Committee on Teacher Education Tuesday, January 13, 2015 1 – 2:30 p.m. School of Education, Room 2277

Participating: D. Halloran, P. Kloosterman, R. Kunzman, J. Shedd, J. Danish, B. Gault, B. Whitaker, M. McClaine, M. Lewison, M. Manifold, L. McCarty, K. Rice, G. Gursel-Bilgin.

I. Approval of October Minutes (P. Kloosterman)

B. Gault moved to approve the minutes. J. Danish seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously. M. Lewison abstained as she did not attend the October meeting.

II. Action Items (M. Manifold)A. M330, M430, M404 proposals

The first action item is approval of a change for EDUC-M330 Foundations of Art Education and Methods I. This course is an introduction to art education theory and related social issues and includes supervised art teaching in public schools. In order to provide flexibility in terms of modes of instruction and widen the range of non-art education majors that might find the content useful, proposal includes changing the course title to EDUC-M330 Designing Visual Learning Experiences for Children. The revised course description focuses on an introduction to fundamentals of designing and facilitating children's visual art learning experiences in schools, community centers and museums. Emphasis will be on pedagogy in the context of practice and field experiences with children. It will be required for art majors. Non-art majors will also be able to enroll with instructor permission.

The second change involves EDUC-M430 Foundations of Art Education and Methods II course. This course has focused on advanced study of curriculum developments in art education and methods of teaching visual art in secondary settings. A new course title, EDUC-M430 Art Education in School and Museum Settings, is proposed. The focus of the course will change to advanced study of curriculum developments in art education and methods of teaching visual art in PreK-12 schools, museums, and other professional settings.

The third proposal relates to the changes in EDUC-M404 Laboratory/Field Experience. A new title, Laboratory/Field Experience in Non-School Art Education, is recommended along with an abbreviated title of Non-School Art Education. Contact hours for this course will be 15-45 and there is no request for a variable title.

As these course proposals were approved by Elementary Education Council and Secondary Education Council, the committee did not need a motion. After a presentation on the proposals by M. Manifold, all three proposals were approved unanimously.

III. Information and DiscussionA. Student teaching report (J. Shedd)

Shedd shared reports on 2013-2014 Elementary and Secondary program completion. In 2013-2014, 210 elementary candidates applied to student teach. Of the 210, 8 (3.8%) were delayed from starting their student teaching placement by at least one semester for academic or personal reasons. Once student teaching placements began, 2 (1%) candidates had a placement cancelled due to performance issues. In total, 200 candidates completed student teaching successfully. In 2013-2014, 123 secondary candidates applied to student teach. Of the 123, 5 (4.1%) were delayed from starting their student teaching placement by at least one semester for academic or personal reasons. Once student teaching placements began, 4 (3.5%) candidates had a placement cancelled due to performance issues. In total, 111 secondary candidates completed student teaching successfully.

At the end of each semester from fall 2010 through spring 2014, candidates and their supervising teachers were asked to complete an evaluation of the student teaching experience. In general, the surveys asked both sets of stakeholders to rate the effectiveness of the university supervisor, the tools, and mechanisms defined by the Office of Student Teaching, and the quality of preparation for the field by the academic program. Stakeholders were asked questions requiring Likert scale rankings and open-ended responses. Likert scale responses could range from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). At the culmination of each semester's student teaching placement, teaching candidates and supervising teachers completed an online culminating survey regarding their experiences. The details of these surveys were presented in the reports regarding both programs.

B. Alumni follow-up report (J. Shedd)

Shedd presented the 2010-2011 Graduate Follow-up Report Executive Summary. This was a survey of the 2010-2011 Bachelor of Science in Education (BSED) graduates during the period of June 2013 to March 2014. Attempts were made to contact all 384 graduates, first by email and then by telephone. Respondents completed the survey either online (via the Web-based program SurveyMonkey) or over the telephone with a staff member.

The survey consisted of 24 items. All respondents were asked about their employment status. Those who indicated they were teaching were prompted to complete a total of 16 to 18 items depending on their major. Those included 12 Likert-scale (Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree) items related to specific teaching skills and open-ended items prompting for examples. Those not teaching were presented with seven items focusing on current employment and whether they left teaching voluntarily. Additionally, all respondents were asked about their perceived preparation to teach and whether or not they would recommend the Teacher Education Program to others. All were offered the option to discuss their feedback on program and/or any other information

they felt was important to share. Of the 384 graduates identified, 226 completed the survey, representing an overall response rate of 58.8%. Shedd shared the details of this report.

C. IUtpa update (R. Kunzman)

Kunzman shared the developments regarding IUtpa pilots. IUtpa is the customized version of edTPA. The piloting process included four student teacher volunteers in fall 2014 and 30 volunteers for spring 2015. The students in M420 student teaching seminar are also doing a similar teacher performance assessment. The major distinction between these two is that there is not a video component in M420 currently. Also, M420 is not discipline or subject specific in terms of the evaluation of the rubrics. By fall 2016, all student teachers in the M420 seminar will have completed IUtpa. The guiding question for the Office of Teacher Education (OTE) in this process is what it is that our student teachers need to be successful when they get to student teaching and to demonstrate in practice what they learn in the classroom. An online seminar that goes along with M420 has been created. The primary purpose of that seminar is to support students as they do the IUtpa or M420. Another piece that OTE has been working on is how to support students before they start student teaching. A working group will start meeting once a month this spring to communicate about IUtpa across program and subject areas. Afterwards, group members will be able to go back to their program areas and share what they discussed. Another important point Kunzman emphasized is that OTE is trying to keep IUtpa aligned with EDtpa. We have some students who aim to teach in New York and Illinois, and they will have to pass EDtpa to get a license.

The meeting was adjourned.