

**IU School of Education
Teacher Education Council
November 9, 2000**

Present: Jim Ansaldo, Christine Bennett, Don Cunningham, Ginette Delandshere, Amy Flint, Tom Gregory, Janet Johnson, Diana Lambdin, Fritz Lieber, Lissa May, Jill Shedd, Mary York;
Others attending: Bob Appelman, Bradley Levinson; Minutes taken by: Janet Anelli

Handouts: Documents mailed prior to meeting: Minutes from October 5, 2000 and October 18, 2000 meetings, 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), School of Education Constitution; Handouts at meeting: New Course Request - Latino Education Across the Americas (H380), Memo: To: TEC, From: Ed St. John, Policy Council (10/18/00)

I. MINUTES

Vote: Motion to approve minutes from October 5, 2000 meeting with the following change: Page 3 under Specifying Assessment, add the word "assessment" to the last sentence.

PASSED.

Vote: Motion to approve minutes from October 18, 2000 meeting with the following changes: Page 2, Paragraph 2, change the phrase from "the TEC was a Faculty Council committee" to "the TEC was a Policy Council committee." Page 2, Paragraph 2, rephrase the sentence to, "The dean asked the LRPC to look at the constitution as part of the strategic planning process." Page 6, Paragraph 4: Change "21st Center Teachers" to "21st Century Teachers."

PASSED.

II. TEACHER EDUCATION GOAL FROM RETREAT

A. Change in Dates

Ginette presented the TEC's ideas for addressing this goal at the October faculty meeting. At that meeting the due date for completing work on the goals from the retreat was changed from early spring semester to December 15, 2000. The seriousness of the task was questioned if there is to be a December deadline. The process that the TEC outlined in the last meeting would be impossible with a deadline of 12/15/00; it gives the council only 3 - 4 weeks to work on the project. Could an alternate plan with some dates be presented?

B. Funding

This task is important because the recommendations that the TEC make could be the basis for funding in the school for the next 3 - 5 years. Given the short timeline, the council may not be able to accomplish much with this goal, will that information still be useful for someone to look at and develop funding plans for the next 3 - 5 years?

C. List

The list from the retreat provides a good place to start working on the teacher education goal because it provides a number of ideas and it was created with a lot of input from people at the retreat. The list could be used as a stimulus for ideas and action. It is a sort of laundry list of things; the TEC can't respond to all of them by 12/15/00. The items could be prioritized and the most important ones selected for further work--the items on the list are not necessarily equal. There are also connections between the items so the list could be reduced to 5 or 6 main themes.

D. Big Issues

It was proposed that since the TEC will be looking at teacher education and identifying what is important to supporting the goal related to teacher education, that it should take the opportunity to ask more challenging questions. The process should incorporate a way to generate larger, important questions not just to work with the laundry list of items from the retreat though they can be helpful for stimulating ideas. The TEC does not necessarily need to answer the questions at this time but could propose them for consideration.

One question to consider relates to the size of the undergraduate programs--some feel that we're at or are beyond capacity. It seems people don't want to discuss downsizing but the TEC can take this opportunity to look at the issue.

E. Process

The TEC needs to reconsider the process for accomplishing this task given the new timeline. Some members thought a significant study should be conducted.

Step 1:

The first step of this process may be to use the list as a stimulus in considering the goal. The council could review the list and add or delete items, and then categorize them. Four or five critical goals/questions/themes could then be identified. To meet the December deadline, the TEC could synthesize from there based on their knowledge about education. Under each goal or question, the group could create a set of linkages to other work being done such as the unit assessment and the 21st Century Teachers Project.

Concern: By the 12/15/00 deadline, the TEC could draw on their own views and could pull together some ideas, however, when they work on other projects like unit assessment later in the year, that work could change how they look at this goal.

By the December date, the group might focus on a few big goals and create a more manageable set of ideas to work with, but the ideas will not be well developed. The ideas will need to be fleshed out and the group needs to have a dialogue with a broader audience before they could say that they are comfortable with what is developed and that it is a reflection of the school.

Step 2:

The next step could focus on how to address each of these goals or questions-- what steps could be taken to operationalize them. The group probably couldn't get this step done by mid-December.

Next, the group could reorganize and categorize the information, then look at how it fits with the other things the TEC is working on such as unit assessment and the 21st Century Teachers Project. It seems that this other work also fits under the teacher education goal.

Step 3:

This step could involve collecting additional input, some ideas for this include the following:

- o Teams from the TEC could interview 1 or 2 people from each program to validate what was developed.
- o The goals/questions could be taken to the program coordinators to get their input.
- o TEC members could go to other groups and ask for their input related to the work that's been done.
- o Open forums could be held to obtain input.

Concerns:

- o There is value in going to the program directors and others to get their thoughts but that may be breaking up the big questions into little questions; the big questions may not get asked.
- o The TEC could try to get thoughts from program coordinators but if this is done very quickly given the new deadline, it's unlikely that thoughtful, substantive information will be obtained.
- o The TEC shouldn't just get input from the faculty, others should be involved too. People outside the School of Ed. (COAS) should also be included.

F. Comments & Questions

- o Could the recommendations include having a longer, more involved process? Perhaps two plans could be made with the first part delivered by 12/15/00.
- o Long range planning usually deals with goals, focusing at a higher level, looking at our dreams and our vision, not necessarily how things will be accomplished.
- o What is the School of Education's role in undergraduate education?
- o How do these questions intersect with the new programs (10 teacher ed. programs)?
- o Products: The Policy Council and dean want to see the best articulation of the goal, a set of recommendations, and objectives by which they can be operationalized.

G. Goals/Themes Related to Teacher Education

Ideas related to the list were grouped into a few major areas:

1. COAS/ Educating teachers in content; our relationship with COAS
Diana Lambdin
2. Increase quality and diversity of students
Mary York
3. Partnerships between schools and the School of Education
Amy Flint
4. Increase quality of instruction
 - Als, faculty, adjunct instructors
 - Reduce size
 - Broader involvement of faculty in teacher education
Fritz Lieber

5. Commitment to evidence-based decision making
Jill Shedd
6. Reaffirming teacher education principles
 - Supporting the new teacher education programs
Christine Bennett
7. Issues related to communication, governance, and size
Tom Gregory

The six principles were considered to see how they relate to these issues.

H. Item 7

Governance

Item 7 was added to the list because there are concerns about redefining the governance structure so it represents the interests of the stakeholders. This item can also deal with the current questions concerning governance as it relates to the TEC. It seems that the Policy Council has decided to recentralize power in the faculty and this is affecting the TEC because this council has several non-faculty members and faculty from outside Education. It seems that the faculty wants to spread out the work but not the power.

Comments:

- o It's one thing to have broad participation but people don't have broad responsibility; teachers in the schools aren't that involved with teacher education.
- o People ought to be involved in decision making to the degree that they're affected by it. Undergraduate students have almost no say about how programs are run and they are greatly affected. Stakeholders have varying degrees of involvement.
- o We need to be careful how we go about changing governance.
- o Governance and redistribution of power is fundamental piece of reform— governance should be a reflection of the stakeholders involved.

Size

Some members were concerned about the large size of the undergraduate program and thought it prevents the school from providing quality instruction. Others said that small size is enabling and that decreasing size doesn't necessarily mean things will improve; the focus should be on providing quality.

Communication

There was also concern about addressing the issue of communication across the university, at all levels, and between all groups

I. Task For Next Meeting

The people listed with each item, 1 - 7, agreed to work on that topic area, they will:

- o Write one to two paragraphs to explain and flesh out the goal.
- o Make linkages to the other efforts the council is involved in such as unit assessment.
- o Send the draft to Tom and he will try to build it into a coherent document.

Tom will write the overarching piece on the fundamental elements in item 7. When he receives the documents from the others and has pulled them all together, he will send a draft

out to people to review before the next meeting. He'll contact the group with some dates. The group can then polish this document and use it as a stimulus for discussion, and then submit the results by 12/15/00. The plan is to have more dialogue about this goal next semester.

III. NEW COURSE REQUEST: LATINO EDUCATION ACROSS THE AMERICAS (H380)

Bradley Levinson

Handout: *New Course Request: Latino Education Across the Americas (H380) and course syllabus*

This course is joint listed with COAS as a Latino Studies course (LAT S380). Students can sign up for the course either through COAS or Education. The timing is good because there is concern about increasing cooperation with COAS. Initially the course will be taught by Education faculty. It is difficult to predict enrollments, if more students from COAS take the course, then later they may have to talk to COAS about fees.

The Latino Studies program in COAS is in its second year. The course will also count in the Latin America Studies minor. The course can also be used as a general education requirement in Education.

Vote: Motion to approve the new course request: *Latino Education Across the Americas (H380)*.
PASSED.

IV. TEACHER EDUCATION COUNCIL - GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

Tom and Lanny met and discussed the governance of the TEC. Since the 10/5/00 meeting, the Policy Council has said that the TEC is not in the constitution and has put TEC under the Policy Council. It seems that they have already made this decision so some of the strategies the council considered previously are no longer workable.

A. How the TEC Can Proceed

Tom discussed three possible courses of action:

1. Accept the situation the way it seems to be developing now, that the TEC is a standing committee of the Policy Council, that the Policy Council will decide the council membership, and that they have created a faculty majority in the membership.
2. Collect historical information about how the TEC was originally set up, what it was intended to do and what its governance was meant to be in order to figure out what was originally intended. A meeting could be convened including three of the key people involved in that initial process: Don Warren (dean), Larry Brown (former dean and first chair of TEC), and Gerald Marker (former Director of Teacher Ed.). Once the council has the information from them, a document could be created to describe what was meant to be and a process started to renegotiate the TEC's position. Policy Council could still take back control at any time.
3. Acknowledge that the TEC is not part of the School of Education's constitution but ought to be. The group could write an amendment that describes the TEC, its place in the governance structure, its membership, how membership is picked, voting power,

etc. The TEC could then go through the long process of seeking an amendment to the School of Education's constitution.

B. Reviewing Documents

Policy Council Minutes

There was some discussion of the handouts including Policy Council minutes from 1991. These minutes were the best references found concerning the creation of the TEC but those from the meetings in which the TEC was approved are vague.

Operating Procedures

Diana briefly explained the background of the operating procedures (see handout from 10/05/00). They were created because the council needed some guidelines to follow during meetings especially related to voting and quorums. This was an internal document and was not sent to the Policy Council.

C. Issues

Changes this Year

It's not clear why changes have been made this year but now that they have occurred, it doesn't seem that the administration wants to change them. It's not clear if what occurred was a purposeful attempt to wrest power from the TEC. This situation needs to be clarified.

History of TEC

Why talk to the individuals who were in the originating group? It would help in collecting background information because there is not a clear understanding of why the council was created the way it was and the original intent, for example, why did they decide not to make the TEC a standing committee of the Policy Council? Some members felt that involving the former deans would create problems politically.

TEC Membership

The strength of the TEC is its diversity-- having representatives from schools, faculty outside Education, and students. The composition of the council and who selects the members is an issue now. Some think the group should be more distributed than it is now.

D. Next Steps

Can the issues related to governance and the TEC's role be dealt with when Tom discusses item 7? It can be discussed there with a recommendation for further study. The relationships and governance need to be clarified. It was suggested that the group review the wording of item 7, including governance, then this issue can be reconsidered..

V. COMPUTER ENDORSEMENT PROGRAM - NEW COURSE REQUESTS

Bob Appelman - Coordinator of Endorsement Program
(See handouts from 10/05/00.)

A. Follow Up From Last Meeting

Page 3 of the minutes from the 10/05/00 meeting includes a list of the next steps for these courses.

- o **Which Campuses use Courses**
Bob found that the courses are taught on all campuses. Endorsements were offered at IUPUI, Fort Wayne, and South Bend. He contacted those campuses and discussed the course changes; they supported the changes.
- o **Approval**
All course requests were signed by the department head.
- o **Changes**
W210: A typo on W220 was corrected, W210 is now listed as a pre- or co-requisite of W220.
W450: A parenthetical statement was added at the end of the description, "Enrollment in this course should be for one credit each semester for up to 6 credits for the Cohort." This addresses both the cohort and other students.

B. Assessment Statements

After talking to people at the other campuses, Bob thought the statements about assessment including portfolios should remain in the course descriptions, the others supported including those statements.

Reasons to include assessment statements:

- o It's important for students to realize when they enroll in the course, that a portfolio will be required.
- o They are trying to standardize across the campuses.
- o If students are required to begin their portfolio in the early courses then they will have the basics as they progress to higher level courses no matter on which campus they take the course. The program wants students to start assembling the portfolio in the early courses.
- o If students getting an endorsement don't have a portfolio that is representative of technology it will be very difficult for them to gain any credentials to show that they have extra competence. They are starting in early classes to build the portfolio; it's an essential part of this program.

Reason not to include assessment statements:

Including those statements in the descriptions *prescribes* the type of assessment that individual teachers will have to include, that can be done without specifying it in the course description. The requirement could instead be included in the course syllabus.

Vote:

W210: Motion to approve this course with the statement concerning assessment.

PASSED. (5 approved, 4 opposed)

W220: Motion to approve this course with no statement concerning assessment.

PASSED.

W310: Motion to approve this course with the statement concerning assessment.

NOT APPROVED. (4 approved, 5 opposed)

W450: Motion to approve this course.

PASSED.

W310: Motion to approve this course with this statement concerning assessment, "*Learning will be documented and assessed through written assignments and a teaching portfolio.*"

PASSED. (5 approved, 4 opposed)

The discussion of the In-Service Computer Certificate Program was postponed to a future meeting.

VI. REPRESENTATIVE FOR DIVERSITY COMMITTEE

Jim Ansaldo will be the TEC representative for the Diversity Committee during the remainder of the fall semester. Christine Bennett will be the representative in the spring.