

IU School of Education
Teacher Education Council
October 5, 2000

Present:

Jim Ansaldo, Lanny Beyer, Cathy Brown, Don Cunningham, Ginette Delandshere, Amy Flint, Tom Gregory, Janet Johnson, Diana Lambdin (Frank Lester from 4 - 5 pm), Fritz Lieber, Lissa May, Mary York; Others attending: Bob Appelman, Mary McMullen; Minutes taken by: Janet Anelli

Handouts:

Documents mailed to members 9/27/00: Minutes from 5/4/00 Meeting; Assessment White Paper (3/4/98); **Computer Endorsement:** Course Change Submissions and Program Information to the TEC (5/19/00), Computer Endorsement Overview (12/27/99), The Computer Endorsement Cohort, Course Change Requests: Survey of Computer-Based Education (W210), Technical Issues in Computer-Based Education (W220), Computer-Based Teaching Methods (W310), Research in Instructional Computing (W450), Topical Explorations in Education (F401); **Early Childhood Education:** New Course Requests: Foundations of Early Care and Education from Birth to Age 3 (E348), Teaching and Learning for all Young Children I - Birth Through Age 3 (E349), Course Change Request: Teaching and Learning for All Young Children II (E354); **Additional documents distributed at meeting:** Proposal for In-Service Technology Education Certificate (8/27/00); Operating Procedures for the Teacher Education Council; Assessment Ideas and Activities (10/5/00)

I. **MINUTES**

Vote: Motion to approve minutes from 5/4/00 meeting with sentence change on page 5, change "F200 is a topical course but not an experimental one" to "F200 is not an experimental course."
PASSED.

II. **COURSE CHANGES - COMPUTER ENDORSEMENT PROGRAM**

Bob Appelman

Handouts: *Course Change Submissions and Program Information to the TEC (5/19/00), Computer Endorsement Overview (12/27/99), The Computer Endorsement Cohort, Course Change Requests: Survey of Computer-Based Education (W210), Technical Issues in Computer-Based Education (W220), Computer-Based Teaching Methods (W310), Research in Instructional Computing (W450), Topical Explorations in Education (F401)*

A. **Background**

Last semester those involved with the endorsement program looked at the ISTE Standards as goals for the endorsement students to meet. As a result of that process they adjusted the outcomes so they matched what they wanted to cover in W210, W310, and W220. They are submitting these course requests because they found that the course descriptions no longer matched the changes they made in the program. Also, they updated some of the courses and needed to revise the language and terminology so it was more current and matched the new focus on networking and operating systems instead of programming. They worked with IUPUI so these changes matched what they are doing as well.

The information on F401 and W450 relates to a new, alternative cohort path that they are testing out.

B. **Questions and Comments**

W210 - Why was some information left out of the new course description that sounded important such as the social, moral, and technological issues of educational computing?
They will address that information in W310. It is not specified, but they felt the content was incorporated under the phrase "infusing technology into the K12 curriculum."

The course change request for F401 asks to change the number to W420. Is F401 only a computer endorsement course? No, it's a topical course. The endorsement program can't eliminate F401 as a course, it's more than just a course in their program, others use it as well. Should this be a new course or a course change request? If they want this course to be experimental for now, they can continue to use F401 as the number and then later they can submit a new course request.
Bob withdrew the F401 course change request.

W450 - Internship Fees

If this course is listed as an internship the Bursar will charge students \$50.00 in addition to the regular course fees. The program doesn't want students charged extra for this course so they may reword the course description.

"Internship" usually refers to something beyond student teaching not before. The higher course number reinforces this impression. Instead, W450 is how they will handle early field experience in the endorsement.

Apprenticeship

In the cohort document (under Components of the Program, The Apprenticeship) there is a statement referring to the apprenticeship, "The relationship continues through student teaching." The use of "student teaching" in the statement is misleading, it is actually referring to the W410 practicum not student teaching so the wording should be changed.

What is the relationship between W410 and W450? They are related in terms of their field experiences, they provide two different options. In the W410 experience, students are placed with a teacher. There is more ownership in terms of dealing directly with teaching and instructing students. In the cohort, students start in the field from the first semester. They find a teacher and start working with the teacher.

Placements

Concerns were raised about guaranteeing up to 15 computer endorsement placements in local communities based on the limited placement resources, however, the 15 placements are over a 3 year period, they aren't simultaneous.

Do the endorsement placements have to be local? Usually the placements for the endorsements are outside the local schools and that will work for the program. They are very sensitive to issues involved with placements.

In W310 they also have field experiences and students have to find a teacher that's willing to work with them, they aren't 'placing' them. Some faculty have contacts to which they refer students. TEC members were concerned about students being given the responsibility to contact teachers directly and felt that teachers would not like this approach. Others said the principal should at least be contacted first. It seemed it would be best to coordinate with the placement office.

Due to the limited placements available and the growing concerns of MCCSC about our high needs for placements, some schools will only take a set number of placements at a time. The School of Education as well as Business, SPEA, and Nursing may be trying to place students in the schools.

Experiences Outside of Schools and Acting as Consultants

The endorsement students also work with the Boys & Girls Club; they have a broader field--teaching and integrating technology into instructional environments.

The endorsement students have a benefit to offer the placement settings as well, they can provide professional development for teachers; so theirs is a more symbiotic relationship. The cohort may work with a whole school as a consultant providing a service. This helps because they can negotiate a service.

W450: Some students (about half) work with W200 instructors. They need to work with a teacher and this can occur within the School of Education. If students have outside placements, they will be supervised: they complete the standard forms, Bob visits the students in schools, and evaluations are done.

Endorsements and Certificates

If endorsements are eliminated in the future the program will probably become a certificate program. They are working with David Kinman on this.

Courses Outside Bloomington

Are the courses used outside the Bloomington campus? They are not sure where the courses are used because the bulletin only lists IUB and IUPUI; they will check on this. The remonstrance process may take care of this concern.

Specifying Assessment

In W220 why is the assessment of exam and assignments specified? Doesn't this limit the instructors? The assessment was described on the other courses because it involves a portfolio. They thought because they were specifying it on some courses they should put it on all of them. Because of the emphasis on portfolios they felt it was important to include in the course descriptions.

Assessment

Comments:

- Even if they list the portfolios on certain courses do they need to specify assessment on W220 which is fairly standard?
- If they specify the assessment it sets a precedent so perhaps it shouldn't be specified on any of them.
- Could they list the portfolio as a component of the course instead of as the assessment? Or list it as work to be completed?
- They could take out the comments about assessment in the descriptions on all the forms.
- The assessment and portfolio requirement will be in the syllabus so perhaps it does not need to be in the course description. Course descriptions are used in the bulletin and also serve as a guideline for what is taught in a course.

Approvals

The course requests don't have approval signatures from the department chair, that should be included before the TEC approves them. These courses are offered through IST.

C. Next Steps

Bob will take the packet back and will resolve these issues:

- Determine if the courses are taught outside Bloomington.
- Obtain approval and signatures.
- Remove statements about assessment from course requests.

II. PROPOSAL FOR IN-SERVICE TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION CERTIFICATE

Bob Appelman

They created this certificate program because there are many practicing teachers who want to get some kind of certification related to technology. The computer endorsement discussed previously is geared towards preservice teachers. Some practicing teachers have participated in that program but it has not been a very good match for their needs--they would prefer more depth.

This certificate program will consist of a workshop, online courses, and a course offered during a semester in which teachers work at their schools and meet at some points to coordinate with their cohort. It is a 12 credit hour program.

They would like to discuss this proposal at the next TEC meeting.

III. CHANGES IN THE TEACHER EDUCATION COUNCIL

A. Issue

There is some concern this year about processes involving the TEC. Appointments to the council were made in a different way than in the past and there have been changes in the composition of the council. Lanny was informed by the Dean's office which School of Education faculty would be on the TEC this year and the number of SOE faculty was increased from 7 to 9 members. The message also stated that the new outside members would be appointed at the first meeting. In the past, TEC members were selected by the Director of Teacher Education or the Associate Dean of Teacher Education. It's not clear at this time who made these changes or why. These changes are problematic for purposes of faculty decision making and changing policies of an organization without any preliminary discussion.

B. Review of Documents

Lanny and Tom reviewed documents [*Teacher Education Governance Committee Report and Recommendations (8/15/91)*, *Memo: Teacher Education Council (9/16/91)*, *Policy Council Minutes (10/16/91)*, *Policy Council Minutes 11/20/91*] related to the creation and mission of the TEC. In 1991 a committee was formed to look at the issue of governance. In October 16, 1991, the Policy Council minutes approve the TEC with certain caveats though the caveats were not specified. The *Teacher Education Governance Committee Report and Recommendations (8/15/91)* Recommendations 8, 9, and 10 under Governance, were read.

They also reviewed the SOE constitution. The TEC did not exist at the time the constitution was written so there is no reference to it, but other review committees were created that dealt with undergraduate education such as the Undergraduate Program Committee. After reviewing the documents, it is still not clear exactly how the TEC should function and if the TEC is a standing committee of the Policy Council.

C. TEC Operating Procedures

The TEC has been following a set of operating procedures for the past several years. Diana gave some history about the development of these procedures. There was a need, after the TEC began to meet, to have some guidelines as to how they would operate and vote so they could better ensure having a quorum. They drafted a set of guidelines and refined them. It was thought they were in use since 1995 with a couple revisions since then. They served as an internal document.

D. Issues Raised Since Last Spring

Some members said that in meetings that occurred since last spring with the new dean, questions were raised about the TEC such as what is the TEC and by what authority has it acted in approving programs? The TEC was listed as a Policy Council committee. If they are not a Policy Council committee on what authority are they acting? Who gives the TEC the responsibility to make decisions? With all the changes in the Dean's office, there are new people looking at Teacher Ed. and the TEC. They are asking what is the best way for the TEC to function.

E. Composition of TEC

Some members stated that concerns had been raised at other meetings about the composition of the TEC. There have been 16 voting members but only 7 of them were School of Education faculty--a minority. There was concern that the majority was from outside the SOE faculty and that they were approving School of Ed. programs, courses, and policies.

Should there be a difference between reviewing and voting? Perhaps only the SOE faculty should be voting members and others would have a role to review and discuss.

The school/university partnership was about giving the schools a role in deliberation about what teacher education ought to be about. The TEC composition also gave Arts and Sciences a role.

Appointment to Committees

Members of Policy Council standing committees are appointed. In the past couple years faculty have indicated on which committees they were interested in serving. This gave the different committees a pool of people from which to select.

F. Questions and Concerns

What is the rationale behind the TEC processes? Who instituted the changes this year and what is the rationale behind it? Did someone say it wasn't working the way it is? We need to clarify the role of this committee and what is its status with respect to the Policy Council. Where does it fit within the standing committee structure?

In the past the TEC didn't "report" to the Policy Council but it did review and approve items that were then sent to the Policy Council. The TEC does set policy. There were concerns in the past that the TEC should be more proactive instead of reactive, by setting policy they are being more proactive.

G. Next Steps

Tom and Lanny proposed that they would write a memo of understanding of how the TEC ought to be operating and get reapproval of the process. They could write a draft for the next meeting stating the problem and giving some ideas for clearing up questions concerning the TEC's governance and structure. The TEC could develop and revise it, and then send it to the Policy Council.

Members requested copies of the documents related to the creation of the TEC that Lanny and Tom reviewed as well as the SOE constitution. They will be sent out before the next meeting.

IV. ELECTION OF TEC CHAIRPERSON

Tom Gregory was elected to chair the TEC during this academic year.

V. EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION - NEW COURSE REQUESTS AND COURSE CHANGE REQUEST

Mary McMullen

Handouts: *New Course Requests: Foundations of Early Care and Education from Birth to Age 3 (E348), Teaching and Learning for all Young Children I - Birth Through Age 3 (E349), Course Change Request: Teaching and Learning for All Young Children II (E354)*

A. Sophomore Year, Spring Semester

There are 13 credit hours of course work in this semester. The credits were originally in one large block course, E350. There was a conflict with the course number so it had to be changed. At the same time, the large block course in the junior year was being split into two smaller blocks. They decided to break the former E350 into two smaller blocks as well (6 cr. and 7 cr.) and change the course numbers to E348 and E349. The courses in the program are sequential and tie together.

Field Experience

The 1 credit hour field experience was included within the course. There were questions about separating that out which would enable field experiences to collect a fee for the course. If they separate the 1 cr. field experience they would like a new course number.

Focus of E348

What age is being focused on in E348, age 3 or age 8? The description discusses both which is confusing. The age group focused on in the methods and instructional component is birth to age 3--the very young child. The child development theory and information taught that first semester goes through age 8, covering the entire early childhood period.

- They could change the description to say that they will examine child development and learning and eliminate the age references if that would make it less confusing.
- The TEC has not seen syllabi for E348 and E349.

B. Junior Year, Spring Semester, E354

In the junior year, the program increased the field experience from 1 credit hour to 3 credit hours. A memo was sent to the TEC on 10/8/99 from Cary Buzzelli concerning this change but it was never discussed in a TEC meeting. Methods are being taught in that semester: 2 cr. math methods, 2 cr. science methods, 2 cr. language arts methods, and 2 cr. social studies methods. With only 1 credit hour of field experience they were not getting enough time in the field to do lessons in each subject area.

The field experience increase will change the program from 125 credit hours to 127. The course change specifies a change from 10 to 12 hours. It's likely they will separate this field experience from the block as well.

- Three credit hours of field experience will translate into approximately three ½ days per week in a K/primary classroom.
- E354 is a Bloomington only course.

C. Resubmit Paperwork

Mary will withdraw the current course requests and will resubmit the paperwork. She will create separate courses for the field experiences.

VI. ASSESSMENT

Lanny Beyer

Handouts: *Assessment White Paper (3/4/98)*, *Assessment Ideas and Activities (10/5/00)*

Lanny distributed the *Assessment Ideas and Activities* document which concerns the assessment of programs and submission of the unit assessment system. The system has to be submitted by 6/30/02 and approved by 6/20/04. Any institution that doesn't have a unit assessment system in place by 6/20/04 will not be able to graduate students. Given the size of our program and the number of programs we have, this will be a complicated and time consuming process. Both the INTASC principles and the developmental content standards must be incorporated and we need to provide evidence that our students have met these standards. Students will have to demonstrate that in school settings. The assessment plan has to be approved by the Standards Board and NCATE will look at our assessment plan in its review in 2002.

Jill and Lanny are working on the unit assessment system and have held a series of meetings with program coordinators to discuss the requirements of the Standards Board. Until now the faculty have not been very involved with the assessment system.

The Assessment White paper is also a key component of our internal activities and how we assess them. The white paper articulates a philosophy of evaluation and a set of practices. It requires an annual review of all programs and provides guiding questions. There are some differences between the assessment white paper and the other requirements but they are not incompatible.

We have a two-tiered assessment challenge and the TEC has to play a pivotal role in coordinating and overseeing the process.

VII. TEACHER EDUCATION GOAL FROM RETREAT

The TEC also has a charge from the retreat to work on the Teacher Education goal. The Agenda Committee discussed the five goals and determined which committees would work on them. The TEC can work on the goal or can appoint a subcommittee to work on it.

To accomplish this the TEC needs to look at the discussions from the retreat, flesh out the goal and review the wording and determine how the goal can be operationalized. The TEC then needs to give a progress report in the October faculty meeting and in January report to the Long Range Planning Committee.

Some concern was expressed about the TEC taking on so many tasks.

