

Indiana University School of Education
Committee on Teacher Education
December 04, 2006

Minutes

Present: Tom Brush, David Estell, Enrique Galindo, Diana Lambdin, Donetta Cothran for Keith Chapin, Jose Bonner, Jill Shedd, Brent Gault, Laura Stachowski, Tim Niggle, Andrea McCloskey, Dorshell Stewart for Paulette Dilworth

Others Present: Jeane Novotny and Juliana Hallows

I. Welcome: Tom Brush conducted the meeting.

1. Approval of November 6, 2006 Minutes

—David Estell

Handout: November 6 Minutes (buff)

Tom Brush opened the meeting by giving members an opportunity to review the November 6, 2006 minutes. It was motioned that the minutes be approved and it was seconded: MOTION APPROVED.

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

—Diana Lambdin

Handout: New Degree without Certification Process (pink)

Diana Lambdin requested the sixth item be moved to the second item on the agenda. It was brought to the committee and they approved the change.

The handout, created by Tim Niggle, describes the present issue and suggests possible solutions. More specifically, some students in the Teacher Education Program (TEP) are failing to complete the requirements for graduation and certification as a result of not finishing student teaching or not beginning student teaching due to personal or academic reasons. The history section of the handout describes what has been done with these students in the past. Students were dealt with differently chiefly depending on how far they were towards completing their program. For example, if a student had to take 15 credits or more to complete the degree they were referred to other departments, like Continuing Studies, to pursue a different degree. On the other hand, if the students had not completed or began their student teaching, but had completed all of their course work, they were required to take additional credits and then they were granted a degree.

Recently, as Diana Lambdin remarked, students have been required to complete the minimal credits for their program and/or complete a capstone project. This method presents a concern because it may be too cumbersome to undertake if the number of these students should increase. While the Academic Standards Committee and Office of Teacher Education have offered options in the past that allow students to go through an appeals process, and possibly graduate with a degree in Education without certification, there needs to be clear and consistent policy.

Tim Niggle then questioned if the School of Education should be allowing students to graduate in Education if they are not attaining certification toward a professional license. Diana Lambdin then asked if the School of Education should offer a program that is explicitly for students who want a degree in Education without certification. She added that the question was not for this current discussion.

The committee then discussed the types of students that are going through the appeals process as well as different capstones projects. Jose Bonner added that students could complete capstone projects with faculty members outside the School of Education and then he provided an example. Laura Stachowski then asked for more details about some of the reasons students are deciding to go through the appeals process. Tim Niggle responded that there are several reasons, as described in the handout. The committee then discussed the increased number of these students and some of the reasons as to why they did not complete their student teaching. The committee briefly addressed possible problems with offering a non-certification degree in Education (i.e. the lack of institutional memory of which students received a degree with or without certification). Tim Niggle then stated that the committee must first decide if the School should be offering a degree of Education without certification. Once this was answered, the committee could then decide what actions to take.

Enrique Galindo suggested that the proposed appeals procedure described in section 6.C. of the handout be conducted as a pilot study to further evaluate the issue. It was also suggested that a report describing the student cases and results of the study be presented to the committee on May 3, 2007 so that an informed decision could be made. Brent Gault motioned for an approval, Enrique Galindo seconded: MOTION APPROVED.

III. Voting Item: Course Substitution Request for the CEL-T Program

—Tom Brush

Handout: CEL-T Course Change Request

The Computer Education License for Teachers (CEL-T) is a 15 credit program that may be completed by current Indiana teachers who would like an additional license in Computer Education. This allows teachers to teach technology application courses at the secondary level. The CEL-T program is requesting that the committee approve the removal of P506 - *Distance Learning Pedagogy* from the program and implement two courses that students could select between after consulting with their advisors: 1) R546 - *Instructional Strategies*, and 2) R547 - *Computer-Mediated Learning*. The CEL-T handout describes this request in detail.

Tom Brush presented the course change request rationale stating: a) the current instructor for P506 has joined the IST faculty and this course has been renumbered to an IST course – R546; and b) former and current CEL-T students requested that the program offer more experience with web authoring and web design due to the current demand in secondary technology teaching thus the second course R547, a web based development course, was added as an option.

Enrique Galindo asked if the faculty in the program are comfortable with this change. Tom Brush responded that the summer before the faculty members had met and agreed with the changes. Further discussion continued by the committee after which Enrique Galindo motioned for approval of the course change request and Jose Bonner seconded: MOTION APPROVED.

IV. Discussion Item: IUB Common Core General Education Proposal **—Diana Lambdin**

There are three members from School of Education: Diana Lambdin, Christine Bennett, and Enrique Galindo, working on the committee for the Common Core General Education Proposal at Indiana University. This committee is divided into six sub committees that are working toward the development and implementation of a “common core” of courses for Indiana University, Bloomington. They will be approving the specifications for each category of courses for the common core and later, in the spring, they will be examining specific courses that will fit these categories.

To help with this process Enrique Galindo asked for feedback from the committee. Jose Bonner asked about the progress of the committee and if that information was public. Enrique Galindo responded that eventually all work the committee completes will go to the Bloomington Faculty council. He continued that the common core committee will be a standing committee that will not only implement the changes, but also review new courses and changes to the common core. A discussion followed about the process of approving, changing, and reviewing these common core courses. Diana Lambdin provided some examples and the committee talked about possible problems for the School of Education.

V. Discussion Item: Update on NCATE and Social Justice

David Estell stated that in the previous meeting Gerardo Gonzales would be sending a letter to NCATE about the issue. Diana Lambdin responded that the letter was sent and no response has been received. Enrique Galindo stated that the Elementary Education Council will be meeting about whether to use the State or professional organization as their accrediting body. Tom Brush asked if there were any other questions; after no response he then moved to the next item.

VI. Discussion Item: Update on Accreditation Program Review Process

Jill Shedd stated that the Secondary Education Programs have made a decision to go with their professional organization accreditation processes. Recently, Jill Shedd, and others, sat in on an online workshop put on by the National Council of Teaching Mathematics (NCTM) to help her further understand the professional organization accreditation process. She reported that it was very enlightening and gave clarity about the process. She provided some examples to the committee and this was discussed further.

Jill Shedd stated that unit reviews may be staggered throughout the 2007/2008 academic year, however, if programs present in 2008 they have to present 2 years of data as opposed to one. She continued that she will be meeting on Thursday with the director for the Division of Professional Standards to discuss State review process and to gather more information as to what will be required.

VII. Discussion Item: Revisiting the Six Principles **—Jill Shedd**

Handout: Colorful Bookmarks

The School of Education's six guiding principles are the conceptual framework and the academic foundation on which its programs sit. Thus it has been used in a variety of ways; for example, as a means for evaluation of student teaching, as a professional agreement between the School and its students, as an evaluation of students' field experiences and so forth. The guiding principles are the foundation for School of Education in regards to the structure of its undergraduate programs. The purpose of reviewing these principles is to examine whether they still currently represent the School of Education, if they are inclusive, and to evaluate whether some principles need to be added, changed, or removed. Diana Lambdin gave some examples of additional principles that have been suggested in the past, which are social justice, global perspectives, diversity, technology, and inquiry – all of which were discussed when the principles were initially developed 10 years prior.

Jose Bonner began a discussion about the differences among various disciplines in regards to inquiry. Tim Niggle added that the principles are more process oriented in that the school uses them to evaluate students and its performance. Tom Brush suggested that a faculty committee be formed to review the principles and see if some changes should be made.

Enrique Galindo asked if the committee has done an assessment to see to what extent these six principles are reflected in the School's programs. Jill Shedd responded that the student teaching and field experience evaluations do include these principles. Summaries of the student teaching evaluations have been shared with the respective program coordinators. There may be themes across these evaluations that could inform the committee of possible changes. Jill Shedd remarked that when these principles were created, it was for the design of programs and not for the evaluations of students. She added that it would be interesting to ask programs to review themselves within the context of the six principles; however, the first round of UAS reports will be concluded in May. When the next round starts, the committee could redefine how/what the next review requirements will be. Diana Lambdin commented that it seemed more appropriate to review the principles after the accreditation process in 2009, for the principles seem to be reflected in our programs and are integrated throughout our evaluation of students. Tom Brush agreed and added that the committee could include questions about the extent the six principles are reflected in each of the programs in the next round of program UAS reports and make the appropriate changes to the principles, if needed. Tom Brush asked if there were any comments or questions. None were given concerning this item and the meeting was adjourned.