

IU School of Education
Teacher Education Council
October 12, 1999

- Present:** Melissa Beeker, Lanny Beyer, David Birch, Gary Bridwell, Amy Seely Flint, Diana Lambdin, Fritz Lieber, Charles Schmidt, Amy Sutley; Others attending: Tim Niggle, Laura Stachowski Minutes taken by: Janet Anelli
- Handouts:** Minutes from Meetings: April 27, 1999 and September 9, 1999; Memo: Update on Developments in the Overseas Project from Laura Stachowski (10/12/99); General Education Proposal; Memo: Comments on the Campus-Wide "General Education Requirement" Proposal from Lee Ehman (10/11/99)

I. MINUTES

Vote: Motion to approve minutes from meetings on April 27, 1999 and September 9, 1999.
PASSED.

II. OVERSEAS PROJECT

Handout: *Memo: Update on Developments in the Overseas Project* from Laura Stachowski (10/12/99)

Laura Stachowski, Director of the Cultural Immersion Project, presented this information.

A. Background

The Cultural Immersion Project includes two student teaching projects, the American Indian Reservation Project and the Overseas Project, as well as a project for experienced teachers. American Indian Reservation Project: Students teach for the whole semester and live in BIA dorms in the Navajo Nation and contribute to dorm life programs in the evenings. Placement is in the four corners area.

Overseas Project: Includes 10 - 16 weeks of student teaching in Indiana and then students go overseas for eight more weeks of student teaching. Students live with host families or boarding facilities on a school campus. They are placed in England, Wales, Scotland, Ireland, Australia, New Zealand, India, or Taiwan.

Student Teaching: Community and cultural involvement are important elements. Students have to perform service learning projects in the local communities; they are expected to get out and do things off the school grounds. There is also a strong academic component. Students submit weekly or biweekly reports and extensive service learning project reports.

Experienced Teachers: The overseas practicum for experienced teachers is a newer program. It involves a 3 - 4 week opportunity in one of the host countries, usually in the summer.

Overseas Placements: For overseas placements, they have a long standing relationship with the Foundation for International Education.

B. Kenya - A New Option

They are exploring Kenya as a new option for placements. The people in Kenya support the idea and are open to their proposals. This location involves many safety and health concerns, more so than other settings, even India. There is an Overseas Study Advisory Council which approves new overseas projects on campus; they are working with the council.

Nairobi Visit

Laura is going to Nairobi on November 3 to look at schools and check on housing. Students will probably live in boarding facilities during the week and go with families on the weekends.

Start Dates

If all approvals are met, they could send experienced teachers to Kenya fairly soon--Summer 2000. It may be a more viable option for experienced teachers than student teachers--they might be able to handle the extreme differences better--but some student teachers have done very well in difficult settings.

Because student teachers need to do advance preparations before these placements, they go through an academic year of cultural preparation for the experience, they: attend meetings and workshops, keep an overseas journal related to the country, explore country profiles, and do in-depth reading on education and culture, the earliest student teachers could go to Kenya would be January 2002.

C. Questions/Comments

How many students participate in the Overseas Project? 50 - 65 students participate in that program and 40 - 45 students in the Reservation project. For the Overseas project, we send a few students to each country.

How many students request non-Western placements? We get about six students per year. A few students go to India; we do a lot of counseling with those students. There were two students prepared to go to Taiwan but they had to back out after the earthquake. The program is offered to other IU campuses and Purdue and Ball State as well. IUNW has had requests for student teaching in Africa.

How are students informed about the program? They advertise in many ways: Laura goes to student teaching intake meetings and speaks, they put up posters and displays, and send mailings and flyers to other campuses and schools. Laurie Prior created a new web site for the Overseas project; they are now working on one for the reservations project.

Comments

- It sounds like a wonderful opportunity for students especially with our focus on diversity.
- Laura participated in this project when she went through the program and it changed her life. It really makes students grow when they go somewhere different; they become different people. Kenya could be very exciting if it can meet safety/health concerns.
- There are no limits on placing different content areas or levels. They can place most areas and endorsements.

Laura presented this idea to the TEC to answer any questions and get comments. She could follow up with the TEC after her trip.

III. SELECTING CHAIRPERSON

- Fritz Lieber will act as the chairperson on November 18.
- Amy Flint will act as the chairperson on December 9.
- Lanny acted as the chair for this meeting.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS/OTHER ISSUES

A. "The Call to Teach"

A new activity will be held in the School of Education on October 23, "The Call to Teach." Students who were admitted to the program in the last 12 months (about 530) were invited. It is hoped that this will become an important tradition in the school, marking a milestone for students recently admitted. Lanny reviewed the program and the topics of the speakers.

B. Teacher Assignments

Meetings will be held soon with faculty to discuss how to arrange for teaching assignments, especially in Fall 2000 when many new programs will be starting. The school needs a system and must develop a plan for deploying faculty.

C. Honors Project

Lanny will be creating a proposal for an honors project which will specify criteria for what students need to achieve/complete (probably a GPA measure and creation of an independent project). The work could be reviewed and evaluated by several faculty in and outside a student's program area. He would like to get a designation on students' transcripts who complete this successfully, that would state that they graduated with honors.

D. Conference Participation by Undergraduates

Lanny is trying to find ways to create a fund for underwriting conference participation by undergraduates in order to foster professional development.

E. New TEC Members

An email was sent to the School of Education faculty to try to get more participation in the TEC. Cathy Brown is interested in participating and Lanny wanted to discuss this with the TEC because she is both a faculty member and an administrator. The Council discussed the appropriateness of her participation and if it represented a conflict of interest for her to be on the Council. There was no objection to her being on the Council.

F. Diversity Council

The TEC agreed to have Fritz continue as their representative on the Diversity Committee.

V. GENERAL EDUCATION PROPOSAL

Handout: *General Education Proposal*

A. Background--This Proposal

- This proposal is a substitute for an earlier set of proposals instigated by Gros Louis to create a common undergraduate experience. The earlier proposals had some innovative ideas but were not accepted.
- The intent of this proposal is that the campus will come up with a general ed. list of courses in six categories that all units (schools or programs) of IUB will agree to count in their degree programs. If this proposal is approved, there will be campus-wide general education lists from which students can select courses; the courses will be interchangeable. The lists provided in this document are examples, they will be finalized in the future.
- Some courses may meet both School of Education and university requirements such as H340. The School of Education will have additional general ed. requirements, some of them specific, which cannot be substituted.
- University Division is excited about this proposal it gives them 20 guaranteed credits into which they can channel students and which every school will have to accept.
- In some ways this may not be very different than what happens now--freshmen take a number of courses and have their freshmen year full when they come to us. The difference may be that now we spend a lot of time with University Division and advising students--if they think they might go into education, they are given advising sheets and other materials so they can make better course choices. This proposal would force us to count courses that may not be a good fit for our programs.
- We should be sensitive to what might have motivated this proposal--COAS or the president's office seem to be behind it.

B. Process

Course Lists

If and when this proposal is approved, the Council assumes that there will be a process in which units can recommend additional courses from their unit to be included in one or more categories.

Voting

The various units (degree granting, 4 year programs) on campus will vote on this proposal. It's not clear how the voting will take place, two possibilities were discussed:

- The proposal will be voted on by units, and the units will determine *individually* whether or not they will take part in this program.
- The proposal will be voted on by units and if a 2/3 majority of units approve the program it will be put in place for the whole university.

C. Comments

Voting

- Curriculum decisions are the prerogative of the faculty so voting should be by unit--the individual units should make their own decisions about participating. We need to get clarification on this issue.
- In principle, the vote should be by unit by school/college to preserve the integrity of our programs.

Rationale

It's not clear what the proposal is about, there is no focus in this proposal. Members thought it was so freshmen could come in, select courses, and not worry about what their major was initially, or have serious problems later on if they took courses that didn't count for their major. The earlier proposal had a rationale, students could piece together cohesive courses, with this list they don't have to.

This proposal has no justification and doesn't try to address what we want courses to try to do for freshmen or general education. Instead of just listing categories and courses, isn't there something more important to talk about related to this such as what kind of intellectual experience we want students to have in the general education domain? That would require communication across units and involves more than just voting this proposal up or down.

Exploration: The only justification for this proposal is that of allowing students to explore, and not penalizing them for doing so because they didn't take the right courses for a particular major early on.

Development of Proposal: The Background section refers to a five year discussion, it's not clear to us how this document represents the values and comments that came out of their five years of discussion and the earlier proposal. How does this proposal relate to the earlier one? We have solution, but a solution to what? What was the problem? We don't know what the discussion was to prompt this solution, there's a missing rationale.

Discussion and Consensus: If all the units worked together to talk about what the philosophy and purpose of general education is on this campus there could be a proposal that would have consensus. This document reflects no philosophy or intellectual justification for the general education experience here nor does it reflect a mechanism where by a campus-wide consensus has been attempted. This proposal provides a list of courses and doesn't seem to be connected to anything.

This Proposal/Earlier Proposal

The earlier freshman year proposal included creative and innovative ideas. It tried to provide smaller classes with thematic unity, all those ideas are gone. This is a gatekeeping mechanism for 20 credits. In developing the earlier proposal, they did try to get a lot of communication among units in the university.

Time

The development of the original freshmen proposal took 2 years, this one has taken 2 months. This raises some concerns.

School of Education and General Education Requirements

Because 1/2 to 1/3 of our courses are in the general education distribution, this proposal won't hurt our school in particular; other schools in the university with lower general education requirements will see a greater impact.

This proposal will have a disparate impact on schools. For example, Music has low general education requirement because they have their own special curriculum; they'll end up contributing to COAS general education.

Even though the School of Education has substantial general education requirements (50-60 credits of 128 credits), this proposal will cause some problems. For example, if students take specific courses in history instead of survey courses, the focus is off. In our programs we have selected courses that support teaching, for example, survey courses in world or US history, because that is what students will be teaching in schools. Under this proposal, elementary students might go through the program without a US history course.

Some of our programs may have to be more elastic about their general education requirements; some are quite specific now.

Course Lists

How are the courses chosen for these categories? Who will approve the courses on the list?

It was thought that the Campus Curriculum Committee created this list and will review/approve future proposals for additional course listings. The Council was not sure what the process was for establishing the course lists. More information on this process is needed. The School of Education would like to add more courses.

Even if we get the courses we want on the list, there is still the problem that students might not take them. We need to specify what students need to take for our programs.

Isn't it likely that students will only take general education courses on this list? The courses on the list will probably be very attractive. This proposal has enormous implications for areas of the university whose courses aren't represented on the list.

Without intellectual support for how these categories are supposed to contribute to education, it seems this is just a way to support certain units whose courses make the list.

Education Courses on Lists

There are only three education courses on the lists: H340, M235, and Q200.

Can we get more education requirements on the lists? This would enable students to satisfy our requirements and university requirements. If we can suggest additional education courses for the list, we could have other students take our courses as well.

300 Level Courses/Course Redesign

- H340 is listed on the proposal; it's the only 300 level course. Freshmen probably won't take a 300 level course so perhaps we could redesign it, include similar content, give it a lower number, and count it in our programs.
- If H340 stays as a 300 level course, HPER may also have additional higher level courses to add.

Substituting Courses

H340 is listed in the Social, Behavioral and Historical Studies category (page 3). According to this proposal, students could take any course on this list, however, they can't substitute one of the other courses to meet the requirement of H340 in our programs.

Course Categories

In our general education requirements we have both written and oral communications. This list only has written communications, it would be a problem to leave oral communications out--this doesn't make sense for teachers

Timing

They gave us only a short time to respond to this proposal (see schedule on last page of proposal), the memo went out to Don Warren on 9/22/99 and asked for a response by 11/17/99. Some faculty may have seen this proposal after it was referenced in an email but it's unlikely that many faculty have reviewed it. There has been very little school-wide discussion.

Input

The units should have more input into proposal, this document doesn't give much opportunity for that and the TEC needs to give feedback today.

Comments from Lee Ehman

Handout: *Memo: Comments on the Campus-Wide "General Education Requirement" Proposal* from Lee Ehman (10/11/99)

The Council read over the memo from Lee Ehman. Some felt his comments made sense but had questions about the double-counting of courses. Concerning W200, members wondered where he would get additional instructors to teach the course. This course is very full now, if it was opened up to others how could we handle the students? The course also runs out of space. Perhaps the course could be redesigned if it was necessary/desirable to increase student numbers to generate income.

D. Implications

Budgeting/Staffing

This proposal could have significant budget and staffing outcomes/repercussions.

More Credits

- Students may end up taking more credits if they don't know their major early on. This proposal could also put extra responsibility on freshmen advising.
- Students could spend the first semester or two taking various unconnected courses, then they would find they need to take additional courses for education and will have a high number of credits, spending more time in school.

Courses Selected

If we can't list the general education requirements that we are now offering such as F203, it will put those courses at a severe disadvantage because students may not take courses that are not on the list. If students think that they might go into education then they might take education courses that are on the list.

Twenty Credits

- The 20 credit hours must be part of our 128 credits, leaving us 108 hours to get students through the Teacher Education program.
- This forces us to use categories and courses in our programs that may not be as appropriate as other categories and courses.

GradPact

Will this lead to the erosion of GradPact? It is likely that it will affect GradPact. If this proposal goes through, Lanny may advocate dropping GradPact as an option for our students.

- If our programs are not eligible for GradPact we could lose students.
- In a meeting Tim Niggle attended concerning GradPact, some thought the proposal was a good idea because it would unify the curriculum and the school's would change their programs to fit--they would adjust to these requirements.
- GradPact says students can get through school in four years, this says they can get through in four years and can explore the first year too.

Education Programs

This proposal will create some problems for certain programs. An example is math requirements--math is not required for secondary students but is required for elementary. This will mean a fundamental change in the way we grant degrees; it's not clear how it will sort out in the different programs.

Programs: We may need to look at existing and new programs, check on the requirements they have, and determine if there are specific courses they must have or if the new courses will be ok. If this passes, the School of Education has the responsibility to look at our requirements and find 20 credit hours within the six categories to fit within the university general education requirements.

Elementary Education:

- Most of our programs could accommodate at least sections of this proposal.
- DDSJ has a fairly open-ended list of general education requirements. They might fit with this proposal or may need to be slightly modified.
- The impact will probably be significant for the other two elementary programs which specify certain courses--it could loosen them up.
- The problem is that in elementary education we are you're providing background for instruction in elementary classrooms, if students substitute specific courses (i.e. History of Tibet) for a survey course (i.e. survey of American History) it's not preparing students for the classroom.

Additional General Education: This will probably mean that we would have to make the additional general ed. requirements in a program tighter and students might have to take more higher level courses to meet their general ed. requirements.

University Control

- This proposal opens the door for the university to increase its control over what the School of Education does. It gives a university committee, not a school committee, control over the degrees and programs offered by a school. The course list being determined by the university is a real change in perspective from what we've traditionally done--it's a breach of ethics.

- Undergraduate degrees range from 122 - 128 credits; a degree can't exceed 128 credits. With this proposal, we're ceding 20 hours to University Division; these credits will have to be pulled out of the 128.

COAS

This proposal is an attempt to support COAS; only three Education courses are on the lists.

Direct Admits

This could lead to direct admits to the School of Education. It would enable us to better advise students.

Faculty Role

The most central role that faculty have is determining the curriculum, it's fundamental. If we let go of that, who are we?

Understanding of Proposal - HPER

HPER is looking this now, their Academic Council met last Friday, it seemed that they understood that the 20 cr. would be on top of the other required credits, unless courses matched up.

Certification

- The issue of graduating students without certification and offering additional courses for certification may have to be revisited.
- This proposal doesn't consider the issue of certification, this is a liberal arts proposal. We are a school that is tied to certification of teachers.

Can we use certification issue as an argument? We have to make judgments about what will help students be able to teach, to ensure that students are prepared to teach. In order to have competent graduates we need to have integrated Arts & Science and Education courses.

E. Action

- This group has to decide on their reaction to this proposal, write a response, and submit it to Policy Council within a week. It will be helpful for others and Policy Council to know what we are thinking and to have it in writing.
- TEC needs additional information on: how the vote will be conducted and how courses will be selected for the lists.
- Today we can agree on a list of sentiments and Lanny will write a document and share it with the Council to review.

F. Discussion of Principles and Objections

Faculty and Curriculum

- The faculty role in determining curriculum is fundamental. It should have integrity within in each unit.
- Faculty determination of curriculum is a fundamental principle which will be violated by the process this puts in place.

Rationale

- There's no intellectual justification for this proposal, these categories, or any other curriculum strategies, that would provide the intellectual experience with some kind of integrity and unity for the general education requirements portion of a student's academic career.

- We need to think about general education in terms of courses that lead somewhere instead of abstract collections of individual pieces.

Timeline

- The proposal raises the questions: Why are we doing this? Why do people want this proposal?
- The timeline for this process is much too short including the time that we have to respond to the proposal. The timeline should be questioned--this is a campus-wide proposal, we have only two months to discuss it.

Discussions

We recommend that larger discussions go on beyond the Campus Curriculum Committee so this isn't decided by just one group.

Voting

How will the decision on the proposal be made? By faculty units or by a majority vote?

Proposal is Premature

There are too many questions remaining at this point, including how courses will be selected for the lists. This proposal is premature.

The TEC is sympathetic to balancing the need for student choice and exploration with focus and integrity in choice of courses.

Lanny will write up the comments and will send it out to the TEC for review, and then to the Policy Council.

