

Indiana University School of Education
COMMITTEE ON TEACHER EDUCATION
Minutes

4:00 p.m., Tuesday, April 29, 2003, Room 2277

Present: Eric Ban, Tim Niggle, Diana Lambdin, Peter Cowan, Terry Mason, Anne Dopkins Stright, Brent Gault, Mark Helmsing, Genny Williamson, Jill Shedd, Lynne Boyle-Baise, Gretchen Butera, Matt Hoagland, Jesse Goodman

Others Attending: Susan Klein, Bob Appelman, Donetta Cothran

Handouts: 4/29 agenda, 4/15/03 CTE minutes, Memo: *Technology Integration Certificate*; Proposal for requirement changes for admission of CoT students to TEP; Memo: *CoT/Special Education Licensure*; Health Education – Secondary Teacher Preparation “tab” sheet; All Grade Physical Education “tab” sheet; Revised Draft of CTE Subcommittee on K-12 Standards Recommendations; Memo regarding the Academic Standards Committee; CTE Annual Report to Policy Council, 2002-03; Proposal for Standardizing Admission Dates for Teacher Education Programs; Secondary Education: Pending Requests for Authorized Courses; Student Teaching Placement Data: Trend Summary & Notes; Data Sheet: *Student Teaching 2000-2004*, Long-Range Strategic Plan: Goal 1 with 8 sub-tasks

As the meeting began, new member Eric Ban asked about his function as a member of CTE. Also, he wondered where CTE fits into the overall picture in teacher education.

In the discussion, it was explained that Eric, as a graduate student representative, is a fully-functioning member of the committee, with full voting rights and responsibilities. As to CTE’s place in the overall governance structure in teacher education, Diana Lambdin related that CTE is a committee of Policy Council that is charged with overseeing all teacher education programs, including policies, initiatives, and the UAS. Policy Council is the only elected governing body in the School of Education, so it must approve any course/policy decisions that come out of its committees. Approved decisions are then sent on to the Education Council, which is comprised of members from all Indiana University campuses.

In addition, Eric expressed concern about the responsibility of considering all students’ needs when proposals are brought before CTE. He wondered how, with the limited knowledge of individuals on the committee of other programs, CTE members were able to make the best decisions for all students in IUB’s teacher preparation programs.

Terry Mason related that even though CTE is an “elected body,” there is an attempt at creating a balanced panel of individuals that represent the various departments and programs associated with teacher education, in addition to representatives from K-12 education. Finally, the inclusion of Office of Teacher Education staff – those who have the “big picture” of teacher education in mind – also helps ensure that sound decisions are made by CTE.

Eric, having experienced the frustration of being “inducted by fire” into CTE, volunteered to work with another, more experienced CTE member to create a 2-page document that relates the basic information about CTE discussed above. CTE members agreed that this would be helpful to new members, and that the committee as a whole would benefit from new members being

well-informed about the structure, policies, and responsibilities of CTE. Terry Mason and Diana Lambdin offered to help Eric in the creation of a CTE induction guide for new members.

1. Approval of 4/15/03 minutes:

Handout: 4/15 minutes

After reviewing the minutes, CTE members suggested the following corrections:

- Tom Marshall from IST should be listed as Tom Brush.
- The field experiences listed for the language education courses should have been changed from 20 to 40 hours in the field for field experience.
- It should be noted that CoT students may choose between the MS or HS methods course in Language Education.

It was moved by Anne and seconded by Brent that the minutes be approved as corrected.
MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Corrected minutes, along with an updated action chart, were sent to Jane Kaho in the Dean's office for posting on the School of Education website (5/2/03).

2. Program/Course Requests:

Handouts: Memo: *Technology Integration Certificate*; Proposal for requirement changes for admission of CoT students to TEP; Memo: *CoT/Special Education Licensure*; Health Education – Secondary Teacher Preparation “tab” sheet; All Grade Physical Education “tab” sheet

- **Program Request – IST Certificate in Technology Integration:**

As there were no faculty from IST to present the program request for an IST certificate in Technology Integration, the request was tabled until fall 2003.

- **Program Request – Revision of CoT eligibility requirements for admission to TEP:**

Susan Klein requested that CoT's current S400/S500 requirement for admission to teacher education be changed from “*Completion of one semester of S400 or S500*” to “*Enrollment in S400 or S500.*” All of the other School-wide requirements will remain in effect. The change would be accompanied by several new instructions to CoT students:

- CoT students should apply for admission to the Teacher Education Program by the end of their sophomore year. Those holding junior standing or higher when they enter the program should apply for admission immediately upon beginning S400/S500.

- **CoT** students must still be admitted unconditionally to the Teacher Education Program before they can register for their content methods course(s). Students must also have completed at least ten of their 30 required Expectations for their Portfolio before they can actually begin the course.
- **CoT** students should also apply for student teaching when they register for their content methods course (or for the last course if they are taking two or more).

There was some discussion about what might happen to students who apply to TEP while in the S400/S500 seminar, but then fail to successfully complete the seminar. It was decided that admission to TEP should be conditional until S400/S500 is completed.

Also, Diana Lambdin asked how the completion of the 10 expectations, which is required before students can begin methods courses, will be documented in the Office of Teacher Education. In response, Tim Niggle related that students would be admitted to TEP conditionally, and then a checklist could be utilized, as it is in other programs, to make sure that students have completed their requirements before beginning their methods courses.

Tim Niggle agreed to work with CoT faculty to “iron out” the differences expressed above in a way that would be satisfactory to CoT and the Office of Teacher Education.

It was moved by Lynne Boyle-Baise and seconded by Genny Williamson that the CoT proposal be approved, with the discussed changes. **MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

- **Program Request – Final Revision of CoT/Special Education Program Requirements:**

Susan Klein related that one course that should have been included in the post-baccalaureate program presented at the 4/15/03 CTE meeting – K548: *Families, School, and Society*, needs to be added as a requirement for those seeking licensure at the post-baccalaureate level.

After some discussion about the overall structure and number of required credit hours of the graduate program as compared to the undergraduate CoT program, it was moved by Anne Dopkins Stright and seconded by Lynne Boyle-Baise that the addition of K548 as a graduate requirement for the SpEd license be approved. **MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

- **Program Request – Secondary Health Education with P.E. cognate:**
- **Program Request – All Grade P.E. with Health Education cognate:**

Dr. Donetta Cothran, representing HPER, presented drafts of two new programs that HPER has created in lieu of the dissolution of minors in the Indiana state licensure

program. The two programs she presented were a Secondary Health Education program with P.E. cognate, and an All Grade P.E. program with Health Education cognate. She presented the program drafts, not for CTE approval, but rather for feedback from CTE as to whether or not the programs were “on the right track” to meet new guidelines.

CTE members related that, at first glance, the programs seem to exemplify the best possible case scenario with courses currently offered, as well as meet necessary license requirements. In fact, it was noted that the programs presented by HPER are probably a “template” for other programs.

Diana Lambdin suggested that the programs could be thoroughly reviewed over the summer to ensure that they are fulfilling the new licensure guidelines. Dr. Cothran agreed that this was a good idea. Perhaps the programs will be brought back for approval in the fall.

3. CTE sub-committee on Indiana Education Roundtable's Action Plan for P-16 Education – Discussion of recommendations:

Handout: Revised Draft of CTE Subcommittee on K-12 Standards Recommendations

Terry Mason shared a revised draft of CTE subcommittee on K-12 standards recommendations with CTE. Revisions of the original draft were made based on CTE members’ suggestions. The revised recommendations were as follows. The changes were marked in **bold type**:

In response to a request from Dean Gonzalez that the School of Education institute an assessment of teacher education students’ knowledge of and capacity to use the Indiana K-12 Academic Standards as a requirement to student teach, the IU School of Education Committee on Teacher Education is providing the following commentary and recommendations. This document is divided into three main parts: (1) Concerns, (2) Short term recommendations, and (3) Long term recommendations.

(1) Concerns

- A. *Program autonomy* – While CTE is charged with overseeing the quality of all teacher education programs within the school it also supports program autonomy. It is the responsibility of programs areas to ensure that current theory and practice within each field of study (including the Indiana K-12 Academic Standards) are reflected in the learning experiences provided for students. We are, therefore, hesitant to support any mandated test or assessment of Indiana K-12 standards that encompasses all programs. Furthermore,
 - Standards have already been established in the form of the School of Education’s six guiding principles. Our implementation of these standards was documented through the NCATE and IPSB accreditation process this year, as was the integration of the INTASC standards into our courses and programs.
 - Also, IU SoE faculty currently address the Indiana K-12 standards, both practically and critically, in their undergraduate courses. For example, early field experience students are required to refer to grade level standards when planning lessons in order to better prepare grade-level appropriate activities. Students are also asked to study grade level and subject area standards in order to critically evaluate them – to view the standards in terms of strengths and weaknesses.
- B. *Excellence in Teaching* – Scholarship, exploration, and reflection have traditionally been the backbone of IUB’s teacher education programs. **The spirit of inquiry that is central to the mission of a research**

university requires open and continuous debate on educational policy and practice. While the School of Education must be responsive to a variety of constituencies including state and federal agencies and professional organizations, decisions regarding curriculum and teaching must also be informed by the professional knowledge that defines excellent teaching. Insofar as considerable disagreement exists among scholars and practitioners regarding the extent to which the current standards reflect this knowledge, we believe that the Indiana K-12 Academic standards should be presented in our courses and programs as objects of inquiry and critique as well as, where appropriate, guides for curriculum planning.

- C. *Research basis* – There is no firm evidence to support the efficacy of utilizing the Indiana K-12 standards as the primary focus of the curriculum. By incorporating the academic standards into the teacher education benchmarks, and thus elevating their importance, the IU School of Education may be legitimizing the use of standards whose success is based more in rhetoric than in research based practice.
- D. *Epistemological concerns* – When asked to teach and assess the Indiana academic standards in our teacher education programs, there is an assumption made that teacher candidates can “know” the standards. Questions arise:
- What does it mean to know the standards and how would we assess knowledge of the standards?
 - Would students be expected to memorize the Indiana K-12 standards in each of the subject areas?
 - Would students be expected to use the standards guides as a resource?

The above concerns notwithstanding, the CTE acknowledges that some action can be taken to provide documentation of how the K -12 Academic Standards are addressed in our teacher education programs. Therefore, we make the following short term and long term recommendations:

(2) Short Term Recommendations

1. *Provide materials, namely copies of the standards guides and/or CD-ROM's to all teacher candidates before their first field experience.*
2. *OTE document analysis* – The Office of Teacher Education **in collaboration with this committee** can review course syllabi and related documents to determine how the standards are used in teacher education courses. Information gathered through this process can then be made available to interested parties.
3. *OTE survey of faculty* – The Office of Teacher Education **in collaboration with this committee** can conduct follow-up interviews or surveys with faculty to clarify and further document the use of standards in teacher education courses.
4. *Link on IUB SoE webpage to IDOE website* – To give students and faculty further access to the Indiana academic standards, a link to the Indiana Department of Education website could be created on the SoE webpage.
5. *Cite NCATE and IPSB standards* – As IUB SoE has successfully completed the state (IPSB) and national accreditation (NCATE) processes, both of which mandated that student academic standards be addressed in some fashion, we should cite these forms of accreditation as evidence of our inclusion of Indiana's K-12 Academic Standards.

(3) Long Term Recommendations

1. *Provide incentives to encourage SoE faculty and staff to serve on state-level committees to facilitate communication between the business, legislative, academic sectors on key issues related to academic excellence at all levels.*
2. *Support forums in various venues that address what research says about the relationship between academic standards and assessments, teacher preparation, and student achievement.*

3. *Support further research to explore the relationship between academic standards, improved teaching, and student achievement with the establishment of a research fund to support inquiry into these issues.*

After a brief discussion about the tone and message of the recommendations, it was moved by Gretchen Butera and seconded by Peter Cowan that the revised draft, with the addition of an introductory statement to Dean Gonzalez, be approved by CTE for dispersal to the Dean and Policy Council. **MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

4. Informational item: faculty concerns regarding the Academic Standards

Committee:

Handout: Memo regarding the Academic Standards Committee

As an informational item, Terry Mason shared a memo written by a faculty member that expressed displeasure at the current functions of the Academic Standards Committee. There was a brief discussion about the memo, wherein it was pointed out that there is some confusion among faculty members as to the functions of the Academic Standards Committee, especially with regards to graduate students obtaining certification.

Diana Lambdin said that she would be happy to speak with Dr. Flinders, the author of the memo, to clear up any misunderstandings about the function of the Academic Standards Committee.

5. Informational item: CTE annual committee report to Policy Council:

Handout: CTE Annual Report to Policy Council, 2002-03

As an informational item, Terry Mason shared the CTE annual report to Policy Council that he had recently authored and turned in. The committee expressed their approval and gratitude toward Terry for successfully completing this task.

6. Discussion: enforcing TEP admission deadlines:

Handout: Proposal for Standardizing Admission Dates for Teacher Education Programs; Secondary Education: Pending Requests for Authorized Courses

Discussion continued from the 4/15/03 meeting about standardizing admission dates for IU teacher education programs. It was pointed out that standardized dates for admissions deadlines do actually exist, but have never been enforced up to now.

So, any change in admissions procedures would be a matter of the admissions process formally implementing their timetable, as opposed to creating a new one. Tim Niggle explained the following:

Currently, the School of Education (SOE) allows “rolling” admissions, that is students may apply for admission to the Teacher Education Program (TEP) at any time.

Applicants are processed and a response is sent via e-mail within 48 hours during the work week.

Most programs require a 2.5 GPA overall, 2.5 GPA in the major, completion of or enrollment in four pre-requisite courses, and passing scores on the PRAXIS I exam. The two exceptions to the general rules are the Community of Teachers programs, which requires the completion of one semester of S400/S500 and the PRAXIS I exams; and the graduate certification programs which require a 2.5-3.0 GPA and completion of the PRAXIS I exams.

Students who meet all of the criteria specified for a particular program are given an “unconditional admission.” Students that have completed all requirements but the pre-requisite course work and are currently enrolled in those courses are given a “conditional admission.” Conditional admits allow students to participate in the Continuing Student Registration process in October for the spring semester and April for the summer and fall semesters before final grades are reported. If the student fails to make the necessary GPA they are dropped from their authorized courses. Students who are missing one or more parts of the admission requirements are placed on “deferred admission” status.

The criteria based rolling admission strategy has been successful because the demand on programs has been relatively stable; programs have been able to offer most of the required classes every semester; the course/clusters have not been rigidly sequential; and program length was limited to a maximum of four semesters. This has allowed students enough flexibility that being admitted in fall or the spring does not necessarily affect the length of time required to complete the program.

Many of the conditions that existed in the past have changed with the introduction of new programs. There is a broader variety of students seeking initial certification; a proliferation of certification programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels; program requirements are becoming more complicated; and course sequences that are more rigid. These developments come at a time when the level of faculty/staff resources and expected changes in the university infrastructure are requiring increased attention to each semester’s course offerings.

One solution is to re-institute specific dates for admission. This proposal is based on the idea that if the faculty have a pool of applicants to choose from, then they can be more selective about their candidates. In turn, the candidates can be more closely monitored as they progress through the program and adjustments made to the program as needed. This strategy allows for more informed decision making about program planning, instructional resources, and facilities.

The SOE Bulletin currently identifies March 1 and October 1 as admission decision dates. We would like to start using these dates fall 2003. That will give us some time to get the information out to the students and to direct early admits to new programs. This will interface neatly with the deadline for admission to the old programs (June 30, 2003) and the entry of the first class of students to the new programs.

Students who have been admitted unconditionally or conditionally are allowed to enroll in the authorized TEP courses for the following semester. If an unconditionally admitted

student's GPA falls between 2.45-2.49 the student is permitted to remain in the authorized classes. If the student's GPA falls between 2.35 and 2.44 the student is removed from the authorized courses. Students with a conditional admission to the TEP who fail to complete their pre-requisite course work or fail to maintain a 2.5 GPA are removed from authorized courses.

It was moved by Lynne Boyle-Baise and seconded by Anne Dopkins-Stright that standardized deadlines for admission to TEP be enforced. **MOTION PASSED, WITH ONE ABSTENTION (Mark Helmsing).**

7. Report from student teaching: trends, projections, and feedback on the new student teaching evaluation process:

Handout: Student Teaching Placement Data: Trend Summary & Notes; Data Sheet: *Student Teaching 2000-2004*

As time was running short, Jill Shedd requested that CTE members carefully study the handouts regarding student teaching during the summer. She expressed some frustration at the lack of time available for CTE members to adequately study and discuss data, especially since CTE is charged with making "data driven" decisions about teacher education programs.

8. CTE Assignment from Policy Council for Goal 1 of SOE Strategic Plan: Where do we go from here?:

Handout: Long-Range Strategic Plan: Goal 1 with 8 sub-tasks

At the beginning of next school year, a discussion needs to take place within CTE to determine its role in supervising and maintaining Goal #1 of the SOE Strategic Plan.

9. Election of CTE chairperson for the 2003-04 school year:

Lynne Boyle-Baise suggested that Terry Mason, having done an excellent job chairing CTE during the spring 2003 semester, carry on as chairperson for the 2003-04 school year. Terry accepted the nomination, and was accepted by the CTE members as 2003-04 CTE chairperson by a vote of acclamation.