for the one section offered in the second summer session, all students are required to observe two math classes at two different levels in the elementary grades. Nearly all of these observations are completed at the University School. Students are required to complete these observations and hand in observation reports. Often students comment on their Student Evaluation Instruments (SEIs) as to the worthwhile experience these observations provided. Without the University School this experience would be sacrificed.

2. One of the graduate courses in the Masters of Education Degree in Elementary and Middle School Mathematics Education offered by the Mathematics Department is Diagnosis and Remedial Teaching of Mathematics (EM 652). Part of this course is providing a math clinic for children who need help in mathematics. This clinic is the crucial component of the course which provides experience for our graduate students to practice diagnostic and remedial techniques in teaching mathematics.

The University School has always been cooperative in providing the clinic with children who need extra help. The University School

teachers' willingness to advertise and enlist children indicates their concern for children and their dedication. Without this assistance from the University School, the difficulty in finding local children for the clinic would be increased. The children must be local because the clinic meets for one hour a week during the three-hour class period.

3. Last Spring, Dr. Judi Hechtman and I submitted a grant proposal to the Pennsylvania Academy for the Profession of Teaching. Dr. Hechtman is the first grade teacher at the University School. We were funded for \$12,500 for the period of May, 1994 to May, 1995. The purpose of the grant is to enhance the teaching of mathematics through the use of children's literature.

One activity of the grant is an assignment in my EL 313 class. My students observed Judi teach a math lesson using children's literature with her first graders. My students observed this lesson either live or on videotape. Judi also visited my class to expand on the lesson and answer any questions. After this observation, I assigned a lesson plan to be completed using children's literature to teach mathematics. Judi and I graded these lesson plans. The followup to this assignment was for my students to implement their lesson in Dr. Hechtman's classes if possible and if desired. Of the 80 students in my EL 313 classes, we have been able to schedule 60 to teach in Judi's classroom. These 60 students chose this experience over the usual two required observations. Others would have chosen this option if scheduling time would permit. We, Dr Hechtman and I, believe this is a much more valuable experience than the observations, especially since it is a supervised teaching experience.

In summary observation and teaching experiences would be sacrificed in our math methods classes if the University School were not available. Experiences at other more remote sites could not be used because our students usually carry a full load of other courses while taking the math methods courses. In addition to our students and classes, my scholarly activity has been enhanced by the availability of the University School. Implementation of the above mentioned grant would be very difficult without the expertise in children's literature of Dr. Hechtman and availability of the University School.

**MEMORANDUM
PROFESSIONAL STUDIES IN EDUCATION**

Date: December 6, 1994

Subject: Data Collection on University School Participation

To: Faculty Teaching EL Courses *EL 313, MA 320*

From: Gail J. Gerlach *GG*
Assistant Chairperson

Dean Butzow has requested information on participation at the University School. This data will be used by the Curriculum Committee of the Teacher Education Coordinating Council in discussing the proposal to close the University School. His question is, "What specific courses or program requirements are currently tied in with the University School?"

If any of the courses that you have taught regularly (or this semester or last semester) have required students to participate at the University School, please complete the chart below and submit this data to me by **noon on Monday, December 12**. Thank you!

Course Number	Semester/Year of Participation	Approximate Number of Students	Brief Description of the Activity (e.g., collaborative journal writing)
EL 313	Spring 93/94	60	2 observations
EL 313	Fall 93/94	55	2 observations
EL 313	Spring 92/93	90	2 observations
EL 313	Fall 92/93	90	2 observations
EL 313	Spring 91/92	90	2 observations
MA 320 (450/550)	Fall 94-95	30	interviews
"	Spring 93-94	25	interviews/observation
"	Fall 93-94	20	interviews/observation
"	Spring 92/93	40	interviews/observation

Jacqueline Gorman
Your name

**MEMORANDUM
PROFESSIONAL STUDIES IN EDUCATION**

Date: December 6, 1994

Subject: Data Collection on University School Participation

To: PSE Faculty

From: Gail J. Gerlach^H
Assistant Chairperson

Dean Butzow has requested information on participation at the University School. This data will be used by the Curriculum Committee of the Teacher Education Coordinating Council in discussing the proposal to close the University School. His question is, "What specific courses or program requirements are currently tied in with the University School?"

If any of the courses that you have taught regularly (or this semester or last semester) have required students to participate at the University School, please complete the chart below and submit this data to me by **noon on Monday, December 12**. Thank you!

Course Number	Semester/Year of Participation	Approximate Number of Students	Brief Description of the Activity (e.g., collaborative journal writing)
EL. 425	Spring '94 (wanted to do activity this semester but one class was scheduled during the lunch hour and the other in the evening)	50	Teaching of literature-based language arts lessons to first grade (video taped & used for handwriting research by Dr. Hechtman & myself)
ED. 702 ED. 703	every semester including Summer	55	Each graduate student in the Reading Specialist Program completes the six credits of clinical

Linda Williams
Your name

Practicum utilizing the facilities of the University School. Children from the University School as well as the outside community are diagnosed and remediated. The classrooms, library, computers, multipurpose room, and playground have all been used extensively every semester during one evening a week and daily during the second summer session.

MEMORANDUM
PROFESSIONAL STUDIES IN EDUCATION

Date: December 6, 1994
Subject: Data Collection on University School Participation
To: PSE Faculty
From: Gail J. Gerlach
Assistant Chairperson

Dean Butzow has requested information on participation at the University School. This data will be used by the Curriculum Committee of the Teacher Education Coordinating Council in discussing the proposal to close the University School. His question is, "What specific courses or program requirements are currently tied in with the University School?"

If any of the courses that you have taught regularly (or this semester or last semester) have required students to participate at the University School, please complete the chart below and submit this data to me by noon on Monday, December 12. Thank you!

Course Number	Semester/Year of Participation	Approximate Number of Students	Brief Description of the Activity (e.g., collaborative journal writing)
ED 242	Spring 1994	20	observation and journal writing

Karen A. Chick
Your name

MEMORANDUM
PROFESSIONAL STUDIES IN EDUCATION

Date: December 6, 1994
Subject: Data Collection on University School Participation
To: PSE Faculty
From: Gail J. Gerlach
Assistant Chairperson

Dean Butzow has requested information on participation at the University School. This data will be used by the Curriculum Committee of the Teacher Education Coordinating Council in discussing the proposal to close the University School. His question is, "What specific courses or program requirements are currently tied in with the University School?"

If any of the courses that you have taught regularly (or this semester or last semester) have required students to participate at the University School, please complete the chart below and submit this data to me by noon on Monday, December 12. Thank you!

Course Number	Semester/Year of Participation	Approximate Number of Students	Brief Description of the Activity (e.g., collaborative journal writing)
EL 425	SUMMER '94	16	DIAGNOSTIC JOURNALS Between children & IUP students

B. Kupetz
Your name

**MEMORANDUM
PROFESSIONAL STUDIES IN EDUCATION**

Date: December 6, 1994
 Subject: Data Collection on University School Participation
 To: PSE Faculty
 From: Gail J. Gerlach
 Assistant Chairperson

Dean Butzow has requested information on participation at the University School. This data will be used by the Curriculum Committee of the Teacher Education Coordinating Council in discussing the proposal to close the University School. His question is, "What specific courses or program requirements are currently tied in with the University School?"

If any of the courses that you have taught regularly (or this semester or last semester) have required students to participate at the University School, please complete the chart below and submit this data to me by noon on Monday, December 12. Thank you!

Course Number	Semester/Year of Participation	Approximate Number of Students	Brief Description of the Activity (e.g., collaborative journal writing)
---------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------	---

*Elementary Education
 Junior Block Placements*

Dr. Howe is always willing to place those junior block students who are only taking part of the block and can only be in the classroom for 3 days a week. No other schools have expressed a willingness to take these non-traditional block students

Mark Twit
 Your name

I have placed \approx 8 students in the past two years for a total of $8 \times 30^{\text{days}} \times 4^{\text{weeks}} = 96$ teaching days

**MEMORANDUM
PROFESSIONAL STUDIES IN EDUCATION**

Date: December 6, 1994
Subject: Data Collection on University School Participation
To: PSE Faculty
From: Gail J. Gerlach
 Assistant Chairperson

Dean Butzow has requested information on participation at the University School. This data will be used by the Curriculum Committee of the Teacher Education Coordinating Council in discussing the proposal to close the University School. His question is, "What specific courses or program requirements are currently tied in with the University School?"

If any of the courses that you have taught regularly (or this semester or last semester) have required students to participate at the University School, please complete the chart below and submit this data to me by noon on Monday, December 12. Thank you!

Course Number	Semester/Year of Participation	Approximate Number of Students	Brief Description of the Activity (e.g., collaborative journal writing)
EL215	Spring/94	25	Observing several classes noting developmental aspects.
EL215	Spring/94	4	intensive observations (4-6 hrs) of children, to write a developmental case study.
EL 725	Summer/94	8	intensive observation and supervision of student teachers using a clinical supervision approach

George Bieger
Your name

MEMORANDUM
PROFESSIONAL STUDIES IN EDUCATION

Date: December 6, 1994
Subject: Data Collection on University School Participation
To: PSE Faculty
From: Gail J. Gerlach
Assistant Chairperson

Dean Butzow has requested information on participation at the University School. This data will be used by the Curriculum Committee of the Teacher Education Coordinating Council in discussing the proposal to close the University School. His question is, "What specific courses or program requirements are currently tied in with the University School?"

If any of the courses that you have taught regularly (or this semester or last semester) have required students to participate at the University School, please complete the chart below and submit this data to me by noon on Monday, December 12. Thank you!

Course Number	Semester/Year of Participation	Approximate Number of Students	Brief Description of the Activity (e.g., collaborative journal writing)
222	Fall 1994	25	Observation of a reading class and written summary and response

Gail, the following are not "participation" but I think are important:

1. Signing out books from the University Library.
2. Participating in Dr. Hechtman's book order program.


Your name

**MEMORANDUM
PROFESSIONAL STUDIES IN EDUCATION**

Date: December 6, 1994
Subject: Data Collection on University School Participation
To: PSE Faculty
From: Gail J. Gerlach *gjt*
 Assistant Chairperson

Dean Butzow has requested information on participation at the University School. This data will be used by the Curriculum Committee of the Teacher Education Coordinating Council in discussing the proposal to close the University School. His question is, "What specific courses or program requirements are currently tied in with the University School?"

If any of the courses that you have taught regularly (or this semester or last semester) have required students to participate at the University School, please complete the chart below and submit this data to me by noon on Monday, December 12. Thank you!

Course Number	Semester/Year of Participation	Approximate Number of Students	Brief Description of the Activity (e.g., collaborative journal writing)
EL 422	Spring 1994	15	Student diagnose one child's reading abilities utilizing formal and informal assessment instruments. Methods to remediate and or support additional growth once their noted.
	Fall 1994	12	
EL 222	Spring 1994	35 + 15 = 50 student	

Dr. Diesel also talk and allow students to observe "whole language" activities & assessment situation

Donna P. Middle
Your name

**MEMORANDUM
PROFESSIONAL STUDIES IN EDUCATION**

Date: December 6, 1994

Subject: Data Collection on University School Participation

To: Faculty Teaching ^{EE}~~EL~~ Courses

From: Gail J. Gerlach
Assistant Chairperson

Dean Butzow has requested information on participation at the University School. This data will be used by the Curriculum Committee of the Teacher Education Coordinating Council in discussing the proposal to close the University School. His question is, "What specific courses or program requirements are currently tied in with the University School?"

If any of the courses that you have taught regularly (or this semester or last semester) have required students to participate at the University School, please complete the chart below and submit this data to me by noon on Monday, December 12. Thank you!

Course Number	Semester/Year of Participation	Approximate Number of Students	Brief Description of the Activity (e.g., collaborative journal writing)
EE200	Fall & Spring 94 94	22 each Semester	6 hrs of observations 3 teaching experiences Per student

For the last 4 years
this has been part of
the requirements.

N. Yost
Your name

Date: December 8, 1994

Subject: Data re: courses with ties to the University School

To: Gail G. Gerlach
Assistant Chairperson

From: Marilyn E. Willis

Course No.	Semester/year	Approx. No. of sts.	Description of experience
EE 200	Sp/Sum/Fall '94, Sp.'95	20/sem., 7 sum	observe K-3, write reports, plan collaboratively with classmates for experiences for K. Teach in K three different times, evaluate children's learning during their experiences, write report of their experiences
EE 315	Fall '93, '94 Sum. '93	20/sem, 6-8 sum	observe, interview, write reports; plan, introduce, support, and evaluate a play center to be left up 1 week (3 visits by student to observe and evaluate). Written report of play center including rationale, introduction, support of experience, and evaluation.
EL 215	Sp. '93 (3 secs.)	Approx. 60 T.	choice of observation, interview or other approved child understanding activity

Note: These are the most recent times. I regularly have taught these classes in the past.

Please see also my written testimony presented at the open hearing on November 10, 1994. A copy is attached.

TESTIMONY

Presented at the open hearing on the status of the University School

November 10, 1994

Submitted by Marilyn E. Willis, Ed.D.
Coordinator Undergraduate Early Childhood Education
Teacher Certification Program
Department of Professional Studies in Education

I want to tell you how the University School impacts on two of the courses that I teach. The two courses that I am speaking about are Introduction to Early Childhood Education (EE 200) and Development and Learning Through Play (EE 315). There are two sections of each of these courses. The other two sections are taught by two of my colleagues who also use the University School in the same way I do. The total students served in these combined four sections is approximately 90. Students in these courses both observe and plan for participation in experiences with children in these classrooms. The total number of mini-lessons generated by both the introductory and play classes would number in excess of 100 in a semester.

In the introductory course students observe a minimum of five hours in classrooms of their choice (K-3). They also have the opportunity to observe teachers working with hearing impaired children, music classes, physical education, Spanish, art, and computers. The students submit written reports of their observations. Additionally, they plan cooperatively with classmates for experiences with both large and small groups and then carry out these plans with their partner(s) in the Kindergarten on three different occasions. Informal evaluations of these experiences are discussed as a part of students' course work, thus giving a common basis for discussion and real and relevant meaning to otherwise disconnected textbook discourse.

In the Development and Learning Through Play class students do up to two observations or interviews which are written and presented to their classmates. Additionally, they plan and introduce a play or theme center appropriate for the classroom which they choose (K-3) to be left in the classroom for one week. Students observe the children interacting in the centers for a minimum of two more observations. During these observation times students also support the experience using a variety of appropriate techniques, or interact with the children to facilitate change, as appropriate. Students write and share their plans, observations, and evaluations with their classmates, who have also been participating in the same setting, which makes their shared learning founded on real rather than hypothetical situations.

Planning of these play or theme centers is done in conjunction with the University School classroom teachers, as well as with me and their classmates, which lends a genuine experience of collaborative effort. Additionally, class time is spent to collectively discuss the planning as it progresses and group input is valued and incorporated.

The question often comes up, "Why can't students receive these same experiences elsewhere?" Students might possibly receive similar experiences elsewhere, but it is difficult to be sure. Questions which need to be considered are those concerning close collaboration and common experiences for our students and their classmates on which to build. Add to this the shared philosophy and practices, not to mention the issue of supervision should students be placed at other sites. The faculty-student ratio is large in our program. There simply is not sufficient numbers of faculty to do the appropriate supervision should the distances be wide. Again, the fact is crucial that the teachers in the University School do share common philosophy and goals, therefore the collaboration in planning provides a strong scaffolding to support our students in their first experiences. That philosophy and practice is developmentally appropriate as defined by the national societies which represent the Early Childhood Education profession, such as: The National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC); the Association for Childhood Education, International (ACEI); as well as the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE), to mention only three.

In the Early Childhood Education Program, we have identified several sites which meet the criteria for developmentally appropriate practices as defined by these professional organizations, and the University School is one of those sites.

The argument could be made that it would be advantageous to make partnerships with other sites. Such partnerships could be mutually beneficial. There are, however, many unanswered questions as to the shared cost of such collaboratives, faculty time allotted, time-on-task at the sites, travel time to and from sites, student transportation, reciprocal agreements for shared responsibilities, and many more questions.

It should be obvious that, were it not for the University School, these courses which I have described could not be delivered as as they now are. Many of our stated outcomes would be difficult to meet.

A final question. While we are eager to form or strengthen partnerships with other schools, why not make our University School our prime partner?

Department of Spanish and Other Languages
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
454 Sutton Hall
Indiana, Pennsylvania 15705-1074

(412) 357-2325

MEMO

IUTP

December 5, 1994

TO: Dr. William Barker
Co-Chair
TECC Curriculum Committee

FROM: Dr. Eileen W. Glisan *E.W.G.*
Coordinator
Spanish Education

Dr. Butzow has requested that I provide you with information concerning which of our program requirements in Spanish/Secondary Education are currently tied in with the University School.

All Spanish/Secondary Education students enrolled in ED 242 (Pre-Student Teaching I) complete a one-semester practicum at the University School. The entire class of pre-student teachers (10-12 students) meets with me for approximately 8 class sessions at the beginning of the semester. Students are assigned two grade levels (for example, Kindergarten and Grade 1) at the University School. In addition to observing classes and keeping a weekly journal of their observations and experiences, they teach two lessons per week (1 1/2-hour lesson for each of their two assigned classes) throughout the semester.

I have also used the University School as the means for providing hands-on teaching practice for students enrolled in SP 390, Teaching Elementary Content Through Spanish. Students teach two or three lessons to the sixth graders at the University School.

Feel free to contact me if you need additional details. I am at home on maternity leave for the rest of this semester, and I have a sabbatical for next semester. You can reach me at home at 412/935-0799.

cc: Dr. John Butzow, Dean
College of Education

December 9, 1994

SUBJECT: University School

TO: Dr. William Barker
Co-Chair of TECC

FROM: Ken Hershman *Ken*
Physics Department

I am responding to Dr. Butzow's inquiry dated December 2, 1994 concerning programs/courses tied to the University School.

After consulting with Terry Peard (Biology) and Joe Costa (Chemistry), the only involvement we know of is ED 242 (Pre Clinical I).

MEMORANDUM

TO: Bill Barker

FROM: Rich Nowell

RCA

RE: University School

DATE: 12/9/94

I understand the TECC committee has already voted on this, but I am following John Butzow's request in providing data for you. We have done this in other formats previously, and I am supplying you with those documents. I have tried to highlight the crucial statistics. Hope this is adequate. If you need more, let me know.

November 10, 1994

Testimony Submitted to
Hearing on the Closing of University School

Clarice Reber, Chairperson 
Department of Special Education and Clinical Services

Gentlemen:

I'm sure it comes as no surprise to you that the Department of Special Education and Clinical Services is opposed unanimously to closing of the University School. You have seen several documents providing data that shows the important role the University School plays in the pre student teaching clinical experiences of three teacher preparation programs, Education of Exceptional Persons, Education of Persons with Hearing Loss and Speech-Language Pathology.

The problem is this. There are not huge numbers of special education students. Some of the populations, e.g., children with hearing loss, are small. If the educational program is one we want IUP students to see, programs for identified special education children are spread throughout the public school system, not just in one school. Currently, our students can schedule frequent visits to the University School. In fact, our students are in the Classroom for Children with Hearing Loss close to 100% of the time. Without the proximity of program, we cannot place our students with this quantity of experience. I am not denying that there could be alternate plans. There could be. BUT, IUP students would have less time on task. Educational research shows consistently that the single most important factor for learning is time on task.

For example, the Department has been heavily involved with an intensive and successful partnership with the Indiana Area School District and the Department of Professional Studies funded by the PDE Bureau of Special Education Higher Education Initiative. At the most, this significant and important partnership involved a maximum of only four special education students per semester.

If we have our students placed in a variety of off campus sites, faculty must spend excessive amounts of travel time supervising these students. It is not unusual for our faculty to spend one full working day to supervise only two student teachers. We certainly cannot expect that amount of supervisory time to spread to pre student teaching. As chair, I am proud of the large increase of scholarly activity in my faculty during the last 3-4 years. I and I am sure my faculty do not wish to return to a department whose responsibilities are solely clinical and service based.

In summary, the department of special education would end up decreasing the pre student teaching experiences of students in three program areas if the University School were closed. Furthermore, it would stress the faculty's ability to participate in other academic matters to supervise students at distant sites.

April 20 1994

To: John Butzow, Dean
College of Education

From: Clarice Reber, Chairperson *Clarice Reber*
Department of Special Education and Clinical Services

Subject: University School Closing/
Resources for the Department of Special Education


With the potential closing of the University School, there are several resource issues that will need to be resolved. The closure of the school will reduce significantly the number of hours of supervised practice for our students in three teacher preparation programs, EH, EX, and SH. A strength of current program, we will need to plan for many hours of practicum to replace the University School. Please be aware that this is not a complete list of resource needs, but items that come to my immediate attention.

- **Additional Faculty needs:** We will need to provide personnel that can supervise practica in alternate sites. We may want to consider joint appointments with school personnel to assist with accreditation requirements
- **Alternate Workload Assignment to develop different service delivery models:** If there is anything that I learned from the IUP/ARIN/IASD Collaboration Project, it is that new programs require time for people to collaborate, plan and tune new programs
- **Space and Technology:** We need space on campus in Davis Hall to develop a multipurpose classroom to deal with the Technology Issues raised by NCATE. This room could be a place where we set up and use, both for instruction and practicum purposes, both high and low technology used in Special Education in all four of our program areas. We can include augmentative communication systems, assistive devices, vocational analysis technology, amplification systems, just to mention a few. We can also use this space for a classroom. If we start now, we can impress the site visitors in five years.
- **Vans or Cars to transport students to practicum sites:** We will need resources for the vehicles, their maintenance and the training of drivers.

I would be pleased to speak with you regarding any of these issues.

cc: John Johnson, Interim Associate Dean
Mark Staszkiwicz, Interim Provost

The University School of IUP
and the Program in
Education of Persons with Hearing Loss

Richard C. Nowell 
Assistant Chair, Special Education
Associate Professor
Education of Persons with Hearing Loss

One of the strong attractions which originally brought me to Indiana University of Pennsylvania was the presence on the premises of a classroom of deaf and hard-of-hearing students. Throughout the years that I have been here, my initial positive reaction has been supported by the close interaction the program has had with the class of children and its teacher and aides. In every way that classroom has been a "laboratory" for our students.

A "laboratory school" offers many things which are not usually available in a regular public school. Faculty at the university level do not have to feel that they are infringing on the teacher and children when they need interaction to support their efforts in the college classroom. Although the first reason the class exists is for the education of the children, it is also there for the college student to observe and (we hope) confirm those points made in college lectures and discussions.

Much of the benefit of the University School classroom for deaf and hard-of-hearing students is accomplished by its being readily available to students within the framework of their schedules. Because faculty are supervising these students in their activities, a classroom within the building is a huge advantage for the faculty member's schedule. Any arrangement in a school away from the campus would result in further demands on faculty time and reduced productivity in teaching and scholarly work. This consequence would in turn lead to reduced faculty satisfaction with roles at the university.

Looking at the current use of the classroom, we see that a major part of the twenty hours of observation in a classroom for deaf and hard-of-hearing students is done within the University School for the majority of our majors. We have approximately 13 students enrolled in ED 242 each semester, and therefore there is a potential of up to 260 hours of observation done each semester, although the actual number is probably close to 200, or about 14 1/2 hours per week. We are considering some modifications in requirements for ED 242, including requiring many of the hours to be done in other settings and limiting observations in the current classroom to students taking EH 114: Introduction to Persons

with Hearing Loss. There are usually about 40 to 45 students in that class each fall. If they are required to do 5 hours of observation, that would mean 200 to 225 hours of observation just in the fall term.

Students also use this classroom for ED 342: Pre-student teaching II. Many of their placements are elsewhere, but we still desperately need the hours they can get in that classroom to be able to schedule them. Scheduling to meet the needs in the classroom and give our students an appropriate number of hours is a nightmare. Students usually schedule these hours between their regular classes, and if travel time were added, such scheduling would be impossible.

Student teachers are also often placed in this classroom. Their arrangements would not be affected by the placement of the school in another site.

To summarize the usage of the classroom now, we have students doing approximately 200 hours of observation each semester. We propose to reduce that number to 200-250 during one semester. In ED 342 we also have 3 students doing 6 hours of classroom teaching and 7 students doing 14 hours of mainstream support. (Two students also teach a total of an hour and a half of sign language classes to hearing students to obtain hours for ED 342.)

Obviously some of these hours of our students' involvement in the University School Hearing Impaired class could be retained if the class were placed in a local elementary school. Many of the hours would not, and it is likely that the whole program would have to be revised to accommodate a change in placement patterns.

Obviously, our students are not the only ones who benefit from our current involvement with the class for deaf and hard-of-hearing students. The deaf and hard-of-hearing students themselves get a lot of individual attention and additional support in the classroom and in their special class which would not be available without the presence of IUP students. Much of this advantage would be lost.

Furthermore, the flexibility of the teacher to modify teaching strategies and try new things to promote successful inclusion and academic support would be much less likely to happen in a different local elementary school. The type of cooperation and teaching of hearing children to understand and work with deaf children would likely be lost in another setting.

We should not fool ourselves. The quality of education these deaf and hard-of-hearing students will not be as good in another setting, despite the efforts of the teacher and aides. One cannot help but wonder if this was a group from a racial or ethnic minority if the University would consider making a change which would so adversely affect them. Does

the author of the current proposal understand or care about the effects on this minority group?

If the hearing-impaired classroom was moved to another school, I would suggest that the following financial resources would be necessary to maintain the current quality of education our students are getting:

1. additional faculty complement. We are already into overload with 2 1/2 faculty and over 100 students. Additional time demands required would be impossible without additional faculty.

2. vans limited solely to EH majors. Between classes students would need to be transported back and forth to the new setting.

2. full-time van drivers. Someone has to drive back and forth on a regular basis. Classes for the students with hearing loss at the elementary school are not on a regular schedule, and the staggered times would require regular availability of drivers. (Check with Mrs. Graves for documentation of these scheduling problems.)

The program in Education of Persons with Hearing Loss has developed a national reputation. It is currently one of the largest programs in the nation. The quality of this program is strongly supported by the presence of a demonstration classroom within the University School. It is my sincere belief that the dissolution of the University School would do significant damage to our teacher training program. I know that it would do significant, if not irreparable, damage to my job satisfaction.

cc: M. Howe
J. Butzow
C. Reber
L. Pettit
J. Johnson

MEMORANDUM

To: Dr. Mark J. Staszkiwicz
Interim Provost
Office of Academic Affairs
205 Sutton Hall
Campus

From: Dr. Jerry B. Fiddler
Professor of Education
Program for the Education
of Exceptional Persons
Department of Special Education
and Clinical Services
212 Davis Hall
Campus

Re: Proposed Closing of the University School

Date: April 15, 1994

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide you with information that you might wish to use as you continue your decision-making in relation to the future of the University School. I have provided that information as the result of direction from my chairperson, Mrs. Clarice K. Reber. Unless otherwise noted, numerical data cited herein has been provided by one of my colleagues, Dr. Joseph W. Domaracki.

Since the origination of the Department of Special Education and Clinical Services in 1964, the Program for the Education of Exceptional Persons has been making frequent use of the University School. Since the passage of P.L. 94-142 in 1975, however, the Program has made even greater use of the facility, since at that time the first major, national movement was launched to provide exceptional children an appropriate education in the least restrictive environment.

The current academic term indicates to some extent how the Program for the Education of Exceptional Persons has utilized the University School in the past. At this time eight students enrolled in ED 242: Pre-Student Teaching I or ED 342: Pre-Student Teaching II have been involved in work at the University School. My own experiences in the past with ED 242 and ED 342 have shown that each student in those programs makes on the average two visits per week tutoring, and otherwise assisting, the exceptional students in the University School who are a part of the regular classroom. The faculty in our program feel that those experiences are vital to our students who are assigned there. A total of sixteen students have been involved with either ED 242 or ED 342 requirements at the University school during the current academic year.

The University School is a facility that encourages participation beyond the call of duty, too. Students who complete course requirements in that program often spend additional hours in University School classrooms working as volunteers. During the 1994 Spring Semester two graduate students and seven undergraduate students have been working as tutors in the University school; bringing the total for the academic year, in that capacity, to nineteen.

During summer sessions the Program for the Education of Exceptional Persons has utilized the University School for years. For example, during many summers, in-service teachers previously certified in other areas of education, as students in the Department, have experienced student teaching in the University School, enabling each to earn a certificate to teach pupils with mental and/or physical disabilities. Without the advantage of that student teaching opportunity in the University School, it probably would not be possible for those in-service teachers to become certified in special education since during the academic year they are employed as full-time teachers. Our field, then, would miss having a number of special education teachers who have had valuable regular classroom experience, and who have the credibility among their regular classroom colleagues as teachers who know two vital fields in education well, a special bonus for society during these days of guaranteeing the right of pupils with disabilities inclusion into the regular classroom.

The Program for the Education of Exceptional Persons makes another important use of the University School during the summer. Both graduate and undergraduate students taking course work and practicum related to the education of persons with severe or profound mental retardation have had the advantage of on-site, face-to-face, pre-professional, or extended professional, experiences because such persons have been brought to the University School for study through their extended school-year program. Because those graduate and undergraduate students are also engaged in other summer courses at IUP, time restraints would prevent their commuting to off-campus facilities to have other "hands-on" experiences. Furthermore, if those students were not able to use the University School for their summer field experiences it is likely that the enrollment in our program in the department would suffer substantially, at least as far as experienced, regular classroom teachers being in the field of special education goes.

All-in-all, the Program for the Education of Exceptional Persons in the Department of Special Education and Clinical Services strongly supports the retention of the University School. The faculty of the Program feel that the University School provides a valuable service to both the graduate and undergraduate students of the Program. The faculty also feels that without its summer program at the University School over the years, a substantial number of teachers certified in other fields would not be available to help to fill the many professional positions that are required each year in the Commonwealth and beyond.

Finally, our program has had the opportunity to attract three, quality faculty members in recent years. It is my opinion after having been involved with the interviewing process of each person, that among the reasons that they were attracted to the Department was because the College of Education had a strong University School.

cc: Dr. John W. Butzow
Dr. Marilyn S. Howe
✓ Mrs. Clarice K. Reber
Dr. Joseph W. Domaracki
IUP APSCUF Office

TESTIMONY TO THE PROVOST RE. UNIVERSITY SCHOOL
SUBMITTED BY: Clarice K. Reber, Chairperson, Special Education

Clarice K. Reber
Esther M. Shane Esther M. Shane, Director, Speech & Hearing Clinic

The University School is critical in our ability to provide not only the required number of clinical experiences for our students, but the variety of clinical experiences required for accreditation by the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA). This accreditation is mandatory in order to continue the Speech-Language Pathology Program at IUP. ASHA has decreed that any student graduating from an institution that is not accredited will not be eligible for the Certificate of Clinical Competence. Persons need this credential to obtain employment in clinics, hospitals, rehabilitation centers and in many schools systems in states other than Pennsylvania. IUP Speech-Language Pathology received ASHA accreditation in 1990. Clinical requirements for accredited programs include the following: (1) Speech-Language Pathology students are required to observe 25 hours of therapy under the supervision of the IUP faculty prior to supervised on-campus practicum. (2) The first hands-on practicum must be in house and supervised by our faculty 25% to 50% of the contact hours, depending on the type of practicum experience. (3) Students must earn 350 hours of practicum experiences in three different sites, with a minimum of 50 hours in each site. This means IUP Speech and Hearing Clinic must provide a minimum of 50 hours supervised therapy for each graduate student and 25 hours for each undergraduate. The IUP Speech Clinic provides an average of 650 hours of therapy to observe and 1520 hours of therapy and diagnostic sessions for our students annually in house. Thirty-three percent (507) of these hours come from the University School.

A balance of different age groups and disorder types within our clinic population must also be maintained. All of our school age clients are from the University School. Most other school age children are serviced in their own schools and are not available to us. With the exclusion of the University School population, not only will we be scrambling for clients, we will service predominantly only preschool children. Because the University School provides model integration programs for children with disabilities, IUP Speech-Language Pathology students are exposed to a large variety of low incident speech and language disorders, e.g. children with hearing loss and children with other special needs. Accreditation site visitors, Drs. Harold Luper and Gary Lindell, cited the University School relationship to be a "strength in our otherwise limited client population" in their 1991 Site Visit Report to ASHA. During the visit they reported they could only recall seeing one other program in the country that utilized the laboratory school so effectively and that school had been closed about three years ago.

The IUP Speech and Hearing Clinic has a total of 11 school age children, all of whom come from the University School. Five of these children have hearing loss. Four are special needs children with a variety of speech and language disorders. Of the eight children with speech and language impairment, four are in the classroom for the speech and language impaired demonstrating complex speech and language disorders. The University

School allows us to provide a wider variety of school age clientele to our students. The Classroom for the Language Impaired makes us competitive with urban training clinics in terms of complex school age language impaired clients. If we must attempt to set up an "in house clinic" in school buildings throughout the county, we will need to gain permission for our faculty members to supervise our students delivering services to children in school districts. This could become tricky, as a school district justifiably will name their speech pathologist responsible for the speech-language therapy of their children, yet our faculty member must maintain responsibility for the therapy being delivered in order for us to maintain accreditation.

As Speech-Language therapy is traditionally offered in an itinerant mode, we will need to use a variety of schools to obtain the variety of hearing impaired, speech and language impaired and learning impaired children we now service. Further more, the status of the current administrative structure of the Intermediate Unit is uncertain. As has happened in other Intermediate Units, school districts are considering administration of their own speech-language pathology programs. We could be dealing with not one intermediate unit, but up to 11 school districts in our attempt to find a clientele base. Significant annual transportation costs to move faculty and students to the off-campus "in house" clinics will be incurred.

TESTIMONY TO THE UNIVERSITY SENATE HEARINGS
ISSUE: UNIVERSITY SCHOOL

PERSON SUBMITTING TESTIMONY: Clarice K. Reber
Chairperson, Special Education

I will be speaking tonight primarily as spokesperson for the Speech-Language Pathology Program. Experts, Drs. Richard Nowell and Jerry Fiddler, have provided testimony for the programs of Education of Hearing Impaired and Education of Exceptional Persons respectively.

The University School is an integral part of the Speech-Language Pathology curricula. It provides a large proportion of our on campus practica experiences. Furthermore, I propose that our students are better prepared to be speech-language pathologists in the school setting because of the University School.

The University School is critical in our ability to provide not only the required number of clinical experiences for our students, but the variety of clinical experiences required for accreditation by the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA). This accreditation is mandatory in order to continue the Speech-Language Pathology Program at IUP. ASHA has decreed that any student graduating from an institution that is not accredited by January 1, 1995 will not be eligible for the Certificate of Clinical Competence. Persons need this credential to obtain employment in clinics, hospitals, rehabilitation centers and in many schools systems in states other than Pennsylvania. IUP Speech-Language Pathology received ASHA accreditation last year. Clinical requirements for accredited program include the following: 1) Speech-Language Pathology students are required to observe 25 hours of therapy under the supervision of the IUP faculty prior to supervised on campus practicum. 2) The first hands on practicum must be in house and supervised by our faculty 25% to 50% of the contact hours depending on the type of practicum experience. 3) Students must earn 450 hours of practicum experiences in three different sites, with a minimum of 50 hours in each site. This means IUP Speech and Hearing Clinic must provide a minimum of 50 hours supervised therapy for each graduate student and 25 hours for each undergraduate. The IUP Speech Clinic provides an average of 650 hours of therapy to observe and 1520 hours of therapy and diagnostic sessions for our students annually in house. Thirty-three percent (507 hours) of these hours come from the University School.

A balance of different age groups and disorder types within our clinic population must also be maintained. All of our school age clients are from the University School. Most other school age children are serviced in their own schools and are not available to us. With the exclusion of the University

School population. not only will we be scrambling for clients, we will service predominantly only preschool children. Because the University School provides model integration programs for children with disabilities, IUP Speech-Language Pathology students are exposed to a large variety of low incident speech and language disorders, e.g. children with hearing loss and children with other special needs. Accreditation site visitors, Drs. Harold Luper and Gary Lindell, cited the University School relationship to be a "strength in our otherwise limited client population" in their 1991 Site Visit Report to ASHA. During the visit they reported they could only recall seeing one other program in the country that utilized the laboratory school so effectively and that school had been closed about 3 years ago.

Obviously other training programs exist without a laboratory school. I called the Speech Clinic at Clarion to determine how they provided clinical experience with school age children. I found the following information. Clarion has nine school age children on their rolls. They have one person with a hearing loss, four children with special needs, and four children with speech and language disorders (2 high school fluency cases and 2 elementary mild articulation cases). Their students are sent student teaching essentially without experience with school age children. They obtain most of their clients through a preschool program located on the Clarion campus.

The Edinboro Speech and Hearing Clinic has 25 school age children on their rolls, no hearing impaired children and four special needs children working with alternative communication. Edinboro has a lab school and a collaborative fluency clinic with the local IUs that meets in the evening to increase the number of school age children with fluency disorders.

The IUP Speech and Hearing Clinic has a total of 18 school age children all of whom come from the University School. Six of these children have hearing loss, 4 are special needs children with a variety of speech and language disorders. Of the 8 children with speech and language impairment, five are in the new classroom for the speech and language impaired demonstrating complex speech and language disorders and three are children from classrooms K-6. My point is this. The University School allows us to provide a wider variety of school age clientele to our students and a more complete school age clientele than either Clarion (no lab school) or Edinboro (lab school). I know of no where else in the state where training clinics have the number of school age children with hearing impairment. The Classroom for the Language Impaired makes us competitive with urban training clinics in terms of complex school age language impaired clients.

Clarion demonstrates that we cannot expect to duplicate this clientele variety and quantity in our rural area through walk in clientele nor through an extension clinic set up in another school building. We could try to set up off campus in house clinics. Let me reiterate. Students must work under the direct supervision of IUP faculty before we can send them to an off campus

site. If we must attempt to set up an "in house clinic" in school buildings throughout the county, we will need to gain permission for our faculty member to supervise our students delivering services to children in school districts. This could become tricky as a school district justifiably will name their speech pathologist responsible for the speech-language therapy of their children, yet our faculty member must maintain responsibility for the therapy being delivered in order for us to maintain accreditation.

As Speech-Language therapy is traditionally offered in an itinerant mode, we will need to use a variety of schools to obtain the variety of hearing impaired, speech and language impaired and learning impaired children we now service. Furthermore, the status of the current administrative structure of the Intermediate Unit is uncertain. As has happened in other Intermediate Units, school districts are considering administration of their own speech-language pathology programs. We could be dealing with not one intermediate unit, but up to 11 school districts in our attempt to find a clientele base. Significant annual transportation costs to move faculty and students to the off campus "in house" clinics will be incurred. We will need to add some funding for duplicate materials needed for the other sites (\$2000 start up and \$ 500 annually).

Does our client load make our students better than those of the competition? That's hard to say. Our students have more experience with school age children with hearing loss, and severe speech and language disorders than either Clarion or Edinboro. I do know this. IUP Speech-Language Pathology students taking the National Examination in Speech-Language Pathology since 1985 pass this test at a rate of 95% through last year. The national rate is 70%.

I have been speaking as program director for the speech-language pathology program. I would like to make two additional points speaking as Chairperson of the Department of Special Education.

The University School provided one of the first integrated programs for children with learning deficits and physical disabilities in Indiana and Armstrong Counties indeed in rural Pennsylvania. This program initiated in the 1970s quickly became a model for many of the programs provided in the surrounding school districts. Regular education and special education teachers interact and collaborate routinely and readily as well as you will ever see it done. Children at University school accept and interact with these special needs children just as readily largely due to the atmosphere established by the faculty. In the 1980s, the first classroom for children with hearing loss in ARIN was established at the University School. Since this model program, two other classrooms have been established in the ARIN district. Once again IUP University School set the model and paved the way

for other school programs. This fall, the University School initiated a classroom for children with speech and language impairments. This classroom is one of a handful of such classrooms in Pennsylvania, especially rural Pennsylvania.

This fall, the PA Department of Special Education funded IUP, ARIN and the Indiana Area School District for a collaborative project to restructure student teaching to include collaboration between elementary and special educators. Students from both disciplines will teach in both regular and special education settings and receive special training along with their cooperating teachers and University supervisors in the PDE Instructional Support Initiatives. Because the University School faculty collaborate so easily, I asked them to be a site for piloting this student teaching experience along with Ben Franklin School. Starting in January, University School will participate in another pilot special education integration program in collaboration with ARIN and IASD.

IUP can proudly point to the University School as a place where persons with disabilities are well integrated. Twenty percent of the University School population consists of children with disabilities. It provides a very diverse educational program for children in the school and for our students. Yet one year following passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act, we are considering closing the only department on campus that provides well established model educational programs that integrate this minority population. Is diversity important to IUP? Does IUP consider persons with disabilities a minority population? Or is diversity important to IUP only with selected populations or when convenient? Many parents, children, and citizens of the community will hear the later message with the closing of this school.

Second point. Closing of the University School would hurt all of the teacher training programs in my department, Education of Exceptional Persons, Education of the Hearing Impaired, Speech-Language Pathology. It would tear the guts out of our practica programs. You may decide to close the University School. That would be unfortunate. But if you close it, please do not announce you are not harming any academic programs. Be honest enough to admit you are.

Thank you

Number of School Age Children on Rolls of Speech-Language Pathology
Training Clinics at Selected Western PA SSHE Institutions

Fall Semester, 1991

	IUP lab. school	Clarion no lab school	Edinboro lab school
Children with Hearing Loss	6	1	0
Children with Speech and Language Disorders	8 (5 complex)	4 (2 high school, 2 mild artic.)	21 (have lab school and night fluency clinic)
Children with Special Needs	4	4	4

MEMORANDUM

TO: IUP Forum for Cost Reduction

FROM: Richard Nowell, Associate Professor, Education of the
Hearing Impaired

DATE: 11/17/91

RE: Closing of the University School

I would like to speak as to the effects of the closing of the University School on the program in Education of the Hearing Impaired. I will only address the issue as it relates to the resource room for hearing-impaired students located in the University School. The issue is a complex one, and many of the effects are not easily observed or measured. I will try to be brief and state the main points succinctly.

- (1) The extent of direct experiences, both through observation and hands-on experience for our majors in the resource room for hearing-impaired students is a valuable aspect of their training. (A letter from the former coordinator for student teaching at the Western Pennsylvania School for the Deaf will attest to this aspect of our students' preparation.)
- (2) The administration suggests that this cooperative relationship can be maintained through agreements with other schools where the hearing-impaired students will be placed. The administration has no evidence that this is true. To my knowledge, they have not approached any school district to verify that similar arrangements can be made. They don't even know to where the class will be moved. Furthermore, our students without cars may not be able to participate in the way they are now. We may not be able to retain this part of our students' training.
- (3) The administration suggests that the cost-saving will occur beyond increased costs caused by the closing of the school. How has the administration calculated this cost? Several years ago, the two hearing-impaired classes at Bloomsburg University were moved out of the University to other local public schools. The head of the Communication Disorders Department states that the cost for the University went up because of travel expenses for the faculty. In other words, it was cheaper for the University to have the

classes in-house than to have them off-campus. To my knowledge our administration has not presented any figures to prove we will save the amount of money they claim. Furthermore, current students claim that the University School is one of the reasons they came to IUP. If enrollment drops, income to the University will drop.

- (4) The quality of the program will be hurt. The spontaneous way in which students and faculty can now interact with students and staff in the hearing-impaired resource room will be lost. We may be forced to do as Bloomsburg is now considering, that is, depend on video-tape for observation purposes. Will this be sufficient to keep our program the quality program it is now? Or will it result in a decrease of quality and a corresponding increase of difficulty in our students' finding jobs? What about costs of alternate teaching methods like video tapes?
- (5) The professional growth of our faculty is enhanced by the opportunity to interact with practitioners in the field. Given the time demands on the current faculty in this program, maintaining such interaction is difficult, even with such professionals in the same building. If they are moved out of the building, that difficulty will increase. Again, at Bloomsburg the faculty found themselves having to schedule evening meetings with local educators to maintain this kind of interchange. The fact that one of the faculty in education of the hearing-impaired was president of the local parents group and his wife a teacher in the school district, and that the chair of the department was also president of the local school board facilitated such interaction occurring. It is difficult for us to even know if we can set up such meetings. Has the University administration approached the local school boards about this? Furthermore, the increased time demands on the faculty to increase off-campus observations and evaluations (if they can be arranged) will leave less time for teaching preparation and scholarly work.

In summary, the closing of the school is a poorly thought out action. The IUP administration keeps telling us to present evidence to support our contentions. Where is their evidence? Do they have the figures and oral or written agreements to back up their claims that our programs can continue without the University School? The worst-case scenario with us is loss of quality of our training program, loss of revenue through drops in enrollment, additional

costs for off-campus supervision, and additional over-taxing of faculty because of the necessity of more off-campus supervision and professional liaisons.

Finally, there is the situation with the children themselves. Will the hearing-impaired children get the same extent of services in another location that they receive at the University School? A large amount of individual attention and daily support through our practicum and clinic students will be lost. These children, children with disabilities, will be forced to settle for less. One cannot help but wonder, if these students belonged to another minority group, would the University even suggest the dissolution of their program?

DATE: December 8, 1994
TO: William Barker, Co-chair TECC Curriculum Subcommittee
FROM: Mary Ann Rafoth, Coordinator, School Psychology
Certification Program, Chair, Educational Psychology
Committee, Department of Educational and
School Psychology *WAR*
SUBJECT: Use of University School by program students

Graduate Students:

Students enrolled in the following courses complete participatory experiences at the University School:

- EP 712 Individual Evaluation I (use students for practice assessment)
- EP 713 Individual Evaluation II (use students for practice assessment)
- EP 763 Assessment of Personality and Behavior Problems of Children
(use students for practice assessment and observations)

Because students are only learning test instruments at this point, results are not valid and cannot be communicated to parents or teachers. It would, therefore, not be possible to transfer the experience to public schools. Students would be asked to find test subjects on their own, increasing the number of friends and relatives and lowering the quality of the experience (making it less like a real test situation).

- EP 762 Crisis Counseling and Consultation in Instructional Settings
(students do practice observations and teacher consultations)

Similar experiences would be difficult to set up in public schools because of time conflicts and unwillingness of schools to accept consultation from a student.

- EP 751 Internship II (clients are referred from the University School, all entering kindergarten students are screened)

For the last several years, due to increase in our number of student clinicians, we have depended on the lab school for cases. We might potentially require an advertising budget to secure additional clients or faculty release time to work with local schools or mental health agencies to secure clients. Counseling experiences at the practica level are now required by our accrediting agency. These would be very difficult, if not impossible, to arrange and supervise in local schools but are easily arranged at the lab school.

In addition, one student has completed her actual internship (as opposed to clinical practicum described above) at the University School in recent years.

In addition; we have used the University School as a recruiting tool. Our major competitor in the state, LeHigh University, has an on-campus laboratory site.

Undergraduate Students:

EP 302: (Classroom observations and analyses)

Currently, it is very difficult to complete this course requirement because of lengthy waits to be scheduled to observe and requests to limit single-shot observations in Indiana and Armstrong Counties without using the lab school. Typically, instructors allow students to schedule their own observations out of this two county area (usually in their neighborhood school) or in parochial schools. For students who cannot do this, the lab school is the only option. It easily accomodates our students providing observations for early childhood, elementary, art ed., music ed., physical education, speech and language therapy, special education, educ. of hearing-impaired, and even secondary majors who can observe the sixth grade teacher (considered a middle school grade in many schools) teach a particular content area.

Our program would continue, but be impaired in the quality of some experiences, should the lab school close. No specific advantages would accrue for our program because of partnerships because our internship sites are independently secured and maintained by the department.

cc: Educational and School Psychology Department Faculty
Dr. Marilyn Howe

#2

6-DEC-1994 16:22:03.91

NEWMAIL

From: GROVE::DWSTEIN "Dave Stein"
To: WILLIAM_BARKER
CC: JOHN_BUTZOW,DWSTEIN
Subj: TECC request for course requirements tied into University School

This is in response to John Butzow's 12/2/94 letter requesting the above information. I am responding to the request as Graduate Coordinator of Speech-Language Pathology, and my response focuses on our graduate courses only. The four grad courses in which we rely heavily on the University School are the following practicum courses:

SH 661 Advanced Clinic I
SH 662 Diagnostic Clinic
SH 663 Hearing Testing Clinic
SH 671 Advanced Clinic II

We draw extensively on the population of students in the University School to provide practicum experiences for our grad students in these four courses. In the present semester, with the dispersal to their home schools of some of our

Press RETURN for more...

MAIL>

Esc-ctrl: ^] help: ^]? port:1 speed: 9600 parity:none echo:rem VT320

#2

6-DEC-1994 16:22:03.91

NEWMAIL

former clients who had been in the University School, our clinic has directly suffered a loss of clientele. This has been at least partially for the result that some of our grad students will attain fewer clock hours than they are targeted for in a given semester. This situation adds the pressure of attaining more hours during their off campus placement experiences (I estimate that five of the eight students that I am supervising this semester will be in this situation).

If the University School closes, we will naturally have to explore other options for obtaining experience for our clinicians before they are sent off campus. However, the above is true both historically and at present.

I hope that this information is useful in the decision making process.

MAIL>

Esc-ctrl: ^] help: ^]? port:1 speed: 9600 parity:none echo:rem VT320

Geoscience Department
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
114 Walsh Hall
Indiana, Pennsylvania 15705-1087

(412) 357-2379



December 7, 1994

Subject: University School

To: TECC Curriculum Committee

From: Connie J. Sutton *CJS*

I am unable to attend today's committee meeting because I am at the Univ of Pittsburgh at my graduate class, working toward my EdD in Science Education. (I skipped last week to attend the committee meeting!)

I surveyed all the students enrolled in SC 103 - Fundamentals of Earth Science and SC 104 - Fundamentals of Biology. Most are sophomores, and all should be either elementary or early childhood majors. Because our decision would impact them and not the average student, I decided to ask them the questions on the attached sheet. I've not had the time to number crunch some of the responses but completed most.

Knowing how the University School can operate when fully funded and staffed, and knowing what has been accomplished, and knowing how these students feel, I must vote in favor of retaining the University School.

I know that work with other schools is important and should continue as much as possible. However, our lack of "control" worries me. I've had an incident, for example, with one of our partnership schools this semester. I assigned a "project" to a student teacher, as I have done with every student for the last ten years. The school said no - he was not allowed to videotape a lesson and keep the tape because it "shows" students. If something as basic as this is questioned, how are innovative things going to be received?

Again, I favor keeping (and properly funding) University School. I vote to retain.

Combined SC 1030 1014
225 students

SURVEY USE OF UNIVERSITY SCHOOL BY ELEMENTARY MAJORS

Please answer the following questions:

Year (Fr. So. Jr. Sr) 1 57 32 9 % Major EL = 86% ERCH 10% Other 4%

1. Have you done any observations in an elementary school?

74% yes 26% no (if no, do not continue)

2. For what courses were these observations done?

40% Elem courses 15% Ed courses 45% both

3. Approximately how many observations have you made? _____

4. Where were these observations made?

23% Univ School 37% other 41% both

5. About what percentage, if any, were done at University School? _____

6. If you made other observations, how far away, on the average, did you travel? _____ miles

7. Did you have to skip another IUP class to make any of these observations?

23% yes 72% no 5% both

8. Given a choice of location for observing, would you prefer

84% University School 5% other Both 7% ^{Write ins} No Pref. 4%

Briefly, explain your answer.

Appendix B

2.



~~Addendum B~~

Student Congress General Assembly
November 21, 1994
University School Motion

MOTION NUMBER: F'94-22

DATE PRESENTED: NOVEMBER 21, 1994

SUBJECT: UNIVERSITY SCHOOL

SPONSOR: MATTHEW MILLER

CO-SPONSOR: MELISSA PETTIGREW

A MOTION:

WHEREAS: A PROPOSAL HAS BEEN SUBMITTED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY, DR. PETTIT, FROM PROVOST AND VICE PRESIDENT OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS MARK J. STASZKIEWICZ, DEALING WITH A PROPOSAL CONCERNING THE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL (MARCH 94); AND,

WHEREAS: WITHIN HIS PROPOSAL MARK STASZKIEWICZ RECOMMENDS CLOSURE OF THE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL EFFECTIVE FALL OF 95. SINCE THEN AN UPDATE HAS BEEN RELEASED RECOMMENDING CLOSURE OF THE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL AT THE END OF THE 95-96 YEAR.

WHEREAS: THE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL COLLABORATES WITH 13 DIFFERENT IUP DEPARTMENTS INCLUDING ALL RESTAURANT AND HOTEL MANAGEMENT MAJORS THAT RECEIVE CLINICAL EXPERIENCE THROUGH THE HOT LUNCH PROGRAM OF THE SCHOOL THROUGH THE "QUANTITY FOODS PREPARATION CLASS."; AND,

WHEREAS: THE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL IS USED BY NUMEROUS FACULTY AND METHODS INSTRUCTORS AS AN EARLY ENTRANCE SITE FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE FOR FRESHMEN AND SOPHOMORES WHO NEED TO OBSERVE THEORY IN ACTION (9,000 OBSERVATIONS/PARTICIPATIONS 1993-1994); AND,

WHEREAS: THE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL FACULTY RESPONSE DISPUTES SOME FACTS WITHIN THE PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY MARK STASZKIEWICZ; AND,

THEREFORE LET IT BE RESOLVED: THAT WE THE IUP STUDENT CONGRESS DECLARE OUR SUPPORT FOR THE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL; AND,

LET IT FURTHER BE RESOLVED: THAT A COPY OF THIS MOTION BE FORWARDED TO THE UNIVERSITY SENATE AND THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

Appendix B

3.)

~~Attachment D~~

Undergraduate Study
~~Indiana University of Pennsylvania~~
Survey Regarding the
University School

IUP STUDENT SURVEY REGARDING UNIVERSITY SCHOOL
 (If you have already completed a survey, please give this to a friend)

Circle your response to the following questions or fill in the blanks.

1. Year in school? **Freshman: 24 Sophomore: 57 Junior: 120**
Senior: 70 Graduate: 11

2. Major? **Please see attached sheet.**

3. Did the availability of the University School influence your decision to enroll at IUP?
YES NO
92 178

4. If the availability of the University School did not influence your decision to enroll at IUP, were you aware of the existence of the University School when you applied to IUP? **YES NO**
99 115

5. Have you personally observed and/or participated at the University School?
YES NO
214 68

6. If you have observed at the University School, to what degree was that experience beneficial?

I Haven't Observed		Minimal		Somewhat		Greatly
N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
61	4	5	13	38	154	

7. To what extent have you taken advantage of the faculty resources at the University School to assist you with course preparation?

I Haven't Used The Resources		Minimal		Somewhat		Greatly
N/A	1	2	3	4	5	
89	15	23	34	51	67	

8. On the next three lines, please explain your response to question 7.

9. If there is a state university in your area, why did you select IUP? _____

10. If you have observed in the University School and in other schools, what similarities or differences can you cite? _____

11. Based on information that you have about the University School, do you believe the school services should be available to students in teacher preparation programs? **YES** **NO**
267 4

The University School, an integral part of teacher-training at IUP since 1875, provides a unique opportunity for preservice educators in teacher preparation programs. If you believe that this program should be part of the teacher preparation program at IUP, please write a letter of support to Dr. Mark Staszkiwicz ("CC" to Dr. Lawrence Pettit, Dr. John Butzow, and Dr. Marilyn Howe). Thank you for your time in completing this survey.

**PLEASE RETURN THE FORM TO THE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OFFICE BY
APRIL 8, 1994.**

Response to Question 2: Majors

Art Education: 2
Audiology: 1
Biology Education: 1
Child Development/Family Relations: 4
Criminology: 2
Early Childhood Education: 29
Education of the Exceptional Student: 2
Elementary Education: 145
English: 1
Health/Physical Education: 43
Hearing Impaired Education: 10
Home Economics Education: 1
Mathematics Education: 1
Music Education: 8
Nursing: 6
Physical Education/Sport: 11
Psychology: 2
Rehabilitation: 1
Social Sciences: 1
Special Education: 4
Speech Pathology: 6

0220

Sample Responses to Question 7
(To what extent have you taken advantage of the faculty resources at the University School to assist you with course preparation?)

For Language Arts Across Curriculum. Teaching a lesson for sixth grade in Mrs. Rowell's class.

I have used the library at the University School for Children's Literature.

I have used them to aid me in my studies.

I used it to meet requirements for ED 242.

Many of the teachers have been very helpful in lending knowledge and resources when I needed help in preparing unit plans and writing papers.

I use the faculty for help on projects, for observations, for interviews, resources, etc.

I have participated in many observations, and have been able to teach several times within the University School.

It is very convenient to have an Elementary school on property. I have done many of my observations and even taught at the University School.

I have asked one of the teachers if they had any information on a certain topic.

The University School has helped me during observations, course work, and experience with children.

In observations and in classroom experience in my class Introduction to Early Childhood.

I used the library here and thought it was a lot better than the Stapleton. I've also used teacher resources.

To observe and see what happens in a real school setting.

On occasion, I have asked teachers at the University School their opinion on a lesson I have prepared.

I have used the resources to find activities when making up a teaching unit.

I have used teachers resources for lesson plans, observation papers, etc.

I have many times come to the University School for help, using the library,

observations, etc. It is a great help.

I feel that it has been tremendously helpful to be able to test our ideas and teaching with "hands on" experience at our convenience.

I have used my classroom experiences in other classes also the use of the materials available. The library is also a great help.

I have taken great advantage of the University School faculty resources. I was in CM 301 and I got the privilege to take pictures of the faculty and children for a slide-show.

I am taking children's literature and the University School has helped me greatly with this class.

I used it for my children's literature class.

I have used faculty resources to fulfill classroom observation requirements as well as to teach classes.

We have observed many different classes and we are also allowed to use the library. We had journals with children in the school and we have also had the opportunity to teach students down there.

I have worked with both teachers and students of the University School. Observing and interacting with students and faculty is an advantage.

While take Child Psychology, I tutored a student with assistance of the faculty. They helped me use the tutoring experience for a project as well as giving me materials and ideas and books for the tutoring experience.

The faculty resources have helped me in preparing lessons to be taught at the University School.

I have observed several classes, in order to prepare myself for future teaching in my classes and when I graduate.

Doing observations for classes in my major helped to show me what to expect in the future from elementary level.

Many of the teachers have helped me with various lesson plans and they are always willing to offer me their input.

For many of my class projects, I have talked to faculty members for input, suggestions, and materials. For example, one teacher found books and activities for me to use in a unit.

The University School faculty have much to offer. I have borrowed books and received advice that I have used to help me with my courses.

I used books from the University School to help with projects.

In my assignments I fulfilled there, the faculty was very helpful and set a good example for me to follow.

I have used the music department, physical education department, and several classrooms for very worthwhile experiences.

When working on thematic units for two of my classes, I met with several different faculty members who gave me ideas for lesson plans and offered me their resources.

We are doing thematic units in EL 425 and are teaching an activity at the University School. Ms. Marlin has been very helpful with providing ideas, suggestions, and materials. She is very cooperative and flexible.

I have gotten some help on certain lesson plans that I have done for classes - I got opinions and asked for any help they could give me.

The teachers are more than willing to provide materials, info, and advice. I was also able to see the theory put into practice.

I have gotten lesson plan ideas and teacher resource books from the faculty there.

I've discussed issues and ideas about how to teach children with Dr. Wheatly and Dr. Mambo both were very helpful.

I've observed at the University School multiple times (8). I've found every visit rewarding and educable.

I used the library and observed many times for various subjects of all ages.

I've used the library, interviewed children and staff.

I have used it for the library and also to observe and learn from that.

I have gone to visit Dr. Hectman with help in one of my presentations. She was extremely helpful and eager to help. All of the teachers do an excellent job.

Mrs. Yost has many resource books that she lets us use. These kinds of books are extremely helpful in planning activities because our library doesn't have good, current books.

The materials are better than those in the Stapleton Library. I have used much more

than books from the school though. I have used materials to help with my other classes.

I've talked to teachers there, I also did my pre-student teaching I experience there and loved it. I also went back to the same teacher and she gave me resources and help me with lessons.

I would love to be incorporated with the University School as an Art Ed. major.

The University School has helped a great deal with lesson plans along with my other studies.

I needed to know the sign for pilgrim for a sign language lesson and if it was easy for me to go and find a teacher (Professor) who could help me.

The teachers seem to be very willing to share experiences with other students - they don't seem to mind being in the classroom.

I have done both of my pre-student teaching experiences there and have used some of the resources from the fourth grade teacher and special ed teacher.

I have used information and feedback from the teachers (especially Judy Rowell - sixth grade) this has been very beneficial to me. As far as materials as resources, I have not been aware that any are available to me.

I had a very wonderful student teaching experience here. Much better than most of my friends have in other schools.

The teachers in the University School have helped me with resources and ideas MUCH MORE than any college professor would!!

Three of the University School teachers have lent teacher resources to me for classes. I've used the library many times.

The University School has allowed me to interact with many students. The University School is easy to access and the small scale size of the school has allowed me to meet and work with students of all different needs. The teachers are very helpful and willing to have the University students in their classes anytime.

I feel their willingness to help with any question I have. They are also used to having observers in class. I feel more comfortable there.

Teachers gave me the opportunity to come in their classroom to teach and observe also the teachers have given me advice.

I am in that school almost every day either teaching or observing and all of the faculty

members are willing to give help if needed. They are very cooperative and understanding.

I have taught a class at the University School and have also set up a learning center for the children. I have used some of the teachers to help prepare me better.

I observed, talked with a third grade teacher and then taught a lesson to third graders. The teachers help you one on one and give helpful hints in which to prepare the class.

By observing at the University School helped me because the teachers would give you helpful hints that will help me when I get out.

I gained a hands on experience with the kids and it opened my eyes to what it was like.

By observing and also teaching a few half hour classes helps you learn to deal with different situations you can not learn in class.

Teachers at the University School have assisted me in planning lessons, creating my unit plans. Teachers there also let me teach their students to help me get a feel for the students.

Discussed ideas for lessons and materials with teachers, some books made available only in University school library, textbooks and resource materials.

I have observed many classes there and have talked with many different teachers.

Some of the teachers have helped me prepare lessons.

I have talked with teachers at the University School to get ideas for lessons and sometimes they even let me borrow materials that I could use, I thought their help and cooperation was great.

I observe classes at the University School - many classes.

It would be very difficult for me to observe a hearing-impaired class if the University School did not exist. The University School's faculty resources have been of great use to me.

Some of the University School teachers also teach college classes. It is helpful because they are in the classrooms now and can give us the most recent information.

I have observed classes in the University School and participated in the Mainstream Support program. I have also participated in guest lectures presented by some of the University School teachers in addition to having one as a professor. I have gained

numerous insights, ideas, and experiences during my time involved with the University School.

I had several assignments to observe elementary classes and the University School was convenient since I'm a full time student with credit overload every semester.

I use the University School for my pre-professional experience, observing for classes, and resources for my sources of study.

I taught PE for a semester, used the library, and did numerous observations at the University School.

I have used the Davis School for observations and teaching experiences. They have greatly helped in the training for my future career. First time I taught children in a school setting.

Instructors have allowed me to observe the class before I teach to get an idea of how the class responds. They also gave me advice before and after my teachings.

I have received information and materials from teachers at the University School that helped me a great deal when I taught over there.

The University School is beneficial to help better prepare for classes and it allows for on hand experiences with all different students. Hands on experience is held early in your college career and it also serves as a convenience for the college students.

We had to do a learning center for grade three. By talking to the teacher you can learn what will and will not work in trying to get your view/lesson across.

The faculty at the University School is well versed in the current research on innovative learning techniques and very willing to help in planning of curriculum and writing lesson plans. Their willingness to allow observation at all parts of the program is an unexpected benefit that adds tremendously to my education.

I have received a tremendous amount of support, guidance, and help from many of the teachers at the University School. I have also gotten a great deal of information from the University School library that has helped me prepare for several of the classes I've had.

I had the opportunity to observe advanced non-traditional problem solving math lessons that I would like to incorporate into my classroom.

Sample Responses To Question 9

(If there is a state university in your area, why did you select IUP?)

The quality of the EDHI program and the location of the University School.

The University School had a great influence on my decision to come to IUP.

The main reason was for the education of the hearing impaired program and its reputation which relies on the University School.

Yes, there is a university in my area. I picked IUP for the S/P program and found out on my first visit here about the University School. I thought it would be a great way to learn - to have students that I could teach one floor below my area of study.

I specifically chose IUP because I knew of its wonderful reputation as a teacher's college. The existence of the University School also played a key part in my decision - because of the early observations and experiences that I could take part in. I chose IUP over Penn State (where I was also accepted.)

Good school for my major - It has an elementary education lab - University School.

Good education program and experience on campus that tries new approaches - The University School.

I could gain experience as a freshman. The University School was the ideal place to observe.

IUP has a high placement for teachers, close to home, great campus and having a chance to work with the children one on one with the University School being right on campus gives me the opportunity. (I live right by Pitt Greensburg.)

IUP had a university school.

I really like the campus. Also, I liked the idea that there is a school on campus. I am an education major, so the school is a great aspect to me as a future teacher.

The education (especially hearing impaired) program is excellent. The experiences available, including the ones offered at the University School, make the program as fine as it is.

Because of IUP's reputation as a teaching university and the fact that there were many facilities for the pre-student teaching, including the University School.

IUP has an excellent education program and prepares you to teach through the University School.

I selected IUP because of the reputable education program. I also felt that the school had things to offer that other schools could not, for example: University School.

I selected IUP because it is known for having a wonderful and challenging program. There are also many opportunities available at IUP and the University School is one of the main reasons I chose to attend IUP.

Great education program! -Best in the state! University School has a great impact on this!

Sample Responses to Question 10

(If you have observed in the University School and in other schools, what similarities or differences can you cite?)

The University School teaches its students more along the lines of the way we're being taught to teach. Not many other schools do.

Public schools are still in old methods, i.e. basic readers more so than in University School.

The University School follows a much more student-centered, whole language approach.

The University School has children with various disabilities right in the classroom. Mainstreaming - I was able to experience it.

The teaching styles at the University school are more "now" and students seem to enjoy learning more.

The University School uses the newest techniques for teaching/learning. Other schools use the traditional way.

Actually the University School was a much better experience than the other schools I have been to. It seemed much more organized, appropriate and involved.

The University School is involved in more of the up-coming trends in education such as: whole language, hands-on activities, thematic units, and cooperative learning. Other schools are often caught up in basils and workbooks.

The University School offers information about my major and has more hands on opportunities. The teachers are more willing to help and give advice.

The University School is more up-to-date in practicing many of the newer teaching practices and techniques. The teachers are more excited about what they are doing, willing to assist the college students, and more willing to adapt their lessons to meet the needs of special students.

I have seen in the University School that you are able to adapt the instruction to the individual student better than in other schools. Also, teaches you to adapt your instruction to all students including ones with disabilities.

The University School uses more hands-on, active, and modern teaching methods. The University School also provides support (more) for special needs students.

The University School setting allows for more "hands on" involvement and interactions

of the students than does a public school.

I was much more welcomed and could participate more in the University School.

The non-traditional (whole language approach) vs. The traditional (public schools).

Non-traditional vs. traditional approach.

University School uses more updated techniques - more whole language. I don't know where I would have really been exposed to such instruction outside my IUP classroom.

The University School gives more individual attention and seems to be better equipped for meeting special needs.

In the University School, there is more one on one with students and teachers, this I believe enhances learning.

You get to work on a more individual basis with the students.

The University School is a good place for students to get a feel what it is like to teach a class, to make sure they like it and want to stick with it and doesn't take a great amount of time from the student.

The students at the University School are much more eager to learn than students I have observed elsewhere. I am also very impressed with the knowledge the students have acquired.

The University School offers an alternative curriculum to observe while addressing the needs of elementary age children.

It is easier for the student to walk across campus than to have to be bussed to every class.

Because the University School is small, observing and working with students is much easier. The University School is much more cooperative about allowing University School students to visit, observe, and teach than other elementary schools within the area.

The children in the University School are attended to individually. Handicapped children are able to participate freely. Some have their own interpreter or helpers. I have never seen this at any of the public schools I've observed.

The teachers really work with the children and it's a lot of hands on experiences and a lot of good techniques are used. I feel that it is a quality experience for the children who are able to attend. This is an excellent experience for the students who are

education majors.

They practice more of what we learn in our courses than many schools do.

The University School is one of the only schools that uses all the innovative techniques I am learning about in my classes and my readings.

The observations are alike in that they are genuine and natural, not just textbook reactions. The best place to see these methods is in the actual classroom. Having access to the University School's a benefit that is greatly appreciated by myself. It is well worth the cost of maintaining it. I have seen and learned so much there, to help me in my teacher preparation program.

The students in the University school are more prepared for the student observers. There is no disruption and I feel the observer receives a more realistic view of a functioning class.

The University school gives you the setting for students that should be in all school districts. A lot of other schools and teachers give us very bad examples to follow and could be damaging to future children.

They use new and innovative teaching techniques. The children are learning in the best possible ways.

The University School observation was more beneficial to me than other observations.

There seems to be more mainstreaming of students with disabilities and special needs at the University School than I have seen elsewhere.

The students at the University School receive an education that is developmentally appropriate and has a multicultural purpose.

I feel more free to interact and/or interview the children.

The University School is more modern. The teachers are always trying something new.

The children in the University School act more normal during observation because they are used to it.

The University School teachers use new and different approaches to teaching that gave me ideas on how to teach my own class. It was a great experience, and I am glad I got to do my observations at the University School.

The University School uses methods consistent with innovative teaching methods. Unfortunately, I have not had the opportunity in either observations or in my Junior

Block experience. The observation in the University School inspires me (or gives me hope) that when I have my own classroom that I can use methods used in the University School.

Sample Responses To Question 11

(Based on information that you have about the University School, do you believe the school services should be available to students in teacher preparation programs?)

Definitely.

If the University School is abolished, IUP is likely to lose future students.

I feel strongly that the University School is an important part of teacher preparation. My education would have been lacking without it.

The services are also useful for students in other majors, such as speech, language pathology, and nutrition.

They do not benefit me, but to other future teachers they are available resources for experience and preparation.

It is very important to those who use it.

Most definitely. Please keep it open.