

Committee on Teacher Education
February 23, 2010
School of Education, Room 4204

In attendance: Jeane Novotny, Jose Bonner, Karen Wohlwend, Susie Gronseth, Janice Bizarri, Tom Brush, Keith Chapin, Peter Kloosterman, Luise McCarty, Sarah Warfield, David Estell, Tim Niggle, Anne Leftwich, Enrique Galindo, Marjorie Manifold

I. Approval of minutes from January 21, 2010 (Enrique Galindo)

Enrique Galindo suggested an edit to indicate that the Math Department has “*proposed* that instructors from the School of Education will teach N101 for the next three years at which point the program will be reviewed again in the hopes that the remonstrance will be officially removed.”

Tim Niggle moved to approve the minutes with the amendment. Luise McCarty seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.

II. Voting Items

A. Program Changes - Visual Arts Program (Marjorie Manifold)

Marjorie Manifold presented on a course hour distribution change for the All Grades program. It was proposed that EDUC-M482—All Grade, the student teaching placement for all art education majors seeking certification in All-Grade Visual Art certification with no endorsements and/or minors, be changed from a 10 weeks/10 credit requirement to a 12-16 week (10-16 credit) requirement. In addition, all art education majors who are seeking certification in All-Grade Visual Art Certification, with or without endorsements and/or minors, would be required to enroll in EDUC-M420: Student Teaching Seminar: Understanding Schools (1 credit).

Rationale for the proposed change is that 10 weeks of student teaching is too short of a time for students who are receiving All-Grades certification. Historically, it is hard for the School of Education to place visual arts teachers within a 50-mile radius. Further, those teachers are needed for practicum teachers, which overburdens them when it comes to student teaching. Today, the majority of students return home to student teach and the department feels they need 12-16 weeks in the field; if the 16 weeks option then it should be split between elementary and secondary placements. An additional rationale is that visual arts students are the only students not required to take the student teaching seminar, because in the past there have not been enough visual arts supervisors in the field to provide that seminar. However, the seminar that is provided today is broad enough that it would (a) cover the needs of students and (b) remove the need to have to teach students at the practicum level how to put together a teaching portfolio too early on in their development. These proposed changes, although they require more credits in order to graduate in the visual arts section, are needed to improve the visual arts program.

The discussion was opened up to the Committee members. It was clarified that M420 already exists in the School of Education, but visual arts students in the past have not been required to take the course. The change also applies to graduate students enrolled in Z532. There are

approximately 24 students per semester who are placed in student teaching assignments, including those working toward certification and undergraduates who are taking the student teaching course. However, the number of area teachers who can work with those students tends to be low. In some cases, students are encouraged to go home to teach because there are no area classrooms in which they can be placed. There was a discussion about how the student teaching hours are distributed under the current proposal, as well as how hours are distributed in other programs. It was clarified that the 12-hour option is to allow for schools that offer K-12 in one building. Standard for physical education and music is the variable 10-16 student teaching hours, which is why the proposal brought to the CTE read 10-16, as opposed to 12-16. Keith Chapin shared that the physical education placement is a 16-week experience that is split evenly between 8 and 8. This also accommodates the all-grade certification. It was clarified that students must take a minimum of 12 hours in order to get financial aid. It was noted that as REPA revisions begin, field experience hours may be affected throughout programs.

Tim Niggle moved to accept the proposal with an amendment indicating that 12-16 hours of student teaching in visual arts will earn students 12-16 credits. Anne Leftwich seconded the motion. The amended proposal was accepted unanimously.

III. Information Items

A. New PRAXIS pedagogy test requirement (Tom Brush)

Tom Brush passed out an email that had been sent to members of Elementary and Secondary councils with information of the pedagogy test now required for licensing under REPA. Included in the email is a link to what the pedagogy test will look like. As faculty consider changes in course distribution, the inclusion of a pedagogy test might be something to consider in more depth. Those seeking licensure will still have to take the Praxis 2 and a basic skills test. The pedagogy test requirement is a third test. It was noted that Early Childhood, Elementary, and TAL tests currently have a pedagogy aspect in their design. However, the new pedagogy test requirement is apparently a new test that has been added for the REPA legislation. Although some Indiana campuses require Praxis 2 for graduation, it is not required at IU Bloomington. Nor is it likely that the new pedagogy test will be required for graduation. According to REPA, individual schools may no longer decide which tests to use for admission to Education programs. Instead, REPA mandates for the use of Praxis 1 and cut scores on the ACT and SAT.

The Committee discussed how All-Grades will be tested under the new pedagogy requirement. It was noted that the state has yet to come to a decision regarding tests that already include a pedagogy section. It was clarified that the pedagogy test will be effective July 1, thus affecting incoming freshmen in 2010.

IV. Discussion Items

A. Update on REPA discussion with Elementary and Secondary Councils (Tom Brush)

The most impacting changes at the secondary level brought on by REPA is that all candidates must complete identical content requirements in their programs to that of the major in the college. At the Elementary level, the biggest change is that all Elementary Education majors must also complete a minor, either in the content area or in one of the areas approved by the

state. Using a mock program sheet generated by Office of Teacher Education advisors, Secondary Council members have been asked to analyze requirements for individual majors in the college and to return for the next meeting prepared to discuss what coursework, from a content perspective, they think would be necessary to meet the requirements of REPA. It is hoped that this strategy will help determine course distribution for each program and to determine what, if any, modifications need to be made to professional education requirements at the Secondary level. Preliminary feedback from Secondary Council members suggests that overall the School of Education should be able to smoothly integrate current programs with the REPA legislation. It was noted that Social Studies is going to be harder to accommodate than other programs, given that currently the majority of Social Studies students do not receive a major in any one area. In addition, at the Secondary level Bob Sherwood has taken the lead on proposing a Secondary Education minor with the college. The creation of a Secondary Education minor would allow students enrolled in COAS working toward a major in a discipline to also earn an Education minor that will lead to certification. Bob Sherwood is planning to propose this minor at the upcoming Secondary Council meeting. The Elementary Education Council members were given the task of looking at their programs and determining what a minor would be comprised of, if they want to propose a minor. A minor is defined as a minimum of 15 credit hours, based on COAS programs. Faculty at the Elementary Council were encouraged to examine minors as a secondary licensing area.

Proposed for the current CTE meeting is a discussion on how to fit the minor into current programs, and what modifications need to be made to current programs, in order to still allow students to finish a program in four years. The discussion was opened up to the Committee members. It was clarified that the area of concentration could be expanded so that it counts as a minor. The rationale for the minor by the state is to allow students to get additional content in order to graduate. However, an advantage for the School of Education is that REPA also listed other areas, e.g. Reading, that would be acceptable as a minor. It was clarified that the Reading addition (24 hours) that was cut can now be a minor, as well as an additional license. It was noted that faculty should discuss this issue and determine whether they are comfortable with the Reading addition doubling as a license. The current addition is still viable until 2013; all changes have to be reapproved under the state.

There was a brief discussion about how other Indiana schools are reacting to the REPA legislation. It was clarified that REPA does not specify credit hours for any aspect of the legislation. It was noted that in COAS the maximum credit hours a student can take in a minor is 29. The School of Education is trying to determine if a viable minor can be done with fewer credit hours than what is currently required. It was noted that a possible option is for Elementary Education to have a major in COAS and complete a minor in the School of Education. There was a discussion about how to offer the minors suggested by the REPA legislation. A recent webinar with the state of Indiana suggested that the School of Education must offer all of the minors proposed under REPA; it had been previously thought that programs could select which minors they offered. This raises various issues for the School of Education, among them how to offer an “elementary minor”, which has never been offered. There was a discussion about how the common curriculum fits into the changes brought on by REPA.

The Committee members discussed further how minors are defined according to REPA. It was clarified that until administration in the School of Education have a firm idea of what a minor is under REPA, questions will have to be tabled. At issue is the relationship between total number of COAS credits and total number of School of Education credits. Tom Brush reminded Committee members that faculty at the School of Education need to take a serious look at programs and decide what to modify while the opportunity exists in order to prove to the state they have not done just the bare minimum. In other words, if the state does not believe that the School of Education has not taken the suggestions seriously, further legislation could be suggested that may worsen the current situation. Regarding credit hour distribution, it was suggested to look more closely at which education courses can count toward general education courses. It was clarified that for any students currently enrolled in education programs, they must finish by August of 2013, before the REPA legislation takes effect. It was noted that incoming freshmen, those first affected by this change, should be told of this decision. There was a discussion about the upcoming common curriculum changes set for 2011. Currently, SIS is flagging courses that count for Education in the common curriculum. Also added to the collection will be courses that are submitted for approval to the common curriculum. Committee members were reminded to attend both the Elementary and Secondary Council meetings in light of recent legislative changes affecting Education programs. It was also mentioned that the Office of Teacher Education is ready to address any questions that come up.

B. Proposed date change for April 27 CTE meeting (Tom Brush)

It was proposed that the April 27 meeting move to April 15 in order to allow enough time for any program changes to be sent to the Policy Council meeting.

The proposal was accepted. The April 27 meeting has been changed to April 15.

Enrique Galindo motioned to adjourn the meeting. Anne Leftwich seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned.