

Indiana University School of Education
Committee on Teacher Education
November 06, 2006

Minutes

Present: Laura Stachowski, Diana Lambdin, Jill Shedd, Brent Gault, Lissa May, Andrea McCloskey, David Estell, Enrique Galindo, and Gerald Campano

Others Present: Jeane Novotny, Jesse Goodman and Juliana Hallows

I. Welcome: David Estell conducted the meeting on behalf of Tom Brush. David Estell briefly reviewed items on the agenda.

1. Approval of October 18, 2006 Minutes

—David Estell

Handout: October 18 Minutes (buff)

David Estell opened the meeting by giving members an opportunity to review the October 18, 2006 minutes. There was one grammatical correction and a name correction. It was motioned that the minutes be approved and it was seconded: MOTION APPROVED.

II. Discussion Item: NCATE and Social Justice

—Jesse Goodman

Jesse Goodman came to express his concern to the CTE about the School of Education's use of NCATE as an accrediting body. He stated that NCATE, from pressures of the government and educational groups, removed the term "social justice" as an example of a teacher disposition from its appendices. Jesse Goodman expressed that this was not a major issue, as NCATE did not state that schools could not have it as a standard; however, he believes that this was an example of government intrusion on teacher education. Jesse Goodman wanted the committee to discuss possible actions that the university should do in response. Possibilities include sending a letter to NCATE through the Presidents office; to drop the use of NCATE as the schools accrediting body, and/or possibly using a different organization such as TEAC. Jesse Goodman then cited from the Indiana Plan for Title 2 Reporting Requirements for Higher Education, sections 207 and 208 of October 4, 2000 which states that actual accreditation is strongly suggested but not required.

Enrique Galindo then clarified that the school is not a member of NCATE and Jill Shedd added that we are members of AACTE: the American Association of College Teacher Education. A member from AACTE sits on the board that governs NCATE. Enrique Galindo remarked that this would be a bigger issue if the School of Education had Social Justice as a standard. He asked if there were any other options for accreditation. Jill Shedd responded that the School of Education has the option to be reviewed by the State of Indiana or by NCATE.

Laura Stachowski asked what the differences were between TEAC and NCATE. Jill Shedd responded that they are both very different processes with TEAC focusing more on quantitative data. However, TEAC is not currently offered as an option for accreditation in the State of Indiana.

Jesse Goodman was excused and the committee then discussed this item further. Jill Shedd commented that removal of the school's participation would not change the amount of work that each program within the school would have to complete. She continued that the issue lies in the reciprocity of teacher's licensure across states and how the school would be affected if it were to choose a different accrediting body. One benefit to NCATE is the likelihood of reciprocity of Indiana licensure across states.

Enrique Galindo stated that he would like more information about the NCATE issue. The committee agreed and stated that it is worth further discussion. Diana Lambdin added that she believed Gerardo Gonzalez was going to send a letter to NCATE to gather information about this concern for the committee to discuss. Jill Shedd then gave a brief history of NCATE. She closed by remarking that the Indiana State Division Professional Standards is looking at the options like TEAC and examining the reciprocity of licensure with other options.

III. Discussion Item: UAS Report, Music Education

—Lissa May and Brent Gault

Handout: Program Review for Music Education (green)

Brent Gault and Lissa May introduced the unit assessment report for the Music Education Program (MEP). The full report can be viewed on Oncourse and includes the following: *program overview, demographic information, faculty, assessment points, program review and appendixes.*

Brent Gault explained that the program is designed to address the guiding principles of the School of Education, Indiana Professional Standards Board, the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium, the North Central Association for Teacher Education, and the National Association of Schools of Music. MEP currently offers two degrees: Bachelor of Music Education degree and a Master of Science in Music Education. MEP also offers certification for those who have completed an undergraduate degree in music and have met the admissions requirements.

Brent Gault described the admissions process for undergraduates; which, consists of a performance audition, music education interview which examines what applicants have accomplished prior to admissions and why they would like to become an educator. Graduate students must also include a video of their teaching and they must have taken the Praxis I as well.

MEP provides the opportunity for students to focus their education in specialty tracks within the following fields: (1) choral music; (2) general (classroom) music; (3) instrumental (band); and (4) instrumental (orchestral) music. Lissa May added that the specialty tracks provide a unique opportunity for MEP students as compared to other programs.

Approximately 152 students audition for MEP and 66 are admitted, which is a 43% admittance rate. Of those admitted only 25% (38 students) attend. Brent Gault cited student and faculty demographics from the handout. Gerald Campano asked if MEP does anything to recruit students from under funded schools. Lissa May and Brent Gault both expressed that was a real challenge MEP is facing.

The assessment process for MEP consists of: 1) the admissions auditions process; 2) an *upper divisional review* (UDR) that occurs during the student's sophomore year; and 3) a professional portfolio evaluation. The UDR consists of an evaluation of student's current progress in course work, performance, music

skills, communication, and contains faculty references. Lissa May describe this process in detail and expressed the importance of the UDR in helping student do better, solidify their career choice, and evaluate progress. Diana Lambdin asked what happens when students decide not to continue with MEP. Lissa May replied that in some cases students may change to a different degree in the School of Music or they are referred to the General Studies Program. The discussion continued regarding 2003-2006 UDR summary of review. The appendixes provide the evaluation rubrics and criterion for each assessment process.

Some of MEP's strengths include the attraction of high-quality students, high employment rate of graduates (who then become leaders in the field), and 100% passing rate of the Praxis II exam. Brent Gault stated that the specialized training and diverse faculty add to MEP's strengths as well. Furthermore, MEP has hired a string music education faculty member which has contributed to an increase in the number of string MEP students from an average of 5 to 14 this fall.

The audition process presents a challenge in that admittance is dependent on what spaces are available in faculty performance studios. Only 33 % of students do not complete MEP which is another concern. Brent Gault stated that when they reviewed the students that chose to leave the program they had scored poorly on their UDR. Brent Gault continues that it has been challenging for MEP to recruit diverse populations, however, they are continuing to work on this issue. The last presenting concern was the improvement of conducting and piano skills areas. Questions followed about the structure and processes of the UDR.

IV. Discussion Item: Update on Common Lower Division Curriculum for Elementary Education

Handout: Revised Common Ground Proposal (salmon)

Enrique Galindo reported that a Common Lower Division General Education for Elementary Education has been approved by the Education Council. The handout reflects the final approved curriculum. Laura Stachowski described the meeting and the process that occurred to get the proposal approved. She stated that one or two members did not approve the curriculum but the majority voted and then approved the proposal for Common Lower Division Curriculum for Elementary Education. David Estell remarked that handout is close to the current curriculum. Diana Lambdin agreed but then elaborated on some of the differences (i.e. the humanities section). She remarked that the Bloomington campus will need to decide how they are going to address these changes. Enrique Galindo asked Laura Stachowski if there was a committee that has been designated to oversee and approve the changes that will need to occur and if the committee discussed the expectation that students finish their degree in two more years after transferring. Laura Stachowski responded that it was not discussed. Diana Lambdin added that the goal of this curriculum agreement was to produce an agreement and it was not necessary to be a "2 plus 2" track. Jill Shedd continued that in the meeting it was not discussed how curriculum changes would be implemented and whose courses would be selected and used. It was suggested that the committee forward items to Gerardo Gonzalez to be on the agenda for the next Education Council meeting in April.

V. Discussion Item: Bachelor of Science in Education without Certification

—Diana Lambdin

Handout: New Degree without Certification Process (pink)

This item has been tabled for the next meeting.

Tentative Discussion Item: Revisiting the Six Principles

—Jill Shedd

Handout: Colorful Bookmarks

This item has been tabled for the next meeting.

There was a motion to adjourn, the motion was seconded, and the meeting was adjourned.