

Indiana University School of Education  
Committee on Teacher Education  
Minutes  
Monday, November 15, 2004, 4:00 p.m.  
Room 2277

**Present:** Luise McCarty, Brent Gault, Tim Niggle, Lisa Gilbert, Greg Mongold, Laura Stachowski, Thomas Brush, David Estell, Harold Green, Jose Bonner, Jill Shedd, Diana Lambdin

**Others Attending:** Andy Norton, Martha Nyikos, Jeanne Novotny, Christine Bennett, David Flinders, Cathy Brown

**Handouts:** September 28 minutes with addendum (1.1, light pink), Documentation for ESL License (2.1 purple), Standards Matrix for ESL Certification (2.2, white), Program Proposal (2.3, dark pink), Course Description (2.4, blue), Program Requirements (2.5, green), Description of Q405 Course Changes (3.1, yellow), Description of M130/101 Course Changes (4.1, orange), Social Studies Program Memo (7.1), Post-Bac Certification Options Table (8.1).

**1. Approval of September 28 minutes with addendum**

(Handouts: 1.1)

After briefly reviewing the September 28 minutes, including the addendum regarding the approval of secondary math methods courses M321 and M422, it was motioned by Greg Mongold and seconded by Laura Stachowski that the minutes be approved.

**MOTION PASSED.**

**Approved minutes from the 9/28/04 CTE meeting were forwarded to Jane Kaho for posting on the Policy Council webpage.**

**2. Voting Item: ESL license addition documentation—Martha Nyikos**

(Handouts: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5)

Jill Shedd began the discussion with a brief overview of the plans to develop an ENL program option into the 2002 licensure framework. ENL (English as a New Language per state of Indiana, but also known as ESL) will be referenced as an addition to a teaching license. The intent of the program is to be an add-on to an existing license. ENL/ESL programs are currently in high demand and IU has a program in place which historically has been completed in summer intensive courses. Now the faculty has upgraded the program to meet the 2002 licensure framework.

In the absence of Martha Nyikos at this point in the discussion, members posed potential questions to be asked about the program, then moved on to item 5 until Martha Nyikos arrived.

Upon Martha Nyikos' arrival, members then posed questions regarding the program. Major concerns included:

- how the bilingual/bicultural education program relates to the ESL license addition
- what a practicum would look like for those already teaching in a classroom

- the problems associated with switching status back and forth between IUPUI and IU Bloomington
- the problems associated with switching status back and forth between undergraduate and graduate levels
- whether or not there has to be a formal admission to the program or simply a declaration of intent.

In light of these concerns, it was decided that revisions be made to the program and the proposal be brought back to the January 20, 2005 meeting for voting.

### **5. Voting Item: Proposal for a fixed deadline for program change**

Jill Shedd introduced the item and asked that a deadline be made for faculty to submit any changes to their programs for the new academic year. The suggested deadline is April 1. By creating this deadline, program advising sheets, which act as a contract for the track students will be following for an academic year, will not have to incorporate potentially confusing additions and effective dates. This will allow the Office of Teacher Education to prepare one advising sheet and share it with faculty, etc. to be prepared for the new academic year as well as freshmen orientation over the summer. Diana Lambdin noted that this does not mean that any and all changes will be accepted just because they are submitted before April 1; rather, it simply means that no changes will be accepted after April 1. It was moved and seconded that the April 1 deadline be established for all program changes. **MOTION PASSED.**

### **3. Course/Program Approval: Q405—Valarie Akerson**

(Handouts: 3.1)

It was proposed that Q405 be changed to reflect changes in the science education faculty teaching the course. Whereas the course was once E405/Q405 and taught by COAS faculty, it is now taught by science education faculty. The changes to Q405 would ensure that the School of Education would receive the tuition dollars for teaching the course rather than COAS. Members posed questions about the course change, including:

- Why not make the course credits a variable 1-4 credits as opposed to the suggested fixed 4 credits?
- Does the course have a field experience component and should there be a fee attached?
- Does the current course name still reflect the nature of the course?

Valarie Akerson was not present at the meeting to answer questions, thus it was suggested that voting be postponed until the January 20 meeting with the expectation that Valarie would be there to answer questions.

### **7. Discussion Item: Social Studies general education requirement—Christine Bennett**

(Handouts: 7.1)

Due to higher enrollments in COAS seminars on teaching social studies and problems accommodating all students, Christine Bennett and the Social Studies faculty requested the following temporary changes for the 2004-2005 year:

- Waiving the COAS seminar requirement for students who entered the program in fall 2004 (this year only)
- Waiving the intensive writing requirement for social studies students who entered the program in fall 2004
- Waiving the intensive writing requirement for social studies students who enter in spring 2005

In the fall of 2005, the faculty hopes to have reinstated requirements and find avenues for students to meet intensive writing requirements elsewhere.

The topical seminar is three credits. Diana Lambdin clarified that although the class is waived, this does not mean that students receive the three credits, only that the seminar will not be available and the credits will need to be sought elsewhere. Jill Shedd clarified that this is only for those students registered in Block I for fall 2004, not all students admitted in fall 2004. This clarification should be reflected in the written proposal, so that where it once read “for students who entered the program” should now read “for students registered in Block I.” With this revision, it was motioned and seconded to approve the temporary modifications to the COAS seminar requirements and intensive writing requirements. **MOTION PASSED.**

**4. Course/Program Approval: M130/M101—Enid Zimmerman**

Tabled until next meeting

**6. Discussion Item: Education honors program update—Luise McCarty**

A small committee from various departments will meet with the representatives from the honors program to devise a proposal for further development of the education honors program. This proposal will utilize existing courses to develop requirements for the honors program.

**8. Discussion Item: Simplifying Post-Bac Certification Options—Jill Shedd, Diana Lambdin**

(Handouts: 8.1)

This will be a continuing discussion for CTE until a decision for simplification is agreed upon. The discussion opened with a brief overview of the various routes to post-baccalaureate certification and the cost and benefits of each, given program needs and external demands on the School of Education.

David Flinders proposed that the policy of minimum requirements in Transition to Teaching be adopted by the other programs in order to achieve consistency across the programs. Cathy Brown and others were opposed to this, arguing that although the School of Education is required to have a program like Transition to Teaching for faster certification, these students will be less prepared to teach. Although there are no policies preventing recent graduates from being admitted to the Transition to Teaching program, the intention of the program is generally for those who already have experience but are looking for a career change, to give them a faster way to achieve certification. Thus, advisors may want to dissuade recent graduates from entering the Transition to Teaching program because they will be less prepared and they may have fewer chances to be hired as teachers.

It was noted that a major part of simplifying options will require these program requirements to be aligned with standards just as undergraduate education programs are.