

IU School of Education
Teacher Education Council
April 8, 2002

Present: Members: Marilynne Boyle-Baise, Ellen Brantlinger, Sarah Franklin, Thomas Gregory, Matt Hoagland, Peter Kloosterman, Diana Lambdin, Joan Pong Linton, Timothy Niggle, Jill Shedd
Visitors: Cathy Brown and Bob Appelman
Minutes taken by: Amy Kemp

Handouts: Agenda (4/8/02); Minutes of the 3/25/02 meeting; Proposal for New Secondary Education Program; and Draft of Procedures for Course/Program Creation or Change for TEC

I. Approval of Minutes

A. Minutes of the 3/25/02 meeting were approved.

II. Update on Office of Teacher Education Policies

- A. Referring to the Operational Changes for New Bulletin handout (see handouts section), Tim Niggle discussed proposed changes in advising and policy. He stated that information in bold type on the handout is current language and the non-bold is proposed to be added.
- B. In item #1, Tim noted that information would be added to notify students in need of a waiver or substitution based on individual disability that they should contact the Office of Disabled Student Services (DSS). He also stated that this information is already being passed on to students by the advising office.
- C. Ellen Brantlinger asked if there was any enforcement of these standards.
- D. Tim stated that there is not but the DSS is a good advocate and that is one of the reasons for advising students to go there.
- E. Tim went on to #2 discussing retention in the Teacher Education Program. It is proposed that the language be changed so that students must have no lower than a C in each required professional education course and no lower than a cumulative GPA of 2.5 in all required courses.
- F. Tom Gregory asked if this would be a problem for students taking non-required courses to bring up their GPA.
- G. After discussion it was decided that these cases will be decided on an individual case basis.
- H. Tim went on to #3 with attention to the Note which states that students have generally been allowed to begin student teaching with a GPA deficiency in an elementary area of concentration. He asked if this practice is acceptable, especially understanding that it applied to 30% percent of students.
- I. Jill Shedd stated that B is the more worrying since student are often advised to "manipulate" the courses in their content area to attain a GPA high enough to student teach.

- J. Ellen Brantlinger expressed an unwillingness to have a policy to stop students from student teaching and questioned whether students should be penalized for one bad semester.
- K. Matt Hoagland asked if these students are unable to pass courses that they are proposing to teach—if so, they should be required to know their content.
- L. Tim asked if it is acceptable to “replace” a required course with another in which the student has received a better grade.
- M. Ellen stated that if the student is able to perform well in another class it should be substituted for the other, but it should be a comparable course or the same course.
- N. Lynne Boyle-Baise stated that she had recently and for the first time been embarrassed by lack of knowledge of IU students in the field and that she is convinced of the need for higher standards.
- O. Diana Lambdin stated that often students will not know their grades before they must have their student teaching papers filed and plans made.
- P. Ellen stated that if it has become a common occurrence to let people student teach with a deficiency, it may cause people to try less. She suggested that there should be strict enforcement of the rule and make exceptions only in exceptional cases.
- Q. Tim Niggle stated that this would mean 15-20 people would not student teach per semester.
- R. Jill stated that the hardest cases are the spring student teachers, when the Office of Student Teaching must make calls to let people know that they will not be student teaching over winter break. She stated, however, that these calls can be made and that it is the inconsistency of the rule that makes the process the hardest.
- S. Lynne stated that if we are consistent with this rule that students would know they would not be able to student teach when they received their grades.
- T. Pete Kloosterman stated that less than a C in methods should stop student teaching but not a deficiency in content courses.
- U. Lynne moved that the **practice of routinely allowing progression to student teaching with a deficiency be discontinued. Students who wish to student teach with a grade deficiency in a content course must appeal to the Professional Standards Committee where decisions will be made on a case-by-case basis. The motion was passed with 1 abstention.**
- V. Tim moved on to #4 and asked if it was acceptable practice to allow thematic areas of concentration.
- W. Jill noted that this is an area where student teaching and advising were not consistent in their practices.
- X. After discussion it was decided that this practice is acceptable.
- Y. Tim moved to #5, he asked if it was appropriate that math majors are held only to a 2.0 GPA as opposed to all others who must have a 2.5.

- Z. Pete stated that this is acceptable since the math department is known for its severe grading.
- AA. #6, Tim summarized the alert process and how it is used stating that when a number of alert forms are accumulated the Associate Dean for Teacher Education determines whether a professional standards committee should form to review the situation.
- BB. Diana clarified that the two committees are different and will be renamed to avoid confusion
- CC. Jill stated that there is a need to consistently file alert forms.
- DD. Ellen stated that the policy of the Student Ethics Board is to have a series of sanctions for each offense. She asked whether it would be good to include these in the bulletin or just notify all students of this when they are accepted into the program.
- EE. Lynne and Tom suggested that it would be better to keep the Associate Dean's position flexible so that she/he can decide if a committee needs to be formed and when.
- FF. It was moved that for #6 the italicized verbiage replace the bold. The motion was passed with one nay.**

III. Secondary Education Program

- A. Cathy Brown began the discussion by summarizing the changes that had occurred since the previous meeting (see color handout).
- B. Lynne asked where she could find the introduction to the program. She stated that she had emailed some comments and suggestions for guiding questions and could not find where they had been included.
- C. After discussion it was decided that no one present had seen Lynne's comments but Diana suggested that they were unlikely to be objected to.
- D. Cathy stated that the Secondary Group had met with CoT and Transition to Teach in order to address questions from the previous meeting. She stated that those programs had agreed to a plan in which the content areas choose which methods course would be appropriate for outside students to take.
- E. Tom suggested there will be a problem if content areas decide that outside students should take the first methods course.
- F. Jill suggested that there will be a problem with linking up field experiences correctly and that outside programs will have to find a way to document that they had met those requirements within their program.
- G. Diana spoke about how this program will intersect with health, drama and journalism programs. She stated that health suggested that there will not be a problem; that journalism was unaware that there would be no minor and that caused a problem; and that she will be speaking with drama on 4/9, but there may no longer be a license in that area.

- H. Jill drew attention to the page 135 of the proposal which deals with field experience. She stated that she wrote this up so that it can be used as a series of guidelines. She focused on the importance of field experience and the need for supervision, minimum numbers of hours, evaluation and cooperation in the schools, including full room teaching.
- I. Lynne stated that this would be impossible for the social studies program to do because of the lack of supervisors. She asked for more flexible language to allow the content areas to adjust, especially in terms of financial allotments.
- J. Diana stated that the field experiences are 2 credits each, which should allow for the payment of supervision and that for the 2 credits that students are receiving they should be working.
- K. Matt asked how much supervision from IU this would involve.
- L. Jill stated that she hoped that it would be much like student teaching where no one is constantly in the building, but cooperating teachers would know to whom to direct questions.
- M. Matt stated that he liked the ideas but that it will be logistically hard to make all of the placements.
- N. Jill stated that this did indeed involve a great deal of work, especially as with respect to the middle schools where there are not currently that many connections with IU. She continued to discuss evaluation of field experience and stated that as of now there are no criteria for passing and the resulting performance is marginal. She stated that there needs to be mechanisms of supervision whereby weaknesses are noted.
- O. Ellen stated that in special education field experience was graded as opposed to pass/fail.
- P. Diana suggested that evaluation forms like those being developed for student teaching could be used and feedback should be gained from coordinating teachers.
- Q. Lynne stated she was uncomfortable voting on the new material and needed to speak with others in her department first.
- R. Tom stated that many syllabi are still missing and he needs those to evaluate the program.
- S. Ellen stated that three educational psychology classes are too many and asked for a rationale for their inclusion since professional education courses are pushing out general education courses.
- T. Diana stated that more educational psychology courses were needed to meet the developmental standards.
- U. Lynne stated that 45 hours of professional education is very heavy and she suggested that students would begin to go to other programs that did not require as many.

- V. Matt suggested that the problem is how early the classes are taken. He stated that they are often not useful before students have experience with an actual class.
- W. Jill questioned the weak connection between the methods courses and field experience and suggested that they be a 5 credit course and be thought of as one package.
- X. Pete closed the meeting stating that he would take further suggestions via email until 8am Thursday and those will be discussed at the final TEC meeting on April 16.