

Committee on Teacher Education Meeting January 21, 2010
School of Education, Room 4204

In attendance: Tom Brush, Tim Niggle, David Estelle, Peter Kloosterman, Anne Leftwich, Luise McCarty, Jeane Novotny, Chris Bezzy, Jill Shedd, Susie Gronseth, José Bonner, Gretchen Butera, Keith Chapin, Dionne Cross, Luise McCarty, Karen Wohlwend, Beau Vallance, Ben Edmonds

I. Approval of Minutes from December 1, 2009 (Peter Kloosterman)
Committee members read the minutes from December 1, 2009. Tim Niggle motioned to approve the minutes without changes. The motion was seconded by Luise McCarty. The motion passed unanimously.

II. Information items

A. N101 Update (Peter Kloosterman)
Gerardo Gonazalez, Peter Kloosterman, Enrique Galindo, and Don Hossler met with the Math Department to resolve the N101 remonstrance. At the meeting, it was proposed that instructors from the School of Education will teach N101 for the next three years at which point the program will be reviewed again in the hopes that the remonstrance will be officially removed. The Math Department requested that the course description be changed to reflect that it is an experimental course. Further, only one section of the course will be taught a semester. The decision is not one that the School of Education initially wanted. However, it was mentioned that IUPUI has recently canceled 102 and 103 over similar issues. Currently, the School of Education is still officially teaching 102 and 103, the former of which will end by 2012 as a result of the new general education requirements.

There was a discussion about what comprises an experimental course and the possibility of pursuing external funding to conduct a comparative study investigating student achievement in N101 and T101. As an experimental course, teaching practices developed in N101 may be applied to T101. Regarding advising, N101 will be available in Fall 2010 but there will only be one section. It was noted that anecdotal evidence suggests that student performance in E343, the Math Methods course, correlates with achievement in N102 and N103.

III. Discussion Items

A. REPA Update (Jill Shedd and Tom Brush)
Jill Shedd and Tom Brush presented on the recent passing of REPA by the Indiana Department of Education. According to the results of the legislation, Early Childhood and Middle School licensing will remain. Elementary Education licenses are now classified as K-6. The legislation does not make any mention of minimum or maximum credit hours or distribution. However, the report does give a description of what needs to be in an Elementary curriculum in general education, which includes subject area concentration, e.g., ENL and Reading. According to the report, there is a new definition of pedagogy: it now includes cultural competency, which has a state of Indiana definition, and technology. Regarding Secondary Education, the Secondary Education degree and major were retained with the caveat that the major for the content area must equal the content requirements in the college. For example, Secondary Education Math students at IU, Bloomington must take the same content math that the BA or the BS students take.

According to the new legislation, all-grade licensing includes P-12. Individual institutions will assign grade levels for Special Education licenses. During the REPA process, there was an extensive debate about temporary licenses. According to the legislation, there is a temporary superintendent's license specific to an individual school board that chooses to hire a temporary superintendent. The only requirement for a temporary superintendent position is a graduate level degree. The advanced degree remains in respective areas. Regarding testing, the Praxis I will be in place until 2011. The Department of Education is considering giving alternatives to basic skills demonstration, e.g. ACT or SAT. The Praxis II remains. From 2013 there will be a pedagogy test requirement. Finally, the passing of REPA allows individual teachers to add to their license either by taking content that an institution has determined meets the requirements of the area or by passing the Praxis II in the respective area.

According to the new legislation, individual teachers will be assigned an ID number on their license. This number is similar to the test ID assigned to classroom students. The ID number will allow the state to follow teachers. As part of the state's race to the top application, they will be following teachers, and monitoring who prepared them and what evaluation they got from principals. Ultimately, the state will be taking into account student achievement on tests to evaluate teacher preparation by the state. The Reading Specialist license is no longer available. However, Reading is available as a license addition.

The discussion was opened up to the Committee. There was a brief discussion about the distribution of courses in the BA/BS programs compared to an education degree. It was noted that graduation requirements for the BA/BS programs do not require the same courses as the education programs, e.g. geometry. Moreover, course requirements for education programs are ones that are likely to show up in a curriculum; they tend to be more school-oriented in their distribution. According to REPA, however, this is a minimum requirement. Programs can add extra courses as they see fit.

The Committee members discussed the Praxis II. There is a possibility that the passing score for the Praxis II will be raised. An email was sent to all licensed teachers to that effect. Teachers are encouraged to keep the e-mail in case the issue needs to be addressed in the future. The Department of Education is also asking for current teachers who might be willing and interested to serve on a committee to determine new passing scores. Anyone interested should e-mail Tom Brush. Regarding licensing, it was mentioned that this may affect the School of Education's reciprocity with other states. Further, advisors may want to consider steering students toward content-area courses instead of relying on taking the Praxis 2 to obtain a teaching license. The Elementary and Secondary Education Councils will be reexamining programs this semester as part of the conversation on the new common curriculum. A recommendation for the Elementary level is to develop minors into license additions, given that every student is now required to have a minor. In this way, students can easily complete their coursework and get an initial license and a license addition in any other area, if they choose to do so.

The Committee discussed subject areas within content areas in relation to licensing and course distribution. According to the license requirements mandated by REPA, education students in social studies will have a major in one area. However, the School of Education can require

additional coursework. A typical college major comprises 30-36 hours; 24-30 is the norm across the state. REPA will probably have the biggest impact in the science areas and in social studies, given that teachers ideally should be trained to teach more than one science and more than one area of social studies. One suggestion is to require all social studies majors to complete a history major and then add on two other areas that have fewer requirements. REPA has eliminated the portfolio requirement.

The Committee discussed the impact of the new license requirements mandated by REPA. It was noted that this will have an impact on how education advisors communicate with students. In other words, even though state law regarding license requirements predicates one method for licensing, IU does not have to adhere to it. Further, with the new licensing rules in place, if education students wish to add to an existing license, they can go through the state, completely bypassing the School of Education. Faculty should address some of these issues regarding content area minors and licenses. It was noted that some of the details regarding administration of licenses are yet to be fully determined.

Finally, it was noted that even with the latitude given to the School of Education programs still must be approved by the state. To that end, the state will have to confirm that programs meet requirements for pedagogy and content.

B. iRubric Presentation and Discussion (Chris Bezzy and Jill Shedd)

Chris Bezzy and Jill Shedd shared information about iRubric, an online grading system that has been piloted by instructors in the School of Education since Fall 09. The rationale for finding grade-reporting software was a reported weakness in assessments that were reported to professional associations. Assessment data that has been historically provided to professional organizations included total scores (e.g., the mean and the range); professional organizations queried how well students did on various elements of any individual assignment. In addition, using rubrics can provide better feedback to students, i.e. setting specific criteria for rubrics that students can access.

It is expected that students will respond positively to iRubric for two main reasons. One, students will receive specific responses regarding their grades, via the detail that instructors write into rubrics. Using iRubric, instructors have the ability to delineate the requirements that must be met for each point on the rubric. Two, instructors can model the use of rubrics for students who are looking ahead to their own teaching careers.

The Committee Members viewed a PowerPoint presentation outlining: (a) why iRubric; (b) software; (c) Fall 2009 pilot study results; and (d) next steps. Regarding software, the presentation included information about (a) student view; (b) building a rubric; (c) attaching a rubric; (d) grading a rubric; and (e) reporting. The PowerPoint presentation is accessible via the CTE OnCourse website.

Discussion was opened up to the Committee members. It was noted that iRubric has now been launched on the Sakai website, where the School of Education at Indiana University, Bloomington is mentioned as a participating school. Currently, the School of Education is paying for the iRubric service. However, it was speculated that as interest in the program spreads to the

University Division, other colleges may want to adopt iRubric. There was a question about working on grades with an assistant before releasing grades to the student. iRubric allows users to grade the rubric and store the grade on the server where the rubric is saved. The grade only becomes public when users give the command to “save into OnCourse.” This allows individual users to revisit rubrics, as well as allowing others to go into iRubric to view rubrics before the grade is submitted.

There was a question about student feedback to the pilot study; to date there has been no feedback reported from participating instructors. It was noted that data should be collected for the current pilot program regarding student feedback. There was a discussion about how rubrics are constructed in iRubric, specifically latitude given to instructors in the design of rubrics. It was noted that in the general education courses, for example in 118, the content is meant to be taught and assessed the same by all instructors. The question of who is going to train instructors was raised. The Instructional Consulting Office can aid users on software mechanics. In addition, there is currently a podcast library being compiled with instructional videos and there are plans for group training sessions. Training sessions will be divided into two parts: one will focus on rubric training and one will focus on software mechanics.

iRubric attaches to the grade book; instructors must use the grade book in order to use iRubric. It was noted that School of Education instructors do not currently have to use grade book to enter grades; current usage in the School of Education is 30%. Therefore, it was suggested that in order to enter grades for key assessments, instructors could use iRubric. However, the goal is for instructors to use iRubric across courses.

In Spring 2010, iRubric will be available for every School of Education course. The goal of the training is for one key assessment from each program to use iRubric in Spring 2010. Starting Fall 2010, the goal is to have all School of Education programs using iRubric. Tom Brush asked for volunteers, one from each department, to pilot iRubric in a key assessment course for the current semester.

C. 2007-2008 Student Teaching Report (Jane Henson)

i. Elementary Programs

Jane Henson presented two PowerPoint presentations reporting on student teaching data from elementary and secondary programs. Both presentations summarized the annual student report for elementary and secondary programs. Each presentation included (a) placement data by department and (b) culminating surveys from student teaching programs. The surveys touched on preparation of student teachers, teaching supervisors, and the student teaching process as a whole. Both reports are accessible via the CTE OnCourse site.

Committee members raised questions during the elementary presentation. Regarding the elementary data, it was noted that students who were delayed for various reasons, including academic issues, were lower in 08 than they were previously. In addition, overall success rate is at least 95% for all student teachers. There was a clarification that the “first choice” results refer to “first choice of the student” for placement. Cancellations in elementary data for 08-09 are highest among Teaching All Learners. However, it was noted that this distinction varies from year to year. Jane Henson explained that the absence of World Languages from the presentation

is due to their small number of respondents as well as their inability to place students on the first attempt. It was clarified that “academic cancellation” is due to a student not making the required GPA. Regarding placement comparisons by content area, it was clarified that the data show more actual requests than number of students due to students who make multiple requests after their first request is turned down. Regarding license additions, such as ESL and Reading, it was clarified that those are considered placement requests.

It was noted that survey data was collected from every student teacher, supervising teacher, and student teaching administrator in the School of Education, all of whom are required to provide feedback on student teaching placements. The data collection method was clarified. Respondents were provided with a list of items that they checked off. They also had the option to add additional categories, which some chose to do. The point was raised that elementary education student teachers gave the most negative feedback to the item concerning preparation for content area. It was noted that elementary education placements include a wide range of environments and that the survey responses could be a reflection of that. It was clarified that the Likert scale used on the university supervisor survey is a 4-point scale. The question was raised of how the construct of “understanding of current issues” was defined. It was clarified that “understanding of current issues” is an assessment of the extent of knowledge concerning the school’s environment and the taking on of the responsibility of professional reading. Regarding the latter, it was noted that IU students do have access to academic journals, although this opinion was not reflected by the university supervisors.

There was a discussion about the relevance of assessments by university supervisors, given that there is little evidence that a supervisor can go in and measure, beyond anecdotal data from the teacher, where a student is. Specifically, university supervisors only perform one classroom observation. The question was raised of any existing difference between the teacher’s response and the university supervisor’s response. Further, the Committee members discussed the role of the seminars in student teacher development that would address issues reflected in survey responses.

ii. Secondary Programs

During the Secondary presentation, it was clarified that the data do not represent Transition to Teaching placements. It was noted that, like the survey for elementary programs, there was little difference between student teachers’ and supervising teachers’ perceptions of the student teachers’ capacity to handle student teaching duties. It was noted that, like the Elementary survey, university supervisors take into account the Six Guiding Principles when responding to survey questions.

The Committee discussed briefly performance data suggesting that student teachers who are replaced tend to perform better than in their first placement. It was noted that School of Education instructors try to troubleshoot those education students who may not be best suited for an initial placement, or to enter the teaching profession. To that end, Jane Henson has started a list, at the request of the Office of Teacher Education, of professional opportunities for education students who do not become professional teachers.

D. 2004-2007 PRAXIS II Report (Jane Henson)

Jane Henson gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Praxis II Report for elementary and secondary data. The report is a comparative analysis of IU percentage of average of correct answers and national percentage of average of correct answers. The data for the PowerPoint were separated by areas of concentration: English, Social Studies, Mathematics, Biology, and Elementary Education. Chemistry data is available but not included in the PowerPoint. It was noted that IU students tended to have higher percentages of average of correct answers for the majority of the categories. A copy of the Praxis II report has been sent to each department head. The PowerPoint presentation is available via the OnCourse CTE website.

Committee members raised questions during the Secondary presentation. There was a question about how test takers were identified as IU students and how long the average graduate waited before taking the Praxis II. It was noted that individuals must take the Praxis II before they can receive a license. Therefore, students who are in their last semester in the education program may make up a majority of IU test takers. It was clarified that the Praxis II Report includes the Transition to Teaching program, and anyone who identifies IU as their primary source of education for the subject field. There was a brief discussion about the significantly higher score for "Behavioral Sciences" for both national test takers and IU test takers. It was noted that when an individual takes a subject-area test, they answer questions across all the areas, regardless of whether the individual has studied those areas. Further, test takers must pass all the areas in order to pass the Praxis II. There was a question about what constitutes a passing score. It was clarified that it is set by the state of Indiana, which may raise the passing score with the passage of REPA.

There was a discussion about students who did not pass Praxis II. IU students perform at 98% for most of the tests. One exception is Spanish grammar, which is the lowest performer at approximately 78-80%. Early Childhood students have consistently performed at 100% in the past. The Office of Teacher Education does not yet have data for 07-08. Jane Henson is available to contact for questions concerning Praxis II data.

David Estelle motioned to adjourn. Tim Niggle seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 5:30.