

Committee on Teacher Education

Chair: Anne Leftwich

Tuesday, January 31, 2017, 2:30pm-4:00pm

Wright Education Building, Room 2140

In attendance: *A. Leftwich, J. Shedd, D. Wyatt, A. Mobley, G. Hopkins, K. Barton, C. Gray, B. Whitaker, D. Estell, J. Lucaites, K. Pilgrim, B. Douglas*

I. Approval of minutes of December 8, 2016

D. Estell called the meeting to order at 2:34. He then requested a motion to approve the minutes from last meeting and the minutes. *A. Leftwich* moved to accept the minutes, *C. Gray* seconded, and the minutes were unanimously approved as written.

II. Old Business

a. M427 (Teaching All Learners Student Teaching Seminar) approval

K. Barton presented on *W. Marencik's* behalf and stated that the change for the TAL program was approved at the last meeting, which included extending it to a yearlong student teaching experience. However, he indicated that the approval of M427: Special Education Student Teaching Seminar still needs to be addressed in regards to this change. Currently, elementary candidates are required to take M420: Student Teaching Seminar for a maximum of 2 credits. Since the student teaching experience has been extended, it necessitates that another course with another number be added for candidates to enroll in for their second semester of student teaching specific to special education experiences. *A. Leftwich* asked for a motion to approve the M427: Special Education Student Teaching Seminar. *C. Gray* moved approval, *J. Lucaites* seconded the motion, and M427 was unanimously approved.

b. TAL program change effective date

K. Barton explained that the issue he would like to discuss is the effective date of the TAL program change, which was not decided during the last meeting. *D. Wyatt* stated that she believes that all candidates are expected to adhere to the new program in one year. *A. Leftwich* clarified that this would be Fall 2018. *J. Shedd* recommended that effective date for the TAL program change should apply to candidates who apply to the Teacher Education Program in Fall 2017 and are admitted for Spring 2018. *D. Wyatt* moved approval, *D. Estell* seconded the motion, 10 members approved the motion, and 2 members (*B. Whitaker* and *G. Hopkins*) abstained because they were not present for the discussion.

III. New Business

a. Global Gateways M420 (Student Teaching Seminar) requirement

K. Barton reported that Global Gateways is an overseas student teaching program as well as a student teaching program for candidates who would like to teach on Navajo

reservations or in inner-city Chicago. As such, this program has additional requirements and courses. Because of the extra requirements, candidates in this program have traditionally been exempt from the 1-2 credit student teaching seminar, but this is currently not an official policy. *K. Barton* proposed on *L. Stachowski's* behalf that candidates in the Global Gateways program be required to take 1 credit of M420: Student Teaching Seminar, because these candidates have to take the EdTPA and will obtain more support and preparation for this experience if they take M420.

J. Lucaites inquired about the specific nature of the support that would be given to candidates through M420. *J. Shedd* specified that support includes online materials, staff who travel the state to provide 2 personal work sessions, and candidates working with one another by reading drafts and talking through issues. *J. Lucaites* then inquired as to why 1 credit is sufficient for this course. *K. Barton* responded by indicating that assigning 1 credit to this course standardizes it across all Global Gateway candidates whether they are elementary or secondary candidates. *D. Wyatt* added that it is also a matter of tuition and fees because candidates have 9 additional credit hours that they need to fit in to their curriculum between junior and senior year, so keeping one hour makes this easier it easier for candidates to enroll in less courses in one semester.

K. Barton inquired how this might affect ECE candidates and *D. Wyatt* indicated that these candidates have their own 3 credit seminar that they take. *K. Barton* then asked whether the proposed 1 credit course would be an addition to candidates' existing early childhood student teaching course or be a replacement. *J. Shedd* responded that similar material to M420 is already being integrated into the early childhood seminar and early childhood candidates are also attending sessions offered across the state. *K. Barton* clarified that the motion would be for all candidates in Global Gateways in programs in which 420 is already required, to take 1 credit of M420.

D. Estell inquired if an adjustment would need to be made to the total required 120 credit hours that Global Gateway candidates need to achieve. *D. Wyatt* responded that this would not be an issue given that candidates would have been required to take M420 with their program. *D. Wyatt* proposed that this requirement be effective starting in Fall 2017. *J. Shedd* added that candidates should complete M420, EdTPA, and Indiana student teaching during a fall or spring semester, whereas their overseas opportunities can take place after the aforementioned tasks have been completed.

J. Lucaites indicated that in his experience, colleges do not retrospectively apply program requirements, they only apply to currently matriculating candidates. *K. Barton* expressed that the overall amount of required credits remains the same, the only difference is modifying an unofficial exemption. *J. Shedd* added that candidates decide to matriculate into the Global Gateways program and are aware of M420 as a requirement, which would not come as a surprise to them. *A. Leftwich* asked for a motion to require all Global Gateway candidates to take 1 credit of M420 starting in Fall 2017, if M420 is part of their program requirements. *C. Gray* provided the first motion, *B. Douglas* seconded, and M420 was unanimously approved.

b. Academic Probation and Dismal Policy revision

K. Barton reported that the revision has been proposed because the existing policy only applies to candidates admitted to TEP; however there are two types of candidates that this policy does not cover (i.e., directly admitted candidates and certified candidates admitted after freshman year to the SoE). Additionally, the existing policy is detailed and convoluted. The new policy states that if candidate GPAs fall below 2.5, they are placed on academic probation and required to meet with an advisor to develop a plan to increase the GPA above 2.5 within a year. If this goal is not met, candidates will be dismissed.

K. Barton explained that candidates have to maintain a 2.5 to be admitted to TEP and to be eligible for student teaching. *K. Pilgrim* expressed that it can be difficult for candidates to meet with an advisor and inquired about the specific advisor that candidates need to meet with. *K. Barton* indicated that candidates will be meeting with advisors located in the SoE. *K. Pilgrim* asked if having candidates wait until the beginning of the next semester to meet and make a plan with their advisors is too late. *D. Wyatt* clarified that registration will place a hold on enrollment until candidates meet with their advisors. She added that candidates will likely be notified of their academic probation status within 1 to 2 weeks of the end of the semester, which is easier in May and more difficult in December. *B. Douglas* asked if candidates are alerted to the hold by the department and *D. Wyatt* responded that yes, candidates will be notified in the initial email that a hold will be placed on their enrollment. She also recommended that stating in the new policy that candidates should meet with a SoE advisor would be a good idea.

J. Shedd inquired about an effective date for the revised policy. *D. Wyatt* proposed that the policy be implemented starting Spring 2017 to begin reviewing grades and officially effective in Fall 2017. *J. Lucaites* expressed that the revised policy seems more restrictive than the old policy and thus, should only be applied to candidates matriculating starting on July 1. *K. Barton* indicated that this plan is less restrictive. *D. Estell* added that the old policy dismisses candidates with GPAs lower than 2.5, whereas the new policy offers a remediation plan. *J. Lucaites* proposed allowing candidates decide which policy they would like to operate under. *B. Douglas* agreed that this is typical conduct when policies change. *J. Lucaites* also emphasized the importance of candidates following the rules according to their bulletin. *D. Wyatt* clarified that the revised policy would be in effect in Summer/May 2017. *A. Leftwich* asked for a motion to approve the revised academic probation policy, including a statement about candidates meeting with a SoE advisor, to be in effect starting Summer/May 2017. *K. Pilgrim* provided the first motion, *B. Douglas* seconded, and the revised policy was unanimously approved.

c. Credit for AP courses

K. Barton reported that in general a score of 4 or 5 on an AP exam counts for a specific course at IU, but a score of 3 counts as “undistributed credit” to be used

toward a candidate's overall credit total (with variation across specific courses). He explained that there has been a recent increase in candidate appeals who would like their AP scores of 3 to count toward specific courses at IU, which have all been denied because of the existing policy. *J. Lucaites* sought clarification on whether the current policy is a guideline or a rule. *K. Barton* expressed that it is a university-wide rule. *C. Gray* asked if there needs to be a specific policy or if the department can defer to the university policy. *J. Lucaites* agreed that this is a statement that can be included in the bulletin for the candidates to abide by. *K. Barton* expressed that he would like to generate a discussion and make a decision that this policy should be supported and continue to be adopted by the department. *D. Wyatt* asserted that providing course credit for an AP score of 3 is a state mandate. *K. Pilgrim* expressed that candidates might not understand what undistributed credit means. *K. Barton* inquired if there should be a limit imposed on the number of AP classes that candidates are allowed to count toward their program credits. *C. Gray* asserted that dual counted courses are offered as a benefit to candidates and taking that away might put them at a disadvantage. *A. Mobley* added that she advises her candidates that course transfer is dependent on university policy. *K. Barton* clarified that perhaps this is not a policy, but a commitment to be followed and communicated to advisors.

IV. Discussion items

a. IUB-Clinical partner connections

K. Barton shared that based on a discussion that took place in a previous meeting, a survey of 69 faculty, candidates, university supervisors, and school partners/staff was constructed to understand their perception of the importance of collaboration between schools and universities in determining candidate field placements. Areas of strength and limitations were also asked in this survey. *A. Leftwich* pointed out that only 6% of university supervisors agree that the field experiences program should be based on knowledge from research during practice. *K. Barton* added that 56% of faculty thought that this was important, but not many individuals from the other categories. *J. Lucaites* agreed that it is interesting that only faculty believe that research, theory, and practice are important. *K. Barton* added that faculty were less likely to believe that procedures for communication were important, whereas other groups thought that was important.

In reference to areas that require improvement, *D. Estell* started the discussion by pointing out that 43% of individuals agreed that improvement is needed in conducting collaborative research and applying to program improvement. However, he thought it was also interesting that 0% of individuals thought that the above was important for good field experiences. *G. Hopkins* added that 0% of faculty perceived program as a procedure for identifying problems as an area needing improvement. *J. Lucaites* pointed out that there is significant disagreement between faculty and candidates on which areas need improvement. *K. Barton* asserted that faculty do not see the need to improve collaboration between schools and universities, but half of candidates and 63% of people in schools considered this as necessary. Additionally, *K. Pilgrim* called attention to the low percentages ranked by all survey participants that considered

existing procedures of identifying problems as important, but was among the top three areas rated as needing improvement. *A. Leftwich* summarized that collaboration between schools and universities needs to be increased to maximize program effectiveness to provide more specific expectations and connect with teachers to provide more resources for candidates. *K. Barton* added that ideally, this model would progress into a relationship of collaboration utilized to determine candidate needs and best classroom practices for candidates. *B. Whitaker* inquired about the role of university supervisors and *K. Barton* responded that they are aware of program requirements, but have no contact with faculty and do not work closely with teachers in the classroom. *C. Gray* pointed out that this might be a function of how busy teachers are, *B. Whitaker* added that she has noticed that supervisors are retired and a little removed from current teaching practices, and *A. Leftwich* agreed that it is important for supervisors to be aware of new technology to utilize in the classroom.

A. Leftwich initiated the discussion concerning program strengths by pointing out that faculty rated procedures for communication as a well-functioning component, but candidates do not agree with this. *K. Barton* and *C. Gray* suggested finding different, more effective ways to communicate with candidates. *K. Barton* shared that he considered the differential ratings between candidates and faculty, staff, and clinical partners of clarity in roles and functions of all parties interesting. *A. Leftwich* hypothesized that candidates might perceive their roles to be less clear because they might be nervous going into the new experience and do not know what to expect. *G. Hopkins* asserted that candidates perceive that they engage in a lot of research and theory, but do not believe that it is important. Interestingly, faculty perceive this work to be important, but is not engaged in enough. *A. Leftwich* recommended conducting mid-semester evaluations with candidates and teachers to inquire about which expectations are not as clear to them. *K. Barton* called to attention the disconnect between university faculty and people in school's perceptions of program expectations, which negatively impacts candidates and further emphasizes the importance of collaboration between schools and universities.

b. Standards for non-authorized/pre-requisite courses

K. Barton started the discussion regarding non-authorized/pre-requisite courses by inquiring how they might be able to improve these courses and course instructors to better retain and engage candidates. *A. Leftwich* asserted that currently, associate instructors in W200 have several trainings, observations, resources, and ongoing support meetings to prepare them for teaching these courses. She continued that despite these efforts, concerns have continued to be raised. *D. Estell* added that a training model that his department came up with was to create teaching assistant funding positions for candidates to gain experience teaching prior to obtaining an associate instructor position, but this model was dismissed due to the extra expenses it would require. *A. Leftwich* also pointed out that associate instructor positions are limited to 2 years of funding in IST. *D. Estell* reported that starting in the fall, all associate instructors are required to have a master's degree to avoid giving graduate candidates with bachelor's degrees and no previous teaching experience teaching

positions, which will serve to increase the quality of instructors and introductory courses. However, this makes provision of funding for incoming candidates problematic. This highlights the tension between providing funding for incoming candidates and prioritizing funding to quality, seasoned associate instructors. He continued by expressing that associate instructors are asked emphasize content relevance and encourage their candidates to attend SoE events to help foster a greater sense of community within the teacher education program.

A. Leftwich asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. *C. Gray* voiced the first motion, *J. Lucaites* seconded the motion, and unanimous approval adjourned the meeting at 3:57p.m.

Next Meeting

Wednesday, February 22, 2017 2:30-4:00PM

Wright Education Building 2277