

**IU School of Education
Teacher Education Council
March 1, 2000**

Present: Melissa Beeker, Lanny Beyer, David Birch, Cathy Brown, Amy Seely Flint, Tom Gregory, Janet Johnson, Bradley Levinson, Fritz Lieber, Lissa May for Charles Schmidt, Carol Nelson for Diana Lambdin, Tim Niggle; Others attending: Susan Klein; Minutes taken by: Janet Anelli

Handouts: Minutes from Meeting 2/2/00; Course Change Request: Methods of Teaching Senior High/Junior High/Middle School Science (M446); *Memo: A Community of Teachers/Special Education (2/23/00)* and attached documents

I. MINUTES

Vote: Motion to approve minutes from 2/2/00.
PASSED.

II. A COMMUNITY OF TEACHERS PROGRAM FOR PRESERVICE SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS

Handouts: *Memo: A Community of Teachers/Special Education (2/23/00)* and attached documents

Susan Klein attended the meeting to answer questions. The TEC reviewed this program on December 9, 1999; the program was approved on principal. The TEC asked the group to provide information on three additional areas:

- Outlines of each content area with approval from the program areas responsible
- Outline of general education requirements
- Explanation of how the program addresses the six guiding principles

The documents distributed for today's discussion address those areas.

Students will receive a license in special education at the middle and secondary level and in a subject area. They will student teach in both areas.

The Special Ed. program has moved towards separating the elementary level from the middle and secondary levels based on discussions concerning changes in the field and in licensing. The secondary program was designed considering changes in jobs at the secondary level--many programs are moving to inclusion with co-teaching. The problem they found was that if students only have special ed. expertise they may get treated more like teachers' aides than as equals in designing school work.

This program is for mild intervention. They are still not sure how they will address severe interventions, maybe at the graduate level.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

A. Computing Options

We don't have a computing "license," we have an endorsement. Endorsements and minors may change in the future.

B. Content Areas

Why are there varying numbers of credits per subject area? They asked the subject areas to identify the courses they felt teachers would need for their content areas. The areas responded with the listings as shown. The credit amounts vary; they also vary in the subject areas as they exist now (in majors and minors). Will students choose different areas based on lower credit number requirements?

C. Elementary/Secondary Programs

Why did you split the Special Ed. program into two levels? We wanted to split the program because there are very different needs and roles at the elementary and secondary levels. We are also trying to move towards the different licensing levels.

D. Why Not a Stand-Alone Secondary Program?

Special Education teachers are being asked to co-teach in subject matter areas, in the current program they don't get the subject matter content. We want them to be a content specialist as well.

If this trend in the schools changes, is there a drawback to our students having more content area courses instead of special education or psychology? No, they'll be even more fully trained to address issues in the secondary school in this new program. Students who graduate in the current program have a watered-down middle and secondary school emphasis.

E. *A Community of Teachers*

Why did you decide to work with the *A Community of Teachers (CoT)* program? The field is leaning towards portfolio assessment which is an element of the CoT program. The group also wanted to encourage students to find teachers that they want to work with--the *A Community of Teachers* model builds on that and on developing long-term mentorship with teachers in schools. They also wanted students to in this combined major to become part of interdisciplinary teams while in the teacher preparation program. The CoT model allows that mix of people within a program and has people from different areas in cohorts together thinking about teaching issues. This will help Special Ed. students to learn to effectively communicate with all other majors. CoT seemed like a good match.

If another secondary program wants to develop a Special Ed. option they could do so.

F. Employability/Content Areas

Is the most valuable kind of Special Ed. combination with math and language arts areas? Those areas are desirable as is Social Studies. Most students will move in those directions but the group didn't want eliminate the participation of someone in Physical Education, Health, Art, or other areas.

G. Grading

Will students be graded? Students will receive grades in the Special Ed. courses and the content area courses but not in the CoT professional education courses which are nongraded.

H. Special Education Courses

Can students outside Special Ed. take courses in the program? No. Some of the courses will include students from both the elementary and secondary Special Ed. programs, as they do now. Other courses will be specific to the program level.

I. Number of Students

How many students will be in the program? In the past they have had from 10 - 15 students with emphasis at the middle and secondary levels. The first year they expect 9 - 10 students and would split them across the CoT seminars. These students will also have their own cohort to look at Special Ed. issues.

J. GradPact

CoT is not a GradPact program; this new program will not be in GradPact either.

K. Communication in the Classroom (F203)

Fritz recommended that F203 be added as a substitute for the speech classes approved for education (S121 or S122) listed under oral and written expression. F203 is approved on a

program by program basis.

L. New Courses

There is one new course for this program, the seminar in CoT for the Special Ed. majors. It will probably be 1 credit hour over two semesters. The program group needs to have the TEC approve that course and then the program with the course can go on to the Policy Council for review.

M. Implementation

The earliest that this program could be implemented is Spring 2001.

N. CoT Seminars (S400)

The S400 seminar anchors the CoT program. It includes the content of several other courses such as H340 and M300. Each semester or half semester is devoted to a set of issues. The particular focus is negotiated with students. They consciously develop the content focus in the seminar; students nominate areas for focus. The seminar has evolved into a set of themes that tend to be very multi-disciplinary. They deal with coverage issues not by forcing content in the seminar but rather through the 30 program expectations.

Are there cases where students might only take two semesters of S400 and miss out on content? There have only been a couple cases of students only taking two semesters, most students take four semesters of the seminar (average 4.2 semesters).

The issue of multi-disciplinary courses came up in Policy Council when discussing the *Inquiry & Social Justice* program. That program has integrated course blocks that include topics such as special education and foundations. The question was raised concerning the Special Ed. content: Who will teach it? Who has the expertise to teach it? These types of courses need to deal with these questions. CoT dealt with this issue when the program was designed--there are other ways to include content besides an expert model.

Can AIs Teach S400? The CoT program has only had one AI teach this seminar. The AI was very experienced and was available to teach over several semesters. The Policy Council approved her to teach the course.

Vote: Motion to approve the proposal for *A Community of Teachers Program for Preservice Special Education Teachers*.

PASSED.

III. COURSE CHANGE REQUEST

Handout: Course Change Request: Methods of Teaching Senior High/Junior High/Middle School Science (M446)

The course change was made to change the course description, eliminating the reference to graduate students.

Vote: Motion to approve the *Course Change Request: Methods of Teaching Senior High/Junior High/Middle School Science (M446)*.

PASSED.

IV. ASSESSMENT DOCUMENT AND PLANS FOR IMPLEMENTATION

A. Background

In 1997-1998, an Assessment Committee looked at assessment practices and our philosophy for evaluation throughout the School of Education. Lanny and Tom Schwandt co-chaired the committee. The committee generated a white paper which became the basis for the unit assessment system that was sent to the Standards Board in Sept '98 and Sept '99. The plans

for 9/98 were approved; they are still waiting to hear about 9/99. The white paper also lays out a plan for having public assessment activities every spring once the new programs are underway.

B. School Visits

Early in Fall 2000, the School of Ed. needs to work with faculty representatives and program coordinators to go out and visit local schools and districts, then more regional schools and districts, and beyond. (Logistics are difficult because placements are spread across the state.) These visits are important for informing superintendents, principals, and teachers about our new programs and the commitments of the programs. We need to let them know what we expect of our students, and talk about our assessment activities which will intensively involve teachers and supervisors (beyond what teachers and supervisors do now).

They are putting together a set of documents about the programs and assessment plans. They will also clarify what teachers and supervisors will have to do in order to provide the necessary documentation to the Standards Board.

C. Future Work

The school will continue to work on the unit assessment plan for the Standards Board; each year it will become more specific and complex. There is a lot of work left to do on the implementation and logistical work. They will be recruiting faculty and others to work with them on implementation of the assessment system.

Two Year Induction Period

The assessment process is also indirectly tied to the two-year induction period for new graduates. We need to figure out ways to meet the demands being placed on new graduates--they will have to complete a portfolio within the first two years before they can get a more permanent license. Fred Risinger is working on this too.

D. Questions

Will there be some process of informing people at the School of Education about what is happening with assessment? Faculty and staff at this school need to know what we are doing related to assessment.

Will assessment plans need to be tailored for specific programs? Yes, because the commitments in each program are very different. We do need to have some consistent plan across programs too.

Do we need to communicate the assessment requirements to programs? Over the last two years they have gone to the program coordinators after new programs were approved and discussed the assessment requirements. They informed them of the framework of assessment from the white paper, and told the programs that they need to determine the detailed parts of the assessment plan for their program. New programs will be added to the assessment report each year.

Where does Music fit into this process? Music needs to know about the assessment and should be aware of the outline (which is not yet available). Music has thought about the assessment but doesn't know what the SoE is doing yet. HPER needs to be involved with this as well.

You'll be requiring more input from teachers, principals, and superintendents, are you offering some sort of compensation? No, we don't have any private money to use for that. We could try to increase the tuition bank but that may not be good solution either--it's not a popular program with some. They are not sure what they'll do about this.

How have teachers been involved designing the assessment plan so far? They have not been involved. There was some concern that this could be a problem down the line especially since we are asking them to do much more work. The site visits will be important for getting feedback from teachers and others.

IV. UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE GPA LEVELS FOR ADMISSION TO TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Handout: *School of Education*

Tim Niggle continued this discussion brought up at the last TEC meeting. He received information from RUGS. RUGS does allow students into the graduate system and doesn't require a GPA minimum. Some of these students wouldn't be admitted to the School of Education because of our GPA requirements. The Music and Business schools have dealt with this issue with policy statements that are handed out when students apply to the program. The statements basically tell students that if they take courses as a non-degree continuing student, the work won't count towards graduate degrees in those schools.

Tim distributed a draft of a statement for the School of Ed. for the TEC to review. There was some discussion of the wording in the document but members wanted to think about it more. Tim will distribute copies of the policies from the other schools for people to review. This topic will be discussed at a future meeting.

V. C- GRADING POLICY

The details of implementation concerning the C- grading policy for the various programs will not be ready to include in the upcoming bulletin. Lanny proposed that statements similar to the following are included in the bulletin:

- Any student who takes a required education course and gets less than a C has to retake the course.
- No student can student teach with a C- on their record until all courses are made up.
- Implementation practices concerning this policy will be decided on by each specific program.

Lanny would like the programs to include information concerning their implementation of the C- grade policy in their syllabi in Fall 2000. Programs may need to talk about the implementation issues together in order to resolve some of the issues and differences. A concern was also raised about the last discussion of the grading policy related to programs allowing substitutions for courses.

Vote: Motion to include this information in the bulletin:

- Any student who takes a required education course and gets less than a C has to retake the course.
- No student can student teach with a C- on their record until all courses are made up.
- Implementation practices concerning this policy will be decided on by each specific program.

PASSED.

VI. OTHER TOPICS

A. Writing Intensive Courses in Teacher Education

Lanny asked the TEC to consider designating some courses in our programs as being "writing intensive" courses. The TEC would need to identify some kind of designation to identify the courses and would need to develop a set of criteria to determine what makes a writing intensive course. This might also include setting a maximum student enrollment of students.

B. Requirements for Admission to Teacher Education

Lanny suggested that the TEC consider increasing GPA requirements for admission to Teacher Education.