

CTE Meeting Feb. 2, 2009
School of Education, Room 2120

In attendance: David Estell, Enrique Galindo, Jeanne Novotny, Karen Wohlwend, Carrie Chapman, Elizabeth Vallance, Ben Edmonds, Brent Gault, Keith Chapin, Jose Bonner, Jill Shedd, Tim Niggle, Tom Brush, Joel Wong, Keith Barton

I. Approval of Minutes for December 1 Meeting (David Estell)

The committee members reviewed the minutes and suggested amendments. David Estell asked for a motion to approve the minutes with amendments. Ben Edmonds motioned to approve. Tim Niggle seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

II. Program Changes

A. New Course Request—G204 (Joel Wong)

Handout: G204 Course Request

David Estell introduced Joel Wong, an assistant professor in the Department of Counseling and Counseling Psychology. Joel Wong presented a new course request for G204. G204 is a survey course that addresses issues of Asian American ethnicity, culture, and race as they relate to mental health. Topics that will be discussed include body image, culture shock, intergenerational family conflicts, cultural influences on mental illnesses, stressors associated with racism and stereotypes, refugee trauma, indigenous healing approaches, etc. There are no prerequisites for this combined undergraduate/graduate class; a background in psychology or counseling is not required. Not reflected on the course approval form is a suggestion from Joel Wong that the course be changed to an online format, as opposed to face-to-face.

There was a discussion among the committee members and Joel Wong about the perceived narrow focus of the course in that it only includes one minority group. Joel Wong said that not only is the topic within his area of expertise, but that information from the course can hopefully be extracted and applied to other underrepresented groups. Additionally, he mentioned that if the course were too broad in scope it would create teaching challenges.

There was a discussion among the committee members about where the course fits into the current curriculum. The course is being submitted as a general education course in the Department of Counseling and Counseling Psychology and will hopefully be cross listed as a graduate-level course. The course is designed to be a general education course, but not a required course for any undergraduates in the School of Education. If education students do take the course, it will most likely attract those students who are minoring in Asian American studies or who have an interest in mental health. Especially as an online course, G204 has the potential to attract students from a handful of other disciplines. The committee saw this as a benefit of the course in that perhaps it will attract people to the School of Education from outside the program.

David Estell asked for a motion to approve the course proposal. Keith Barton motioned to approve the course proposal. Karen Wohlwend seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Joel Wong left the meeting.

III. Information Items

A. NCATE Update (Jill Shedd)

Jill Shedd updated the committee members on the ongoing preparations for the NCATE review in April, 2010. The School of Education is currently going through the second round of program reviews. Several programs have completed state reviews. Those that had been approved with conditions have all submitted their second report to the state and will be on the agenda for the February meeting. Regarding SPAs, there are three departments that went through in September but still have to submit a condition report: Secondary English, TAL, and Secondary Math. Energy will be focused on the three remaining departments.

B. Update on Revision to the "C" Rule (Tom Brush)

At the previous CTE meeting, the committee amended the "C" rule, proposing that the minimum grade that any student could get would be a C-. The changes to the proposal were overruled by the Policy Council. The decision means that a student can get below a C- in a course, and as long as they have a C average in that area they can still be admitted to the education program.

The committee discussed the decision made by the Policy Council as well as the possible effects of that decision on programs and students in the School of Education. There was a discussion about the "C" rule regarding math courses that are taken in the University Division. The question was also raised as to how the "C" rule affects enrollment in the School of Education and whether some required courses should be modified so as not to deter students from applying to the School of Education. Further, the committee discussed prerequisites for the different programs and how the "C" rule may affect students who are take required classes in the University Division.

The committee agreed not to try to change the proposal again, but instead to gather information about how the "C" rule affects student enrollment and performance in the School of Education. The committee agreed to revisit the issue at a later date.

Enrique Galindo announced an informational item. He plans to bring to the committee a course proposal for an M101 class that will count as T101. The course proposal is intended to be in step with the phasing out of 102 and N102 as a required course that students must take with M118. An additional course will then offer two math classes for education students to take.

C. Music Education SPA Review Results (Brent Gault)

Handout: CTE Music Education Report

Brent Gault reported on the ongoing review process in the Music Education Department. The School of Music is accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music, which accredits most of the music departments and music schools in the nation. Members are up for reaccreditation every 10 years.

As part of the accreditation process, the School of Music was required to put together a self-study document designed primarily to review all degree programs offered by the School of Music. Brent Gault shared this document with the committee, as well as explaining the process by which the data was collected and reviewed by the NASM. The NASM visited the School of Music during March 2007 and found that the School of Music met all standards with two exceptions: (a) for all four B.M.E. degrees (Choral, General, Band, String) it was not clear to the team how students acquired small ensemble experience; and (b) for the General B.M.E. degree it was not clear how students acquired the ability to arrange music. In response to these suggestions the School of Music provided a clearer explanation regarding how music education students acquire small ensemble experiences and also added a new course, E312, to the B.M.E. These responses were reported to NASM for their consideration and all teacher education programs in the School of Music were renewed for another 10 years.

Brent Gault opened the floor to questions about the process. There was a brief discussion of the 10-year accreditation cycle for NASM and a brief discussion about the assessment process.

D. Update on Recruitment Efforts (Katie Paulin)

David Estell announced that Katie Paulin was not able to attend the meeting. The update on recruitment efforts has been tabled until the next CTE meeting.

IV. Discussion Items

A. PRAXIS II Requirements for Various Programs (Jill Shedd)

In October, the School of Education received a recommendation from the Indiana Department of Education that all teacher education programs require state-approved PRAXIS II exams for all pre-service teachers completing additional content areas on their initial license. The recommendation was made to facilitate the work of programs and to benefit programs because the DOE feels that if the Praxis II is administered the DOE will have an external assessment of the content of education students. The recommendation also stems from the belief that programs have historically had trouble getting approved because they did not have an external assessment.

To date, the School of Education has not made it mandatory for students to take the Praxis II. All pre-service teachers who apply for an initial license in Indiana must pass the Praxis II in their content area, but this is not required to earn a degree from the School of

Education. Jill Shedd introduced this topic to the committee as a discussion item in order to hear feedback on how the School of Education should proceed regarding Praxis II requirements. Any decisions will not impact 09 graduates, but will rather move the conversation forward so that administrative decisions can be made.

The committee discussed at length the requirements for the TAL program, which has recently been modified, and how an additional Praxis II requirement would affect students in that program. In response to a suggestion from the CEC, 09 graduates will be taking the two special education tests and the reading specialist tests but not the elementary exam. There was a discussion about the additional cost that another test will incur on students, and whether this will affect enrollment. In addition, review processes by the state are likely to be phased out. However, following a recent trend among professional organizations, it may be likely that they would make such a requirement necessary for accreditation in the future.

Another option that can be considered is to modify the current licensing application process and allow students to obtain an initial license for their content area and then return to get a second area added, which would not require an exam. The question was raised as to whether this would be a workable option for students who are signed to teaching positions over the summer and whether it would stratify some students. Also, there was concern that if students want a license addition or if they want to do a specific program that this would distance people from getting more advanced specializations if they have to take additional tests.

It was suggested that further discussion of the issue of whether to require the Praxis II be taken up among program faculty. In sum, the committee agreed that what needs to be questioned is a balancing of issues that include (a) what is best for students economically, (b) what is best in terms of feedback for faculty on programs, and (c) what is recommended by each program's SPA.

Motion to adjourn: Unanimous.