IU School of Education
Teacher Education Council
December 9, 1999

Present: Melissa Beeker, Lanny Beyer, Bill Boone (for Diana Lambdin), Gary Bridwell, Amy Seely Flint, Tom Gregory, Janet Johnson, Bradley Levinson, Luise McCarty, Charles Schmidt, Amy Sutley; Others attending: Dennis Knapczyk, Kate Stocksdale

Minutes taken by: Janet Annelli

Handouts: Minutes from Meeting 11/18/99; A Community of Teachers Program for Preservice Special Education Teachers proposal, 11/11/99, (distributed at 11/18/99 meeting); Memo: Implementation of Policy for C- and Below Courses (11/10/99) and packet of responses to memo; New Course Requests: Reading and Reasoning for the New College Student (X153), Critical Reading and Research Seminar (X155), College and Life Long Learning (X156), Culture of College (X158), Connecting with Campus Resources (X159), Mastering Academic Skills for Reinstated Students (X160)

I. MINUTES

Vote: Motion to approve minutes from November 18, 1999 meeting.
PASSED.

II. ELECT CHAIRPERSON

Tom Gregory was elected chairperson for the remaining academic year.

III. A COMMUNITY OF TEACHERS PROGRAM FOR PRESERVICE SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS

Handout: *A Community of Teachers Program for Preservice Special Education Teachers* proposal, 11/11/99 (distributed at 11/18/99 meeting)

Dennis Knapczyk and Kate Stocksdale attended the meeting to discuss this program and answer questions.

A. Background

The current program provides a K - 12 license. One of limitations of that program is that it's difficult to qualify someone across the K - 12 range--there are too many variables involved. Therefore, the primary focus of the program has been on elementary education with some adjustments for the secondary level.

The faculty wants to offer two undergraduate programs in the future:

- *Teaching All Learners* program: To prepare teachers for a dual license in elementary and special education, K - 6
- *A Community of Teachers Program for Preservice Special Education Teachers:* To prepare teachers to work in Special Ed. programs at the middle school and high school levels, 7 - 12

This new secondary program reflects more of the responsibilities that teachers in Special Ed. now have with the focus on inclusion in secondary schools. This program will provide students with a dual license in general secondary education and special education for middle and high school, grades 7 - 12.

1

This program proposal:

- Provides Special Ed. teachers with background in a content area so they will be comfortable teaching in a general education secondary program; they will have the equivalent of a minor in the content area
- Provides the special education background necessary to teach in Special Ed. programs

Now Special Ed. teachers may play the role of a resource teacher or teacher's aide, working individually with students at the secondary level, because they don't have the content background to teach subjects like math or science in the classroom. These teachers are often trying to catch up because they don't have the content background for what is being taught in classroom.

B.   A Community of Teachers (CoT)
This new program for secondary Special Education will be merged with the CoT program which has been in operation for several years. This new program will be distinct from the regular CoT program; not all CoT students will have the Special Ed. focus. If CoT students are interested in Special Ed. they could add the area; it will be like having a double major.

Students interested in Special Ed. will be involved in certain aspects of the CoT program: participate in some of the seminars, use the same mentorship model; and be absorbed into cohorts. In addition, some Special Ed. courses will be included. The Special Ed. students will participate in the CoT education seminar which will deal with general education and special education issues, focusing on the secondary level. It will be an advantage to regular education students in the CoT seminars to have the Special Ed. students participating. There could be 4 - 5 of these students in the regular cohorts.

Comments

- Students will get a license at both middle school and high school levels so they will need field experiences at both levels.
- Susan Klein has worked with the CoT program over the past couple years providing background in teaching Special Ed. students. This program extends that involvement.
- In the 30 program expectations for CoT, items concerning personalizing education are included. They have expanded the expectations further to include more on diversity and inclusion issues.
- <u>What classes are CoT classes replacing or in addition to?</u> The CoT courses replace Ed. Psych and methods courses.

C.   Content Areas
Students will select a content concentration obtaining the equivalent of a minor in that area. Initially the program team wanted students to get minors in two content areas but it was not possible to fit in the credits.

Comments/Questions
<u>The content area needs at middle school and high school differ.</u> If math is used as an example: In the middle school there may be some classes such as algebra and geometry, but mostly there is basic math at different levels. In high school, there will be many different math courses such as algebra, geometry, trigonometry, and calculus. Special

needs students will probably not be in those higher level courses, so how do the courses listed for our students in the program match up? They have to take the calculus sequence but does that make sense looking at what takes place in schools? On the other hand, those higher level courses may help our students understand math better. We would like a Special Ed. student with a focus on math to be well versed in math so they can be part of the math faculty.

<u>Science - Is the course listing set or is it still flexible?</u>

- At the middle school and high school levels, earth science courses are often viewed as non-college prep. courses. There are 33 credits in biology, the inclusion of an environmental earth science course could be very positive and helpful for students. It might be the type of course in which they would have special needs students in general classes. Could we ask science education about adding an earth science course given the focus of this program?
- There are a high number of hours in science, could there be more discussion concerning the science courses?
- Why the difference in credit hours in the two science areas?

<u>Content or Methods?</u> *Issues in Math Education*, 1 cr., is a course developed as part of the in Anchor Program. In each content area is it better to have more content courses or methods courses? It's up to program area to decide and to design the course. In the Anchor Program, this 1 cr. course provides the opportunity for content area faculty to have early contact with students.

Draft of Content Concentrations
The proposal includes a draft of the content areas. The program team will ask a faculty member in each content area to lay out the courses for an area, then will talk to the whole program area faculty to OK it. They could then return with all areas finalized for the TEC to review and approve.

D.   **Questions**

<u>When will the program start?</u> Susan Klein has been ~~working~~ teaching with the CoT program for 4.5 ~~1~~ 1/2 years. They have already made some modifications to the regular CoT program for students interested in Special Ed. They are ready to try this new program but given the approval process, it will likely begin in Spring 2001 or Fall 2001.

<u>How many students will be involved?</u>

- They expect 12 - 15 students to be interested in Special Ed. at the secondary level. CoT could accommodate those numbers.
- Now there are about 50 - 60 students in Special Ed. but most seem interested in the elementary program (based on practicum preference).

<u>What will be the role of teachers in schools?</u>

After completing this program students can teach Special Ed. and also courses in their subject area concentration because they will have a dual license. There is a high demand for Special Ed. teachers, so schools probably won't use them as content area teachers, but they could be co-teachers in inclusion programs. This program creates a variety of options for students, they can individualize instruction working with students with disabilities and work as content specialists as well. They can also help plan curriculum with regular teachers comfortably and will know that the needs of special ed students are being met. It also creates much more of a sense of equality between content teachers and Special Ed. teachers.

<u>Has there been a demand from schools for teachers in that type of role?</u> This seems to be where the field is moving--many schools are going to a co-teaching model. The structure of a Special Ed. teacher's job will probably vary from school to school.

<u>Can students in other programs take Special Ed. (K) courses?</u> There will be certain courses where *Teaching All Learners* and CoT special education students will participate together. Other courses will probably be open to students in other programs.

<u>Other program option at secondary level:</u> The Special Ed. faculty are working on another program option for students in other majors, elementary and secondary, who want to get a Special Ed. license as well.

<u>What are the General Education requirements?</u> These requirements have not been specified yet. They should be determined before program approval.

E. **Today's Approval**
At this meeting the TEC is discussing and voting on the *notion* of the program, not specific courses. The program development team is asking the TEC to approve today:
- This design for a secondary Special Ed. program--the design concept and direction of the program
- Coupling the program with a content concentration (the concentration areas will be established by each of the program areas involved)
- Using CoT as the delivery system for the program

Vote: Motion to approve the design of this secondary Special Ed. major with the delivery system of *A Community of Teachers*. This approval includes the understanding that when the program proposal comes back to the TEC for approval it will include the general education requirements and all the content concentrations. The program document will also need to address the six principles and inquiry base (or show how they were addressed in the CoT program and relate to this program).
PASSED.

It was also requested that they address how other secondary programs will have access to Special Education.

IV. **IMPLEMENTATION AND ASSESSMENT OF NEW PROGRAMS**

A. **Early Field Experiences**

Background
- There has been a tendency to think that adding more field experiences will be of value to students regardless of how they are constructed or their meaning to students--the more field experiences the better (part of a national trend).
- There are a number of early field experiences that are not supervised or are poorly supervised.
- What the school may want to do in terms of early field experiences and assessment is in part related to the Standards Board's stipulations.

Proposal
Lanny is proposing a comprehensive and critical review of all field experiences in order to get better grasp of how early field experiences are connected across a program, how they contribute to individuals and to courses to which they are attached, and how they build on each other as students progress through a program.

He is proposing a wide ranging and protracted analysis and discussion about field experiences, spearheaded by the TEC. (The TEC is not going to conduct the evaluation but can initiate this kind of study). He does not think that we need to review student teaching because the same issues are not involved.

The central issue is quality, so this review has to apply to all the early experiences that are required. The point isn't to find problems but to determine how these things work together and contribute to the development of our students.

Two elements must be involved:
1. Obtain descriptions of field experiences, the courses they are connected to, and the purpose of the experiences.
2. Look at the evaluative data that we have from students and teachers to determine what they think of field experiences.

What Are Early Field Experiences?

They include any experiences prior to student teaching, involving both on- and off-campus experiences. The field experiences generally start with courses such as F203 and the Ed. Psychology courses. Field experiences not only take place in schools, but may be in non-school sites such as community centers, neighborhoods and other non-school settings. Students could be doing inquiry connected with service learning projects. On-campus experiences include the Teacher Ed. labs required by some programs.

Focus: Current Programs or New Programs?

We might focus on the new programs since the old ones are being phased out but we might want to look at both since we will still have old programs in place for a couple more years. Some programs such as *Praxis* and *Theory Into Practice*, may not have many changes in their field experiences so data on current and past field experiences may be relevant.

Process
- What process will be used? Interviews? Surveys?
- The TEC needs to think about what data to collect and how to ensure data quality that will support evaluation of program quality.

A number of areas could be looked at such as:
- Feedback from people who have participated in field experiences: students, supervising teachers, and faculty/AIs; people in the field would like to contribute and would appreciate the opportunity to give input
- We could review student feedback about experiences--we have some data on that which may already be in a data base. We need to ask about redundancies and field experience assignments.
- In addition to students providing feedback right after an experience, it might be helpful to get later follow up feedback to see what they got out of early field experiences.
- What courses have field experiences? Who, if anyone, supervises them?
- Look across individual courses: Is there cohesion in terms of what the early field experiences mean or their value for our students as they go through the program?

5

Comments/Questions

- How many sections are there of field experiences? What is the magnitude of our field experiences, each semester, each year? We place about 2200 students in field experiences each semester. We can't really expand much further.
- Campus-wide Program: There is a campus-wide program on scholarship, teaching, and learning which may have funds available to study the teaching/learning process. Bradley may look at this for H340.
- Graduate students could be hired to help with data collection and analysis.
- What are the cost/benefits of this review? Will data be collected before the summer?
- We do have historical data for at least the past five years which may be helpful. We're not sure if it will handle our questions, we don't want to limit our questions, but we can see if that data is useful.
- The success factor for field experiences may depend on instructors and their relationships with teachers in the field. If instructors build relationships with teachers then the experiences are usually more successful. It depends how early field experiences are viewed by instructors and practicing teachers.

What Will Be The Result?

- Will we have a set of recommendations/policies that we will give to programs for them to implement? When will that implementation occur, less than 1 1/2 years from now? Probably not.
- We may be able to determine parameters for what field experiences generally ought to contribute to a program.
- If this is done through the TEC office, we can do an analysis of information, then write a report and give it to developing programs: "Here are some positive things and some concerns about the way field experiences have been going, please respond to these when you put your program together."
- We could get feedback from programs about their field experiences and have the information become part of the program assessment.
- We could ask new programs to do an evaluation of the model they are using for field experiences, using available data, to assure us that its a reasonable approach.

B.   Assessment Plan

This issue concerns both our unit assessment system and the requirements of the Board concerning assessment. We created an assessment white paper last year which became the framework for our own Teacher Ed. assessment plan submitted to the Board last September. For the next three years we will add more detail and analysis for the Board, articulating how our assessment plan incorporates the Board's content and development standards and INTASC principles.

Early Field Experiences and Student Teaching

Under the new license structure there is a more intensive and involved review of what our students do in classrooms in early field experiences and student teaching. We will have to rely on reports from teachers and supervisors especially for student teaching, to document that our students are performing as required by the Board. This will be necessary for our students to get their licenses. There will be increased responsibilities on teachers and supervisors. We'll need to do a lot more work with teachers and supervisors in the field to make sure assessment activities meet our needs for reporting to the Board.

<u>Field Teams:</u> This spring we will put together "field teams" which will include the Director of Student Teaching and Related Field Services, faculty coordinators of programs, and possibly students, to meet with teachers and administrators to:

- Describe and discuss our new programs
- Discuss what kind of assessment practices we will need their help with

Public Forum
The Assessment Plan also stipulates that we will hold a public forum every spring to assess our programs and courses. We'll invite teachers, administrators, and supervisors. This will probably begin in two years.

Student Teaching Supervisors
- <u>How are student teaching supervisors recruited? How are students supervised when they are placed outside local sites?</u> We have 15 graduate students that supervise student teachers. Some live in Indianapolis and supervise students in that area. Bloomington graduate students cover other areas. We fill in with other educators (teachers or administrators that are on leave or retired).
- We could better define roles for these supervisors especially now that there will be so much at stake.
- We have added more AIs in these positions. We hope that if an AI has taught in a program, he or she can follow students into the field.
- Faculty need to be more involved with student teaching and working with supervisors.

C. **Staffing Issues**
- The new programs have more novel combinations of credits/courses. We have begun discussions on staffing new programs.
- There has been a decline in faculty involvement in undergraduate teaching.
- It is increasingly difficult to find AIs to teach courses.

V. **GRADING POLICY, C- AND BELOW**
    <u>Handouts:</u> *Memo: Implementation of Policy for C- and Below Courses (11/10/99) and packet of responses to memo*

Fritz sent out a memo to program coordinators asking them to submit their program policy related to students who get grades of C- or lower. The issue is how the grading policy will be implemented in each program. The current policy is that students must make up education courses with C- or lower. This has to occur **before** they student teach. Everything else related to the implementation of this policy will be decided in the program areas.

Background
At the TEC meeting in January 1998, the key concerns related to implementation were:
- Student Teaching: Can students begin student teaching if they have a C- or lower grade? (The TEC decided that they could not.)
- Minors: Are courses in minors or areas of concentration included in the policy?
- Sequential courses: If there are sequential courses in a program, can a student continue to the next course without making up the C- or lower grade?
- Cluster courses: If a program is designed with clusters like the elementary education program, can students continue to the next cluster before they make up the C- or lower grade?

Last year, Judith Chafel sent out a memo asking programs to submit how the C- grade policy would be implemented in their programs. There were very few responses so Fritz sent out the follow up memo.

Other Issues
- We need to be fair to students and tell them what the consequences are if they get a C- or lower. We should state at beginning of the spring semester how this policy will be implemented. We need to give students a reasonable amount of time to plan for and make up courses. Now the advisors are not sure what to tell people.
- The policy for each program needs to be put in the new bulletin.

TEC Review
The TEC reviewed the responses from the program areas. Some faculty were not sure how to respond. If someone oversees a course like H340 or W200, faculty in other program areas should talk to them about when students will take the course and when they'll have to retake it.

FX Policy
- Questions arose related to the FX policy (discussed in response from Judith Chafel). It was unclear how the FX policy is implemented at the university. How often do students get FX? It seems to occur frequently.
- The School of Education can opt out of this policy.
- Incompletes can be given in serious cases such as illness, accidents, death in family, but in some situations students may not be able to keep a scholarship or student loan if they have an Incomplete. In those cases it may be better to have an FX.
- The FX policy needs to be clarified before the TEC can vote on the response from Early Childhood Education.

How to Proceed
After reviewing the responses, the TEC may need to be clearer about what it's asking people to do, perhaps specific questions or some "model language" that could serve as a basis for their statements, needs to be provided so there can be more common statements and parallel language. It may help to let programs see each other's comments--people may not realize the implications for their programs.

Lanny will send out an e-mail to the programs about clarifying their policies.

VI. **NEW COURSE REQUESTS: "X" COURSES**
Handouts: *New Course Requests: Reading and Reasoning for the New College Student (X153), Critical Reading and Research Seminar (X155), College and Life Long Learning (X156), Culture of College (X158), Connecting with Campus Resources (X159), Mastering Academic Skills for Reinstated Students (X160)*

Several new course requests were distributed for undergraduate "X" courses taught by the Student Academic Center. TEC members need to review these courses so they can vote on them at the next meeting.