Committee on Teacher Education
Minutes
February 25, 2004


Handouts: Survey of Teacher Education, Executive Summary of Student Teaching Evaluation Summary and Analysis, Memo from Judith Chafel and Jesse Goodman.

Minutes from January 28, 2004: Approved.

Informational Items:

Terry Mason reported that the Associate Dean of Teacher Education, Diana Lambdin, will be coming up for review.

Terry Mason informed the group that plans to change requirements for W201, W301 and W401 in the elementary education major are underway.

Progress Report on the Committee to Review School of Education Admissions: Terry Mason reported that the sub-committee met last week and made a series of recommendations which will come before the CTE at the March meeting.

Status of H340 – Diana Lambdin reported that at a recent distance meeting, the campuses met to review syllabi from all eight campuses and they were amazingly similar. The course offered at Vincennes, which currently transfers in as H340, however, was quite different. As such, the course at Vincennes is now recommended to articulate as F200. The statewide articulation committee passed that and the change will be communicated to the admissions office. The change will become effective in the fall semester.

Title II Report on Teacher Education Praxis Pass Rates - Diana Lambdin brought a suggestion that we get more information on the institutional pass rates on the PRAXIS tests. IU-Bloomington’s two scores that fall below the statewide average are in secondary math and biology. The general range is between 91-100%. The IPSB has also raised the Elementary PRAXIS II scores for elementary majors and that means that, by raising the bar, our scores may decline. Terry Mason concluded the discussion by noting that this will come up again as it has serious implications for our programs.

Discussion Items:

Survey of Teacher Education Graduates: Terry Mason introduced the item by noting that the survey proposal had been circulated via email and that he had brought along written comments from Lynne Boyle-Baise who was unable to attend. Jesse Goodman began the
discussion by articulating that this was a set-up and expressed concern that this represented an assumption that teacher education programs produced full-fledged teachers. Bruce Law stated that schools do not expect first-year teachers to be full-fledged but that schools do want competence. Christi Smith expressed support for the survey, arguing that students require qualified teachers and students do not have the luxury of time to wait for teachers to mature on the job. Terry Mason questioned the purpose of the evaluation and hoped that the study would provide useful feedback on program efficacy.

Terry Mason introduced two representatives of the Policy Center, Russ Ravert and Ada Simmons. Diana Lambdin asked them to elaborate on where the items on the survey came from. Ada Simmons explained that the Center was approached by Dean Gonzalez. Ada stated that while she could not speak to his specific intentions, she felt that the goal was program improvement, with the survey serving as a follow-up instrument to determine student perceptions of how prepared students felt to get in their own classrooms. Ada Simmons stated that she heard that the stem of the questions was the cause of much of the controversy and proposed changing the stem to better reflect Jesse Goodman’s concerns that teachers were prepared to “begin” mastering the craft of teaching. Jesse Goodman replied that he would prefer ethnographic research with focus groups. Bill Boone suggested that maybe it is a matter of what order the study is conducted in; by beginning with a quantitative study strengths and weaknesses can be located which could then be flushed out through qualitative methods, if funding permits. Bill Boone asked about the size of the sample, which would be 500, representing 32% of the cohort surveyed. Terry Mason stated that there is already considerable research out there and that, given problems of variability, he wondered whether it is a sensitive enough measure. Bill Boone and Jesse Goodman volunteered their assistance to the Policy Center. Jill Shedd said that considering the capital expenditure ($40,000), she wanted really good data. Terry Mason closed the discussion by asking Ada Simmons to write a memo to the CTE and Dean Gonzalez which discussed the kinds of adjustments she felt she could reasonably make to the survey and then we could have something in writing for the next meeting.

**Student Teaching Survey:**

Jill Shedd introduced the item by saying that this is a pilot effort to provide faculty with information regarding student perceptions at the end of student teaching. This is one element of our unit assessment and it incorporates both quantitative and qualitative data. The survey data has been very positive with the variance between “agree” and “strongly agree”. Amongst mentor teachers, as expected, the evaluations are higher than the students rated themselves. The area which seems to require the most improvement is assessment. Jesse Goodman asked whether this resulted from faculty not teaching assessment or because it’s the most complex, nuanced aspect of teaching. Jill noted that All-Grades students feel very well-prepared and similarly highly-rated from the classroom teachers. Jill asked what kinds of information the committee would like to see surveyed as this is a captive audience and nearly anything can be required of students at this point. David Estell requested seeing the open-ended questions that offer more detailed insight on the question of assessment. Terry Mason said that the greatest
weakness is in the self-reporting, but that alternatives may simply not be feasible. Jill Shedd agreed and suggested that this is one kind of assessment and asked for input on other ways to complement this work. Bill Boone suggested focus groups. Diana Lambdin suggested linking this to the Policy Center Survey.

**Supervision of Student Teaching – J. Chafel and J. Goodman**

Judith Chafel reviewed the current method of evaluating student teaching performance which is based on the School of Education’s Six Guiding Principles. Judith Chafel noted that, “We believe that the instrument is flawed and should not be employed for at least two important reasons. First, the School of Education’s Six Principles were articulated to serve as a guide for the design of programs and not for evaluation purposes. Their use as an evaluation tool assumes that the statements articulated on the form describe the realities of public schooling, when this is not the case; the School of Education doesn’t really reflect the reality of schools. Secondly, we believe that the current evaluation form being used breaks the complex activity of teaching into too many discrete items and evaluation levels, making authentic evaluation of student teaching nearly impossible, and often counter-intuitive. In closing, Judith Chafel and Jesse Goodman asked the CTE to ask for a revision of this form which would not distort the Six Guiding Principles and which would embrace authentic assessment. Keith Chapin articulated that he felt the form tried to bring in some level of objectivity and that he found that throughout the entire student teaching period there is substantive give and take. Terry Mason explained that for accreditation reasons, assessment must be based on the Six Principles but that perhaps the instrument could become more interpretive. Diana Lambdin concluded the discussion by saying that some structure to provide a foundation to the conversation is needed.