

Committee on Teacher Education Meeting March 4, 2009
School of Education, Room 2277

In attendance: Lauren Musser, Tyna Hunnicutt, Tim Niggle, Brent Gault, Ben Edmonds, Tom Brush, Jill Shedd, Jose Bonner, Anne Leftwich, Katie Paulin, Enrique Galindo, Karen Wohlwend, David Estell, Elizabeth Vallance, Luise McCarty, Keith Chapin, Jeanne Novotny, Janice Bizarri

I. Approval of Minutes for February 2 Meeting (David Estell)

The committee members reviewed the minutes from the February 2 meeting. Tim Niggle moved to accept the minutes with no changes. Brent Gault seconded the motion. The approval of the minutes passed unanimously.

II. Program Changes

A. New Course Request: ENL Course (Karen Wohlwend)

Handouts: Course Change Request Form: L239, Course Change Request Form, ESL License Addition—Elementary, Course/Program Change: L239, ESL License Addition Requirements

Representing the English as a Second Language program, Karen Wohlwend presented on a proposal to change the ESL license at the elementary level in order to change the certificate from 27 to 24 credits. Included in the proposal are the additions of two courses: L239, Language and Learning, and L445, Methods of Foreign Language Teaching and Field Experience. L239 would replace a language course in the foundations plan; L445 is intended to replace the current methods teaching course, L442. One motivation for the proposal is to recruit students who are pursuing the study of language in the School of Education. In addition, the department feels that the general education course that students currently take, Introduction to Language, is not necessarily in line with the philosophy of ESL instruction and does not focus on pedagogy as much as L239 is designed to do. The proposal also calls for the deletion of L520. The proposal is intended as a license addition for K-6 in ESL.

The committee discussed the proposal as it was presented on the handouts distributed during the meeting. There were questions raised about the number of credit hours included in the proposal. It was also pointed out that an incorrect form had been used. Overall, the Committee agreed that the proposal as it was written was not clear. The proposal was also missing an explanation of how the new course will address the six principles. David Estell asked the Committee whether they should approve the new course during the meeting and delay a final approval once changes had been made. There are two additional Policy Council meetings for the current academic year and the Committee agreed that there would be time left in the semester to table the proposal and vote on a revised version at a later date.

David Estell asked for a motion to table the course proposal until the next meeting. Brent Gault motioned and Luise McCarty seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

B. New Course: N101, Teaching and Learning Elementary School Mathematics
(Enrique Galindo)

Handouts: New Course Request Form, Justification for the new course, Course syllabus

N101 is being proposed as an alternative to T101 due to the success of the N102 and N103 courses and also the need for the School of Education to offer a general education requirement in math. With a general education requirement offered by the School of Education, students will not be required to take a math modeling course such as N118. If students take N118, the School of Education may be forced to phase out one of the three classes that they now take, such as T102 and or N102, so as not to increase the number of credits required for the program. In addition, faculty in the Math Department have found that the students get a lot out of math methods class having taken N102 and N103 in the School of Education. N101 will be modeled after the current methods classes, which include an apprenticeship program for instructors. In this way, the number of courses offered can gradually increase as the trained pool of instructors increases.

There was a discussion among the committee members. It was mentioned that the availability of the course, which is offered every semester, would be attractive to transfer students. A question was raised about the wording of the course name. After some discussion, the Committee members decided the course name was appropriate. The Committee also discussed whether there should be a placement test for the new course. It was suggested that the department create an internal test.

David Estell asked for a motion to approve the course. Luise McCarty motioned and Tim Niggle seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

III. Information Items

A. Recruitment Update (Katie Paulin)

Handout: Recruitment Initiatives

Katie Paulin, Manager of Enrollment Services, introduced herself to the Committee members. She spoke briefly about recruitment efforts in the Office of Teacher Education since November, work that she has done primarily with Don Hossler. Katie Paulin discussed a handout that outlined four points where Enrollment Services is focusing energy on recruitment. One, IU has become more selective regarding the students they admit. Two, there has been a large drop in yield. Three, there have been drops in students who were originally admitted as students in high school who then change their major. Four, there has been a drop in picking up education majors who did not begin their college careers as education majors.

As a solution to the current recruitment challenges, Enrollment Services is using more marketing and outreach, putting in place a communication stream for suspects, for prospects, for students who have been admitted, and for UD students. The long-term goal is to make marketing and communication efforts strategic and integrated using print, web, and e-mail. Enrollment services are also looking to the potential for the Direct Admit program to reach out to high-ability seniors. There was a discussion among the Committee members about non-traditional students, individuals going

through career changes, recruiting at 2-year colleges, and the Transition to Teaching program.

IV. Discussion Items

A. Undergraduate writing: Committee on Writing report (Tom Brush)

Handout: Undergraduate and Graduate Student Writing and Critical Thinking in the School of Education: Discussion of Findings

At the request of the chair of the Policy Council, Tom Brush presented the Committee on Writing Report and asked for feedback from Committee members concerning a forum for discussing the information. The report contains (a) perceptions and issues from faculty and students regarding the quality of writing instruction, and (b) perceptions from students on the preparedness that they felt regarding their writing and critical thinking skills through the courses that they completed at the School of Education.

The main finding from the report is that faculty believe that there are issues with the types and amount of writing that students are asked to complete, the quality of the writing, and the quality of the thinking that went behind the writing. On the other hand, the majority of undergraduate and graduate students felt that they were fairly well-prepared once they left the program in terms of their writing and critical thinking skills. According to the report, faculty feel that asking students to do a lot of writing is very difficult to assess in a thoughtful manner. But they still said that they wished there were more activities and writing assignments that students could complete because they think that would better prepare them for their professional careers.

Committee members discussed how to improve the instruction of writing and reasoning. They discussed how this can be done effectively while the School of Education is raising class sizes to 30 students. It was noted that the University Division offers a general education writing course. However, the Committee questioned whether such a course can address specific writing needs for the field of education, writing across disciplines, or writing for different audiences. The Committee discussed at length how discipline-specific writing courses should be structured.

There was a discussion of what forum should be used to address the concerns brought up by the Writing Committee report and the CTE members. The Committee decided to suggest it as a potential topic for the Fall retreat. It is the hope of the CTE that at the retreat faculty and staff will discuss facilitating and nurturing critical analysis, reflection, and reasoning within the curriculum.

B. Field experience evaluations and professional dispositions (Tyna Hunnicutt)

Handouts: IU Early Field Level Assessment, Professional Dispositions Self-Assessment: Midterm, Professional Dispositions Self-Assessment: Final Summary

Tyna Hunnicutt shared with the Committee feedback from field experience evaluations and professional disposition assessments, pointing out areas that are

strengths and those that need improvement. Assessments are based on two years of data and feedback. The Offices of Teacher Education and the Early Field Experience are using this data and feedback to understand which indicators work well, which seem to not give as much information, and where changes in the process need to be made.

For 07-08 at the elementary level there tend to be more students who have issues with timeliness and attendance; demonstrating a commitment to teaching; and showing initiative. Though this feedback is normal for students who are new to field experiences, only two to six percent of the students actually get marked down. The majority of students who are in their first semester of their elementary field experience are showing good judgment and common sense. This can be attributed to the kindness of the supervising teachers and the fact that the School of Education has great students coming into the programs. When students get farther on in their elementary program, the supervising teachers then tend to say that students need improvement managing group dynamics and showing initiative.

Students at the secondary level, juniors and seniors, do not have the same kinds of attendance issues as their younger counterparts. Most of the time, areas for improvement include managing group dynamics. Students in secondary field experiences tend to be the strongest in being timely, professional in their experience, and displaying good judgment.

Over the summer, dispositional assessment pieces were reviewed and revised. Principals, university supervisors, and the program coordinators of all the field experiences were surveyed about what indicators should be used and how to implement a review process. What is meant by dispositional assessment was agreed on and an effort is being made to make certain that this is a teaching tool and that students understand that dispositions can be learned. The dispositional indicators were generated by the Office of Student Teaching and Early Field Experience. They are being integrated early in the students' programs for discussion so that students may develop them as they go through their programs. A main goal in incorporating dispositional assessments is to facilitate those difficult conversations between the teachers, student teachers, and university supervisors.

The Committee discussed the topic of assessment of field experiences. It was noted that the final summary is a useful tool. There was a problem mentioned with the organization of the assessment forms. The Committee also discussed the time it takes for teachers to fill out the forms and then to add on additional time for students' self-assessments. The benefits of the assessments were noted, mainly that they provide a forum for conversation that will help students as they transition into professionals. Tyna Hunnicutt took note of the suggestions.

There was a motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded. The meeting was adjourned unanimously.