

Indiana University School of Education  
Committee on Teacher Education  
January 24, 2007

Minutes

**Present:** David Estell, Enrique Galindo, Diana Lambdin, Jill Shedd, Brent Gault, Laura Stachowski, Tim Niggle, Andrea McCloskey, Paulette Dilworth, Gerald Campano

**Others Present:** Jeane Novotny, Becky Cramer, Juliana Hallows

**I. Welcome:** David Estell conducted the meeting.

**1. Approval of December 4, 2006 Minutes**

—David Estell

*Handout: December 4 Minutes (buff)*

David Estell, who will be chairing the committee for spring semester, opened the meeting by giving members an opportunity to review the December 4, 2006 minutes. It was motioned that the minutes be approved and it was seconded: MOTION APPROVED.

**2. Information Items**

▪ **Update on IUB Common Core General Education Proposal**

Diana Lambdin informed the committee that the definitions of the various categories for the Bloomington campus common core were approved on December 15, 2006. As of January 15, 2007 the Committee on General Education (CGE) had finished accepting proposals for common core courses. These proposals would then be sent to the appropriate sub committees for review; after which, the subcommittees would recommend courses for the various common core categories. She remarked that the College of Arts and Sciences had submitted approximately 500 course proposals and that the School of Education had submitted five: M135, F205, K205, G203, P314, and a museum and art appreciation course that has yet to be created. The criteria by which each of these courses will be judged are not clear thus there is some uncertainty as to whether they will be accepted; however, there will be repeated opportunities to resubmit course proposals.

Diana Lambdin reported that no T math courses were submitted because they did not believe the T courses were appropriate for that common core category. Enrique Galindo provided an example of some of the requirements his sub-committee (math modeling) requires for math course proposals. Some of the criteria includes: historical information about the course, evidence of grade distribution, and consistency of teaching for the course. He remarked that they decided not to send any math proposals at this time to see how the process will go afterwards they could create stronger course proposals. He added that all the math proposals that were submitted were from the math department.

The board of trustees is suggesting that all Indiana University campuses have the same general education/common core program. To circumvent this the University Faculty Council met to create a proposal that states that not all campus have to have the same general education requirements but they must all offer the courses required by the legislature that are transferable from campus to campus. For information, Diana Lambdin added that the CGE also discussed trustees question as to why the admissions and common core requirements would be implemented in 2011. The main reason for this is that it allows

incoming students and departments to prepare for the changes. She remarked that some members suggested having two tracks of students: one track where the students meet the new requirements and take the common core and another track of students that do not. Another suggestion was that various departments could require their students to meet the new admissions requirements and take common core courses. The committee discussed how the common core could affect incoming students with advanced placement credits if they were no longer accepted.

Diana then closed by stating that the next meeting of the Committee on General Education would be on February 16, 2007 to discuss on some of the stated concerns.

- **Revisiting the Six Principles**

David Estell informed the committee that as a result of the Specialty Professional Association and NCATE reviews many programs may find areas in which the six principles could be altered that could spur future discussion within the committee. He added that if the six principles are changed now it may negatively affect the NCATE review process as there would be no time to evaluate the adherence to the new principles. David Estell suggested that the committee encourage departments to generate a dialogue about the principles in order to foster a greater discussion after the review process. Laura Stachowski stated that she worried this issue may not be addressed in the future but understood the rationale for postponing this topic. She stressed the importance of reviewing the principles and it was noted that this topic would be addressed in the Fall of 2007.

## **II. Discussion Item: Review of NCATE Assessment Process**

—Becky Cramer

*Handout: PowerPoint Slides*

Becky Cramer gave a presentation regarding the processes of the NCATE Specialty Professional Association (SPA) reviews. She had given the same presentation to the Secondary Education Program and so her examples were geared toward that program. The purpose of her presentation was to explain the process of the NCATE SPA review. She explained that programs that have chosen the SPA route must compile a report that is sent directly to NCATE. NCATE will then send that report to a review committee of peers from the appropriate SPA. Next, the SPA will evaluate the report and send their review to NCATE who will then report back to the initial program. Thus it is important that the reports follow all the requirements and are concise.

SPA reports consist of five sections: 1) context information; 2) assessments and related data; 3) standards assessment chart; 4) evidence for meeting standards; and 5) use of assessment results to improve candidate performance. Section one is a description of the program and must be single spaced, 12pt. font and a maximum of five pages. Section two is a chart that lists the 6-8 assessments and when they are given within the program (i.e. Praxis II). Section three is also a chart that identifies which selected assessments evaluate the given SPA standards. Section four is a two page, single spaced, 12pt. font description of assessments, assessment instructions, scoring guides, the assessment data of how students performed, and proof that the assessments indeed measured the SPA standards. Section five is a written description of how the program is using the assessment data to improve or make changes to assessments or program.

Becky Cramer reported that NCATE wants particular assessments in particular locations within the program (Praxis II and second content knowledge assessments, for example). She then continued to

describe various assessments as shown in the PowerPoint Handout. She explained that many programs will have to gather data to fulfill assessment requirements such as candidate impact of student learning. Also, the first five assessments will be the similar, if not the same, across programs and that additional assessments may vary per program. Becky Cramer then discussed some of the concerns with gathering some of the assessment data. She added that she and the Secondary Education Program were working on these concerns.

Becky Cramer then described the timeline for creating and submitting the SPA reports. More importantly if programs submit their reports on 02/01/2008 they will only need to submit one year of data and if they choose to submit their reports on 09/15/2008 they must submit two years of data (which is the last day to submit). The committee then discussed the implementations of these processes. Enrique Galindo asked if Becky Cramer could come and give a similar presentation of the State process to the Elementary Education Counsel. Jean Novotny asked which programs would be required to complete these reports. Jill Shedd responded that the school is only required to do Rules 2002 programs and she has written confirmation that the school only has to report programs that had program completers or certification recommendations in 2005-2006. Thus some of the really small programs will not need to complete the report. She added that Health and Physical Education is going to use the State review process.

David Estell then asked if we had contacted every program for UAS reports for this semester. It was noted that the Health program was not notified and David Estell stated that he would be contacting them to set up a time for when they would present.

### **III. Discussion Item: Bachelor of Science in Education without Certification —Diana Lambdin**

The purpose of this discussion was to discuss whether the School of Education should be allowing students to graduate in Education without certification for a professional license. Paulette Dilworth asked if there were any other colleges or universities in Indiana that offered a degree without certification. Tim Niggle stated that Indiana State, Ball State, Southern Indiana, and IUPUI all grant Education degrees without certification under very extreme circumstances. Paulette Dilworth then asked what the concern about this issue was. Tim Niggle responded that there has been a large increase of students that are going through the appeals process (one or two to 19). The standards committee questions whether or not offering a non-certification degree is appropriate. David Estell added that another concern is that students who receive these degrees may go to other states and obtain a license.

Enrique Galindo stated that this item was discussed and the committee had agreed to complete a pilot study of the current students. Diana Lambdin added that she has reviewed some of the capstone plans and that some of them have made some progress and some have not. Tim Niggle asked how many new cases there are. She reported that she had not received any but eight students were currently working on their capstone projects. Diana Lambdin Emphasized that these are not students who weren't able to do student teaching but rather students who did not want to work in the classroom.

Diana Lambdin then stated that she had received an email from Claire King about an Education degree without certification focusing on working with youth and the interest of funding agencies in these programs. Paulette Dilworth then stated that students could complete an independent study degree that

would allow them to take the education courses they wanted. Diana Lambdin stated that one option would be to offer a list of courses that students could use in their individualized major, like the minor that is offered in Education. The committee then discussed the problems with creating a degree like low enrollment and scheduling logistics.

The impetus for the email Diana Lambdin received was because of lower enrollments in the School of Education (which has to do with admissions requirements and job demands). Jill Shedd added that there are so many other places in society where there is education and work with youth going on and so it may be a good idea to service these individuals. The committee discussed the options for people who would like to work in these areas like degrees in social work and such. The committee then discussed the issues with documenting students that would be receiving a degree without certification and options for students who do not want the classroom experience. David Estell added that providing a list of courses that would contribute to an independent degree would be helpful for those who may want a minor in Education. Tim Niggle responded that there is a list of courses which he described. He stated that would could create and advertise it more formally. He also stated that with the common core students could transfer more readily from program to program.

Diana Lambdin stated that she would like to have Claire King come and present on a degree without certification so that the committee could have a greater understanding about these types of degrees. David Estell asked if there were any comments or questions. None were given concerning this item and the meeting was adjourned.