

Committee on Teacher Education

Chair: Anne Leftwich

Thursday, December 8, 2016, 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, A. Brannan (for W. Marencik), R. Kunzman*

I. Approval of minutes of October 26, 2016

A. Leftwich requested a motion to approve the minutes from last meeting and the minutes were unanimously approved as written.

II. New Business

a. Teaching All Learners (TAL) program changes

A. Brannan made a proposal to extend the existing student teaching program length (i.e., allow student teaching experience for 4 days a week for 14 weeks as a substitution for an early field experience for 1 day a week for 10 weeks), along with a reduction of other coursework. She explained that the goal is to extend the length of the current two 8-week placements to one full semester each. Rationale included a shortage of special education teachers, a need to better prepare our candidates, rapid burnout and early retirement specific to these teachers. Recently at IU, the demands on student teachers have grown, including the incorporation of the edTPA.

Additionally, *A. Brannan* asserted there is research supporting the benefits of longer-term clinical training, resulting in less burnout and more optimal teacher preparation.

A. Brannan proposed the following additional program changes to be made in order to accommodate the student teaching extension:

1. Reduce language arts requirements for TAL candidates (12 credit hours) to be consistent with existing expectations for general elementary education candidates (9 credit hours).
2. Reduce number of special education courses required for TAL candidates to take in first semester of senior year, and incorporate this material into other remaining courses and field placements. The courses that would be eliminated are K362 (Team Approaches to the Education of Students with Disabilities, 3 cr.), and Y420 (Approaches and Issues in Educational Research, 1 cr.).

G. Hopkins asked why the K362 and Y420 courses were selected to be dropped. *A. Brannan* asserted that a new seminar course was offered with the intent to support special education placement, which will include six important collaborative approaches (i.e., placement on an IEP team, meeting with parents, working in co-teaching situation). She also stated that currently, Y420 does not meet the needs of candidates because candidates are not learning how to effectively consume and contribute to research in their field (e.g., build on research work with library sciences, learn how to conduct literature reviews, conduct functional behavior assessments and single subject designs). *J. Shedd* continued this inquiry by asking whether the proposed courses would meet the special education professional association standards

for collaboration assessment. She also mentioned the importance of specificity in assessments to meet CEC standards and whether it will be a key assessment with rigorous rubrics. *A. Brannan* responded that currently, there are not assessments for collaboration in place.

A. Brannan asserted that the proposed changes have been piloted with 18 candidates, which resulted in great success and support from faculty and candidates. Further, she projected that 27 candidates will follow the one-year student teaching program for this year (half in special education and half in elementary education) and for the 2019-2020 year, the program will reach full implementation. *A. Brannan* added that the edTPA allows candidates to decide between general education and special education and the new course syllabi have been adjusted to accommodate either choice for candidates.

K. Barton inquired about the ideal number of weeks that candidates should be engaged in student teaching and *A. Brannan* expressed that the literature recommends more than 10 weeks (10 weeks being state law). *D. Wyatt* added that more weeks of experience is better for candidates and the requirements should be consistent between the two types of student teaching experiences.

A. Brannan reported that a barrier to the program change includes having a Friday class, which conflicts with their student teaching attendance consistency on these days. *A. Mobley* expressed concern for this lack of consistency and asked other members if this was a significant issue with student teaching. *G. Hopkins* discussed his experience with student teaching and expressed that student teaching programs are moving toward co-teaching approaches to provide student teachers with classroom ownership and support. *A. Brannan* added that this only occurs in special education placement and host teachers reported that the missed Friday was not an issue. It only became an issue in schools and classrooms that were especially taxed on time, people, and resources. To remedy this issue, candidates were asked what might work better and no options presented were favored against Friday classes. Additionally, an hour after class to vent about difficulties or share accomplishments pertaining to student teaching was offered to reduce Friday class length. *A. Leftwich* asserted that blogging and use of selfie videos used to reflect on student teaching experiences has been beneficial when implemented with her candidates. *A. Brannan* responded by expressing that her candidates do not like to post discussions, but the proposed ideas are great to think about moving forward.

Lastly, *A. Brannan* asked if there are any remaining potential obstacles to moving forward and in response *D. Wyatt* mentioned providing a course description for the 427 class will be important. *A. Brannan* confirmed that the course description has been submitted and *K. Barton* asserted that it would be beneficial to examine the 427 course approval in the next meeting as a separate approval.

A. Brannan then inquired about the next steps, to which *K. Barton* responded that the committee needs to vote. *A. Leftwich* asked for a vote to approve the TAL program

changes as presented in the sheet provided with the addition of reducing language arts requirements from 12 to 9. *C. Gray* motioned for approval and an *unidentified member of the committee* seconded that motion. A unanimous motion was carried in favor of program changes.

b. Language Arts Area of Concentration course change

K. Wohlwend proposed the following program changes to TIP.

1. Rename the language arts concentration in the elementary program as “Literacy Concentration.” She explained that “literacy” is a more current term in the field than “language arts.”
2. Replace one of the literature courses required for the concentration with L407 (consists of reading foundation, assessment instruction, and strategies that fit with edTPA). She explained that this would provide more content in literacy instruction for candidates who cannot complete the license addition in reading.

J. Shedd added that a possible complementary rationale for the change would be to encourage candidates to get the reading addition. Some discussion ensued around the possibility of also allowing candidates to take L441, so that they could also become more familiar with bilingual education and perhaps pursue an ENL addition. *D. Wyatt* added that the reading addition is perceived to be an advantage to candidates rather than the ENL addition, which has garnered less candidate interest.

K. Barton clarified that candidates would be replacing a general education literature requirement and inquired about its potential effects on allowing candidates to complete their degrees in 120 credits. *D. Wyatt* clarified that the proposed plan works even though it allows only 6, rather than 9, credits to double count for both general education and concentration requirements.

J. Shedd noted that candidates in the elementary program are receiving literacy education early in their careers, which is concerning because it is not being complemented just prior to student teaching. She further suggested this might need to be addressed in another way, instead of just promoting the literacy concentration. *K. Barton* agreed and asserted that a larger solution is needed to encompass ENL as well.

A. Leftwich asked for a motion to vote on the concentration title change, *C. Gray* motioned, and *D. Wyatt* seconded. A unanimous motion was carried in favor of the course title change.

A. Leftwich asked for a motion to vote on removing one English literature general education course and adding L407, an *unidentified member of the committee* motioned, and *C. Gray* seconded. *D. Wyatt* proposed that for current candidates, L407 be an approved substitution and future requirement for candidates who begin in summer 2016 or after. A unanimous motion was carried in favor of the course removal and substitution.

III. Discussion items

a. Standards for Field Experiences in Teacher Education

K. Barton discussed the survey that was sent, which requested that the committee rank field experiences and shared that there were some interesting results that will be discussed next time per the time shortage in the current meeting.

b. “Non-authorized” education courses

K. Barton reported that there was not enough remaining meeting time to discuss the above topic during this meeting, which means that it will be discussed in the next meeting. *A. Brannan* inquired as to what non-authorized courses are and *K. Barton* explained that these are prerequisite courses (e.g., computers in education, school law, G203) taken before candidates are admitted into the teacher education program. Essentially, these courses represent candidates’ first exposure to professional education courses and sometimes candidates enjoy them, but sometimes they do not like them. Moving forward, it should be discussed what these courses should have in common (i.e., general principles) as being introductions to teaching for candidates. For example, candidate perceptions of 2 to 3 of these courses are meant to “weed out” the weaker candidates.

K. Barton is interested in keeping them consistent across sections. *A. Leftwich* asserted that all of her course sections have the same powerpoints, assignments, and TTL resources. *K. Barton* continued this discussion by asking how to provide support that AIs need to achieve optimal consistency and performance in all sections of one course. *C. Gray* asserted that this is a topic she has discussed in her department yearly regarding AI pedagogy classes prior to teaching. She continued that in order to be able to teach, AIs must engage in a 2 week training prior to teaching. *A. Leftwich* expressed that she only gets one day to train her AIs and she prepares all of the curriculum for her course. *K. Barton* reported that many individuals do not have prior teaching experiences before teaching in the School of Education and would like to plan future discussions about strategies to support these teachers and develop clear and consistent expectations. He added that undergraduate candidates are well aware of this issue and that it needs to be addressed. *A. Leftwich* expressed that she observed her AIs this semester and stated that they are doing well. *K. Barton* mentioned that moving forward, it is important to find out how to improve the current system by making expectations clear or changing them.

A. Leftwich asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting, *C. Gray* seconded the motion, and the meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.