

Indiana University School of Education  
**COMMITTEE ON TEACHER EDUCATION**  
**MINUTES**

4:00 p.m., Thursday, February 20, 2003, Room 2277

**Present:** Christine Bennett, Lynn Boyle-Baise, Gretchen Butera, Peter Cowan, Jesse Goodman, Genny Williamson, Terry Mason, Anne Stright, Tim Niggle, Keith Chapin, Sarah Franklin, Matt Hoagland, Eric Ban, Mark Helmsing, Diana Lambdin, Jill Shedd

**Others Attending:** Cary Buzzelli, Gerardo Gonzalez

**Handouts:** 2/20 agenda, 1/22 minutes, TAL UAS outline, TAL Teaching Performance Portfolio, Data Sheet from Office of Teacher Education, SoE strategic plan – goal #1 (8 tasks), Memo: Changes in Math Requirements in ECE TEP, Indiana’s Education Roundtable P-16 Action Plan, **Course Change Requests:** E450, *Senior Seminar and Student Teaching I*; E451, *Senior Seminar II* – (Both early childhood courses, from 1/22); M421, *Methods of Teaching Junior/Middle High School Social Studies*, **New Course Request:** M341, *Foundations for Teaching Social Studies*, Overview of the New Secondary Social Studies Program

**To begin the meeting, Terry Mason welcomed the newest CTE member, Anne Stright, who is representing Counseling and Educational Psychology.**

**1. Approval of 1/22/03 minutes:**

**Handout:** 1/22 minutes

After some corrections to the minutes, it was moved by Lynn Boyle-Baise and seconded by Genny Williamson that the 1/22/03 minutes be approved. **MOTION PASSED, WITH ONE ABSTENTION (ANNE STRIGHT).**

**Corrected minutes and an updated action chart were forwarded to Jane Kaho in the Dean’s office for posting on the School of Education website.**

**2. CTE management of Unit Assessment System**

**Handouts:** TAL UAS outline, TAL Teaching Performance Portfolio, TAL Program Information/Summary of Academic Standards Committee Decisions

Terry Mason told CTE that Diana Lambdin, Jill Shedd, Tim Niggle, and he had met to discuss some possible ways that CTE might address its role in managing the UAS. He reminded CTE that they had decided at the 1/22/03 to invite department/program chairs to explain their program-level management systems, so that CTE might not have to “start from scratch” when designing means of programs’ reporting progress to CTE.

It is CTE’s goal to combine elements common to all SoE programs, as well as specific criteria unique to individual programs, to form a management framework that will

provide useful information with the greatest efficiency. Genny Williamson, Teaching All Learners (TAL) program chair, was asked to share the TAL UAS Outline as an example of a program-level plan.

Genny explained that TAL is a dual certification program in SpEd and EIEd. It is a new program, graduating its first students this spring.

TAL faculty have developed various means of assessment, both for students and the program at large.

- **For Students:** All students complete a TAL teaching portfolio, a tool being used to show competency in specific programmatic standards, as well as the six guiding principles for individual students. Items for the portfolios must be “B” or better work and must be relevant to the TAL program. In addition, portfolios are checked for progress each semester, and should be completed before student teaching.
- **At the Program Level:** five randomly selected portfolios are chosen to “spotlight” certain departmental concerns, for example, writing competency. In addition, student surveys are being formulated to assess student perceptions.

TAL faculty want to measure how much learning is taking place by students in the schools being instructed by TAL teacher candidates.

As an example of types of information available for review by CTE, Tim Niggle shared information already available on the TAL program and a summary of decisions made by the academic standards committee. He related that data like the ones shared can be used to gain information about students in Teacher Education programs, as well as programs themselves.

After a brief review of the summary information provided by Tim Niggle, Terry asked CTE to return to Genny’s TAL example. He asked if there were items from the TAL example that could be used for other program areas. He voiced his opinion that portfolios might not be a good fit for other programs.

Lynne Boyle-Baise asked how the UAS management strategies would fit with the Policy Council directive for CTE to monitor goal #1 of the long-range strategic plan. What purpose will the data collection serve?

Jill shared that the important point in data collection and management is that decisions for teacher education are data-driven, that is, there should be a system in place for making decisions.

Diana shared that the data collected would be viewed by various shareholders in the School of Education, i.e., faculty, CTE, administrators.

Jesse Goodman asked if there was a perceived problem with faculty. Are they incapable of reflecting on the relative success of the teacher education programs? Sarah Franklin remarked that the data collection process might be viewed as a proactive means of preventing problems.

Genny cautioned that the data collection process could easily fall into the category of busywork. Great care must be taken to ensure that the process is meaningful.

Lynne stated that faculty are excruciatingly self-reflective without a structure in place to mandate this behavior.

Terry said that Teacher Education programs are mandated to do some things for accreditation.

Genny asked if faculty would be able to request the follow-up information from the Office of Teacher Education.

The conversation ended with several CTE members' voicing their concerns that there might not be time in faculty's schedules to engage in an "additional" assessment piece; however, most members agreed that some way needs to be devised that encourages faculty to further discuss and analyze their programs in terms of overall quality.

Terry said that CTE would revisit this issue at a later time.

### **3. Program/Course Requests:**

**Handouts:** Memo: Changes in Math Requirements in ECE TEP, **Course Change Requests:** E450, *Senior Seminar and Student Teaching I*; E451, *Senior Seminar II* – (Both early childhood courses, from 1/22); M421, *Methods of Teaching Junior/Middle High School Social Studies*, **New Course Request:** M341, *Foundations for Teaching Social Studies*, Overview of the New Secondary Social Studies Program

- **Course Change - E450 & E451: Early Childhood Courses (Cary Buzzelli):**

Cary Buzzelli reviewed that the course change requests for E450 and E451 were asking that the courses, which are now used for student teaching, be changed to S/F grading in accordance field experience grading policies.

Originally, the letter-grading system was to be used for the seminar portion of the courses; however, letter grades are being given for the entire 15 hours, causing the inflation of some students' grade point averages.

In addition, a change in variable credit is being requested for these two courses, from 10-15 hours to 3-15 hours, to provide more flexibility within the early childhood program.

Jill Shedd suggested that, since in the future E-courses might refer only to seminars, as opposed to student teaching, maybe it would be appropriate to change the variable credit hours to 1-15 hours.

It was moved by Jill Shedd and seconded by Genny Williamson that the course change requests for E450 and E451 be approved. **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

- **ECE Program Change – change in math requirement: T101 & T103**  
Tabled until the March 26 meeting: There are several CTE members that are new to the committee as of second semester. Therefore, detailed information about the rationale behind the changes in math requirements will be shared to better support the decision-making process.
- **New Course Request - M341: Secondary social studies methods course (Christine Bennett)**  
Tabled until the March 26 meeting, due to lack of time.
- **Course Change Request – M421/M441: Secondary social studies methods course (Christine Bennett)**  
Tabled until the March 26 meeting, due to lack of time.

**4. Discussion of Indiana Education Roundtable's Action Plan for P-16 Education, which includes a recommendation to "require the integration of Indiana's Academic Standards into teacher preparation programs" (Gerardo Gonzalez)**  
**Handout: Indiana's Education Roundtable P-16 Action Plan**

Dean Gonzalez shared the common public belief that students coming out of teacher education programs need to be well-versed in the Indiana academic standards that they will undoubtedly have to teach in the public schools. With the advent of legislation like PL221 and NCLB, schools are under tremendous pressure to align their curricula with state mandated standards. In response to this pressure, the Indiana Education Roundtable is proposing a plan that would require the integration of Indiana Academic Standards into teacher preparation programs.

Dean Gonzalez asked CTE to consider incorporating into the "Eligibility to Student Teach" Benchmark some form of assessment of teacher candidates' knowledge and skill in using the Indiana Academic Standards. In other words, teacher candidates would have to provide some evidence of their knowledge of and ability to use the standards before they could student teach.

A lively discussion ensued, during which various CTE questions/concerns were raised:

- By incorporating the Indiana Academic Standards into the student teaching benchmark, is the IU SoE "legitimizing" the standards, when, in fact, many faculty do not agree with their mandated implementation in the first place?

- Standards, at least in some subject areas, were not thoughtfully conceived, in the opinion of some CTE members. Isn't there some other way to address the standards other than "testing" teacher candidates' ability to use them? What about looking at the standards and being able to ask, "What isn't here?"
- The validity of a "preemptive" incorporation of standards assessment into IU's TEP was questioned.
- Would the SoE be helping to facilitate the "de-skilling" of the teaching profession by aggressively incorporating the Indiana Academic Standards into TEP?
- What is the SoE's responsibility in preparing students to "teach to the standards" when those teacher candidates will be completing field experiences in public schools?

No satisfactory conclusion was reached during the course of the discussion, although several important concerns were raised. This issue will be addressed again at the March CTE meeting.

**5. CTE Assignment from Policy Council for Goal 1 of SOE Strategic Plan: Prioritize 8 tasks**

**Handout:** SoE strategic plan – goal #1 (8 tasks)

Tabled until the March 26 meeting, due to lack of time.

**6. Assigning "I" grades: Proposal for new tracking system (Diana Lambdin)**

**Handout:** none.

Tabled until the March 26 meeting, due to lack of time.