IU School of Education
Teacher Education Council
December 6, 2000

Present: Lanny Beyer, Ginette Delandshere, Tom Gregory, Janet Johnson, Dave Kinman, Diana Lambdin, Fritz Lieber, Lissa May, Jill Shedd; Others attending: Bob Appelman, Bill Harwood; Minutes taken by: Janet Annelli

Handouts: <u>Documents mailed prior to meeting:</u> Minutes - November 9, 2000, Memo: Change in Field Experience Sequence (11/16/00), Proposal for In-Service Technology Education Certificate (8/27/00) [from 10/5/00 meeting]; <u>Handouts at meeting:</u> Memo: General Education Proposals (4/26/00), An Elaboration on Goal 1: Continue IU's Commitment to Strong Pre-Service Teacher Education (12/11/00), Reaffirmation of The School of Education's Six Principles (12/2/00), 21st Century Teachers Project (12/6/00), NCATE 2000 Unit Standards (5/11/00), IPSB - Proposed Criteria for Identifying Low-Performing Institutions for Title II Reporting Purposes (11/10/00), Proposed Minor in Educational Studies (8/7/00)

Agenda: Two items were added to the agenda: Praxis - Change in Field Experience Sequence and General Education Proposal.

I. MINUTES

Vote: Motion to approve minutes from November 9, 2000 meeting.
PASSED.

II. PRAXIS - CHANGE IN FIELD EXPERIENCE SEQUENCE
<u>Handout:</u> *Memo: Change in Field Experience Sequence (11/16/00)*

The language arts courses are taught in the field and students in the classes are participating in field experiences. They wanted recognition for the field experience in language arts separately, not just as part of the larger field experience (M401) in the second cluster. The TEC decided to formally vote on the change.

Vote: Motion to approve adding a 1 credit hour field experience (M301) for language arts to the first cluster and changing the M401 in the second cluster to 2 credit hours.
PASSED.

III. GENERAL EDUCATION PROPOSALS
<u>Handout:</u> *Memo: General Education Proposals (4/26/00)*

The memo asks for units on campus to respond to the proposal by 2/18/01. Could a group from TEC work on this and then share their response with TEC and maybe department chairs and program coordinators?

A. Questions and Concerns

Course Lists
o   Who determines the approved list of courses? Who has power to make decisions?
o   Are we giving up power and authority to them? It will be important to have close and ongoing advising for our students so they don't take a course that's inappropriate.
o   Will COAS determine the criteria for each category, for courses on the list? What exactly will that mean?
o   Can we determine which courses qualify for the list or does some other committee determine this? What criteria will they use? Can we suggest additional education courses for this list?
o   The document says that the Campus Curriculum Committee will "manage" the list of approved courses offered outside COAS. What does this mean? Will they identify and approve the courses for the list or just oversee the list?
o   What recourse does an academic unit have if it doesn't like a decision that the Curriculum Committee makes?
o   Our most serious problem: There may be a particular course, like a history course, that we want students to take, but this proposal says we'll have to accept any course from the category. This could be an issue because the programs are all tightly packed and students may not get the most appropriate courses.
o   This proposal may not work for certain schools. Each school gets to decide on this and could ask for an exception. We could specify that a certain experiences are required for licensure or accreditation.

The document is ambiguous; the TEC needs to have these issues clarified before it can respond.

B. Action
Lanny, Lissa, and Fritz will work on the response to the proposal. They will clarify the questions the group raised and will draft a response to the memo, they'll circulate it to the TEC before the next meeting (by January 10).

IV. IN SERVICE COMPUTER CERTIFICATE PROGRAM
Handout: *Proposal for In-Service Technology Education Certificate (8/27/00)*
Bob Appelman

A. Background
This proposal discusses the creation of an inservice certification for teachers to get an endorsement certificate (12 cr. hrs.). Practicing teachers can now take the endorsement for preservice teachers which is serviced by Ticket program but that program is really designed for the preservice group. This new program is designed specifically to meet the needs of inservice teachers.

The program includes two workshops presented here with most other work done online. Online work will involve discussions of authentic situations the teachers are involved with in their own schools, and the projects they're doing with their existing classes will be monitored and feedback provided. They hope to have a GA assigned to this program to develop the inservice experience and to coordinate and monitor the program.

They need to get this certificate in place before they can market the program and begin. They'd like to start the program soon.

B. **Questions/Comments**

Load

<u>How will you handle load issues?</u> They'll use the same criteria as on-campus sections--if there are not enough students they won't offer the course. Now they have six students, they expect they can get 12--they expect enough enrollments to run the classes.

Credit

o   <u>Why isn't there a course number or credit assigned in the spring for the second technology integration project?</u> (They did get credit for the first project.) No course is assigned to the culminating, two-day workshop. Members want to hear a rationale for not giving credit for the work. This seems like a lot of work for students and faculty so they should receive credit for the integration and culminating workshop.

o   Will students stay involved with the second project if there is no credit or course monitoring mechanism? There is no timeline to finish.

o   The last workshop is a capstone or closure experience. Students will present their work at the final workshop. Credit could be attached to it. It's a review and sharing process--you use it as a lever to ask students what they are preparing, what's happening in their classes, and to give them feedback.

<u>Response</u>

o   If they add more credit it will increase the charges for students.
    Is 12 credit hours the maximum they feel they can include? Students want credit for the work they do, even one credit might be enough. Credits also impact teachers in their jobs--credit hours/pay scale. Adding credit also adds income support to the program.

o   They didn't see a need to have as much focus and attention to monitor the second project. The first project involves heavy interaction between instructors and students. Then they will be on their own more, integrating what they've learned into their curriculum on regular basis. Feedback will be provided.

o   The certification is the incentive not the credits. The certificate implies there is continuity until they complete the program.

<u>Options</u>

o   They could have 2 cr. hr. to provide continuity through the end of the program. That would cover the second integration project and the culminating workshop.

o   There could there be practicum credit running through entire course.
    They could use W450, 1 cr. hr. field experience, does each semester provides field experience?

o   They could sign up for a course and could get an R or IX, until they complete their project and present it at the workshop. Then their grade could be turned in.
    They could use R590 or another independent study course if the work is independent. They could check if there are other courses that would be appropriate.

<u>Approval</u>

<u>Is this enough of a problem to TEC to hold up approval?</u> Yes, Bob needs to go back to the group and discuss this. The TEC wants a response on the credit hour issue.

Program
- o   Is this similar to other certification programs? The minimum hours for a certificate by IU standards is 12 cr. hr.
- o   Are they trying to fit too much into 12 cr. hrs.? Why not more credit? The program was put together considering the market and what they felt length of time of concentration teachers would have to focus on the program.

Literature on Technology
<u>Will they read literature on criticism of technology and its uses?</u> It is important for teachers to see critical literature about technology such as technology in a social context or as it relates to teaching.

That content is very much a part of the E533 curriculum. Students will be immersed in the appropriate use of technology and methods of integrating technology as well as why to do it and what the impact will be. Philosophy is important topic in the program.

C.   Action
Bob will meet with the program group to discuss the questions raised and will return at the next meeting with a response.

V.   21ST CENTURY TEACHERS PROJECT
<u>Handout:</u> *21st Century Teachers Project (12/6/00)*
Bill Harwood

A.   TEC Questions
What is the relationship between the TEC and this project?
What is the TEC's role in providing members and participating?

B.   Project Document
This document gives an overview of project now and the current organizational plan. The dean has approved this plan. The group discussed how the committees/councils will be organized and reviewed the organizational plan.

Dean Gonzalez has selected people from the TEC who may serve on the coordinating council; the TEC doesn't yet know who they are. People could also get asked to be representatives from their subject area or program. Each domain area will have 6 - 8 people.

C.   Courses
The course list includes some possibilities; other courses may be added later. These courses were selected based on high enrollments of May 2000 graduates. Up to this point, they have only looked at the elementary programs. They need to add the secondary courses but they haven't gone through that data yet.

<u>Music:</u> The School of Music (or HPER) isn't part of this effort but there are music courses on the list, how should we address that?

D.   Questions/Comments

Globalization
What is meant by this category? This is a catch-all term concerning global issues and connections among issues and across areas, an example is world history. Why is there a split between civics and globalization instead of having a social science category?

Categories
There was some discussion of categories including who created them. The ideas and categories were initially discussed by Dean Warren and the Board of Visitors and then by a committee of administrators. They were clarified over the past two years.
Interdisciplinary approach: Can content be integrated across disciplines? They probably wouldn't have created a council that was so discipline based if they were serious about interdisciplinary approaches. Could SOE and COAS offer courses jointly? Yes.

E.   Role of TEC
When the dean talked to the TEC in October he made certain requests of the TEC:
1.   To articulate teacher ed. goal from the retreat
2.   To take some role on 21st Century Teachers Project
        It was up to the TEC whether to take the project on as council or if the TEC would form another group.

Is item 2. still on our agenda? The TEC was given the charge of taking an active role and had two options: take on the project as a council and expand the group or create a new body for the project. These options seem to have been superseded. The TEC didn't get a chance to pick members and were not informed who the dean selected. Why was the TEC given a charge that has now been accomplished without their knowledge?

VI.   TEACHER EDUCATION GOAL FROM RETREAT
Handouts: *An Elaboration on Goal 1, Reaffirmation of the School of Education's Six Principles*

A.   An Elaboration on Goal 1
The group discussed the date for completing this project and that it was changed from spring to 12/15/00. This change occurred at the fall faculty meeting,

Tom pulled together the different sections that the TEC members wrote. He asked the group to review the document and consider if the authors captured their sense of each theme.

Cultivating Partnerships with Local Schools
Some expected that this topic would focus on partnerships between two institutions: the school and the SOE. This piece focuses on relationships between individuals instead of institutions. What did TEC members have in mind for this section? The examples are appropriate but there may need to be another part about partnerships with schools that are more formal and at a different level.

Reaffirming Teacher Education's Six Guiding Principles
Christine provided a longer handout (yellow) with examples for discussion. Tom put a shorter version of Christine's document into the larger goal document.

Comments:
- o In last paragraph she proposes a seventh principle but didn't write up yet. Can the principles be changed? The other six went through the whole community development process. Some felt that the principles could be modified if necessary.
- o There also is an eighth principle implicit in all the others: inquiry. They didn't include it as a separate principle because it's so fundamental to the others.
- o The was a comment that the structure was somewhat confusing because there are six themes and then six principles.

B.   What is the Point of this Document?
- o <u>Is this document intended to prompt discussion or to provide a set of recommendations?</u> It would be written differently depending on the intent. We want to prompt discussion--we were supposed to have public forums to discuss these ideas, not just have input from the TEC. This document is just the beginning of the process; we haven't gotten to the discussions yet, the timeline is too short.
- o <u>Are we trying to describe the situation as is or as it needs to be?</u>
- o <u>Was there an expectation that this document would be final now?</u> The process gives impression that this document will be acted on, it will go to the Long Range Planning Committee and Policy Council. It will translate into funding priorities. Dave is writing a document for another goal. It won't be written as a final document but as a progress report.

  If the TEC produces a document now there won't be consensus among the TEC or input from others. Some members had objections to parts of the document but there is not time to address those now or by the December deadline. To work create a document that does not have full TEC support and input from others would undermines all the work that's been done in the SOE; a lot of time and effort has been put into recreating our programs in the past several years.

C.   Concerns
- o There hasn't been sufficient time to carefully review these new materials; some parts were just completed.
- o Shortcutting this discussion is a very bad idea. It could have significant impact on someone or on the school.
- o Given the importance of the first goal related to teacher education, a reasonable amount of time should be provided for people to discuss possibilities, share ideas, present alternative points of view, and have ongoing conversations that will allow the TEC to generate a document on which there is consensus and that will be helpful for the remaining activities that will follow the generation of this first goals.

Vote: Motion to have Tom write a memo concerning the goal, share a draft with the TEC, and then finalize it and send it on.
PASSED.