



**IU School of Education
Teacher Education Council
April 5, 2001**

Present: Christine Bennett, Lanny Beyer, Ginette Delandshere, Amy Flint, Tom Gregory, Fritz Lieber, Lissa May, Tim Niggle, Jill Shedd; **Others attending:** Genny Manset, Lew Polsgrove, Barbara Wolf; **Minutes taken by:** Janet Anelli

Handouts: Minutes - March 7, 2001; E-mail from Lew Polsgrove, TAL Program Admissions Requirements (3/1/01); Rationale for Requesting Higher Admissions Standards for the TAL Program; New Course Request: Communication in the Classroom (G203); Review of the Teacher Education Office School of Education - Bloomington Campus Conducted by the Long Range Planning Committee 2000-2001 (2/19/01); Memo from Susan Klein and Dennis Knapczyk: A Community of Teachers Program for Preservice Special Education Teachers at IU-B (4/5/01)

Agenda: Added item: A Community of Teachers Program for Preservice Special Education

I. MINUTES

Vote: Motion to approve minutes from the March 7, 2001 meeting as amended.
PASSED.

II. TEACHING ALL LEARNERS PROGRAM

Handout: E-mail from Lew Polsgrove, TAL Program Admissions Requirements (3/1/01); Rationale for Requesting Higher Admissions Standards for the TAL Program

A. Background

The Special Education faculty was interested in raising the GPA admission requirement for their program from 2.5 to 2.8. Special Education traditionally has higher GPAs; there's a lot of content for their students and its more demanding field in which to teach. Students are frequently called upon by teachers and administrators to act in a consulting role right from the start in their jobs as well. Because of these requirements, the department felt that they need to attract more accomplished students--they wanted to be more selective and set higher admission standards.

- o They expect this to be a popular program and they have had a lot of applicants (55). They can only handle 44 - 48 students. They need a way to limit the number of students in the program and higher admission standards may be a way to accomplish this.
- o Due to grade inflation, 2.5 represents a below average student, 2.8 may represent the average now. They would like to have at least average students in the program but they really want better than average students.
- o Students will also be required to show some evidence of commitment to working with students with disabilities by having some experience already. This was traditionally a requirement.

B. Questions/Comments

- o How many students out of the 55 applicants would be disqualified if they raised the GPA from 2.5 to 2.8? The program representatives were unsure how many students would be disqualified.
- o Is there really that much difference between students with a 2.5 and a 2.8 GPA? No one was sure.
- o Is GPA a predictor of how good a teacher a student will be or just a predictor of how good a student they are?
- o **Experience**
How will the program check the experience of the applicants? They weren't sure yet but they will probably develop a checklist for admissions to use. In the past, experience was a requirement and students had to submit letters verifying it—the program used to have a fairly elaborate induction process. They haven't decided how to approach this yet but faculty are willing to screen applicants. It was suggested that they could have a two-stage process: admissions could first review the paper requirements, then the advisors could give this information to the faculty to review and to verify student experience.
- o **Writing Sample**
They would like applicants to submit writing samples and discussed different ways that this could be done. Music has applicants do writing samples on the spot. Applicants could do that here or they could use the computer rooms and have several writing times available in the evening. The writing sample could be about the applicant's experience with children; this would provide two types of information for review.
- o **Interviews**
Do they interview prospective students? No, but they did do this in the past. It was suggested that they could interview those students that met the paper qualifications or those students that represented the top 40 students applying. There was concern that interviewing might be too difficult and time consuming to do.
Other programs conduct interviews. COT interviews their students, they have about 60 applicants a year. Their students help in the interviewing process. The Music School also conducts interviews with all the students for the Music Ed. program and they have about 180 applicants a year. Project Team does team interviews.
 - o Some members felt that interviews and writing samples would give the program more information about students and they would have a better feel for applicants than raising the GPA. GPA is not necessarily the best predictor of being a good teacher--there are many ways to judge quality.
 - o It was suggested that they don't need to guarantee admission to students that meet the *minimum* requirements. There could be an initial screening of requirements then they could rank order students. They could then select from the best applicants.
 - o Their main concern was to "fix" the number of applicants they would accept—they would like to set a cap. They could have a waiting list or alternates if some students from the top group don't accept.

C. Establishing GPA for Admissions

- o In the past, the TEC did not let other programs such as Praxis or Inquiry and Social Justice, set higher GPAs for admission. The group was not sure of the reasoning and wanted to check the past minutes and to find out if there was a rationale for having one GPA for all programs.
- o Who really has the authority to approve changes in the GPA for admission requirements? Any changes could affect the whole school because they can alter the number of students admitted to the school.

D. TAL Action

The Special Education department withdrew their request to raise the GPA admissions requirement for this program. They will discuss the issues and reconsider their admission policies. They will also collect more data concerning these issues before returning to the TEC. Some areas they might consider:

- o They could collect information and track students who they think were probably qualified but that they had to turn away. This could help make the case for more faculty.
- o Faculty don't really know the entering GPA of students, is there a way to do some sort of validity check on the students who are struggling to see if GPA is a factor? An admissions status report for students would give the GPA and the prerequisites that students have met. Transcripts would list the courses students have taken and would show if there were any very low grades.

III. NEW COURSE REQUEST: COMMUNICATION IN THE CLASSROOM (G203)

Handout: *New Course Request: Communication in the Classroom (G203)*

This course has been offered for two years as F203. Previously the TEC approved the number change from F203 to G203. The department is resubmitting this course request because they revised the description.

The service learning component in the course is an option. If the option is available in a given section, there are also alternatives that a student could complete instead of participating in a service learning experience. Mary York asked them to track their placements in the service learning component.

Vote: Motion to approve the *New Course Request: Communication in the Classroom (G203)*.
PASSED.

IV. TEACHER EDUCATION COUNCIL RETREAT

The TEC retreat is tentatively scheduled for May 14, 9am - 5pm, in Education 2277. The minutes from the 3/7/01 TEC meeting list some issues that the council may want to discuss at the retreat. The report submitted by the Long Range Planning Committee on Teacher Education can be discussed at the retreat. Tom and Jill will work out an agenda.

V. ASSOCIATE DEGREE IN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

The faculty from Early Childhood Education were invited to this meeting to discuss the Associate Degree in Early Childhood Education program proposal that was presented at the TEC meeting on 3/7/01. The TEC wanted to give the program group the opportunity to discuss the benefits and disadvantages of this proposal and voice any concerns about offering this program. No one from the ECE program responded to Tom's email or attended this meeting. As there was no further discussion, the TEC decided to vote on the proposal.

Vote: Motion to approve the proposal for an Associate Degree in Early Childhood Education.
PASSED.

VI. TEACHER EDUCATION GOAL - FORUM UPDATE

Four meetings were scheduled to discuss the document, *An Elaboration on Goal 1: Continue IU's Commitment to Strong Pre-Service Teacher Education*:

- o JARB Meeting, March 26
- o Open School of Education Forums:
 - March 30, 12 - 1:30 pm
 - April 3, 4 - 5:30 pm (No one other than TEC members attended this meeting.)
 - April 5, 12 - 1:30 pm

Fritz gave a brief update of topics discussed at the meetings. The notes from the meetings will be given to Tom to create an addendum to the goal report. The addendum will be given to the Long Range Planning Committee.

VII. A COMMUNITY OF TEACHERS PROGRAM FOR PRESERVICE SPECIAL EDUCATION

Handout: *Memo from Susan Klein and Dennis Knapczyk: : A Community of Teachers Program for Preservice Special Education Teachers at IU-B (4/5/01)*

There was concern that the way the proposal for the new Special Education program was written might have been confusing. This memo was written to correct any misconceptions and to ensure that the TEC understood the intent of the program—this is not a change in the intent of the program but a clarification of the language.

In the proposal, it may have seemed like the program was preparing people to have a double major in special education and a content area, however, that was not the way the program was designed. The program was designed to have a special education major and a content area focus like a minor. The program did not intend that students could teach in the content area.

They wanted the content area focus included in the program because in inclusion settings where there are two teachers, a content teacher and a special education teacher working together, the special education teacher may get treated like a teacher's aide if he or she does not have content background. If the special ed. teacher also has strong content background then the two teachers will be more equal in the setting. The content area wouldn't appear on a license but it could be a university certificate.

The Special Education faculty reapproved the program. The TEC reviewed and discussed the memo. They decided that the program can make the changes described and the program representatives don't need to address the TEC further on this issue.

VIII. UPCOMING TEC MEETINGS

- o **TEC - Final Meeting 2000 - 2001**
Wednesday, May 2, 2001, 4 - 6 pm, Education 2277

- o **TEC Retreat**
Monday, May 14, 9 am - 5 pm, Education 2277

