

Indiana University School of Education
COMMITTEE ON TEACHER EDUCATION
March 23, 2006
Minutes

Present: Diana Lambdin, Dorshell Stewart for Paulette Dilworth, Ben Edmonds, Jose Bonner, Suzanne Eckes, Tim Niggle, Lissa May, Tom Brush, Laura Stachowski

Others Present: Enrique Galindo, Jack Cummings, Cathy Brown, Jeane Novotny

I. **Approval of February 28, 2006 Minutes**

Handout: February 28 Minutes (green)

After briefly reviewing the February 28 minutes, it was motioned that the minutes be approved. Tom Brush notified the committee of a new agenda item: a discussion item on the reconfiguration of the elementary education program as described by the Elementary Education Council (blue handout). APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

II. **Voting Item: Revised Requirements for Elementary Math Concentration—Enrique Galindo**

Handout: Elementary Education Council Items (blue)

Enrique Galindo presented to CTE proposals from the Elementary Education Council, beginning with changes to the elementary math area of concentration. It has been found that there is interest among students in the middle grades license addition for math. The council seeks to encourage students to add an area of concentration while working towards a license addition. The current proposal would revise the current math area of concentration so that students working toward a math concentration can put the coursework toward becoming eligible for a license addition in math for middle grades. The elementary education council proposed the following changes to the content of the math area of concentration:

- 16 credits instead of the current 15
- Taking M211 and M212 (2 credits each), which are requirements for the math license addition, instead of M119 and M120 (3 credits), which are not.
- Eliminating courses at the zero level (M025 and M026) from the list of electives
- Including a new education course, Topics in Middle Grades Mathematics

These changes were brought before the elementary education council, who approved the proposal.

Tom Brush inquired as to the number of students enrolled in the program and any staffing issues involved in making these changes. Enrique responded that they anticipate adding just one section in the methods classes.

It was motioned that the proposal be approved. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

III. **Voting Item: Addition of Elementary Reading Area of Concentration—Enrique Galindo**

Handout: Elementary Education Council Items (blue)

Enrique Galindo also presented a proposal approved by the Elementary Education Council for the addition of an elementary reading area of concentration. The proposal arose from a recommendation from CTE to include a reading concentration for elementary education. This will help students make progress toward a Level I reading license. The program would include 9 credits in language education, and 6 credits at the 200 level or above from COAS, thus striking a balance between using courses inside the School of Education as well as the College of Arts and Sciences to compose the area of concentration.

Tom Brush asked how many students would be interested in this. Diana Lambdin noted that they anticipate that the concentration will be very popular among students.

It was motioned that the proposal be approved. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

IV. **Information Item: Reconfiguration of the Elementary Education Program—Enrique Galindo**

The Elementary Education Program has also proposed changes to the structure of clusters so as to even the imbalance in the number of course sections offered between fall and spring for each of the clusters. The program is currently seeing large numbers of students in the fall and less in the spring. This has made it difficult to plan and staff for these clusters. The proposed change would limit the number of students admitted every semester to 120. Under this change, the same number of students would be admitted each year (240), but the numbers would be balanced over the two semesters. In the transition period until this becomes a regular practice, students may have to wait a semester to get into the program.

The Elementary Education council has also proposed to switch the order of the M201 cluster and M301 cluster. Currently, students take M201 as the first cluster in which they take a field experience requiring them to teach lessons, etc. Students may not be ready to undertake the coursework in this cluster, especially as they have taken very few content or methods courses. Furthermore, the council is concerned that student maturity may be too low for M201; having to teach as part of the field experience without feeling confident in content creates a lot of anxiety for students. Faculty in the M301 cluster feel that they can accommodate students who have not yet taken math and science methods courses. This will allot students more time to complete math and science content requirements (T102, T103, Q202), which will be then be enforced as prerequisites to the 201 cluster.

The current plan is to begin this process Fall 2007, in order to give faculty, staff, and students time to prepare for this change. During the first year, in order to transition to the new program, half the students will do the M201 cluster first, and half will do M301 first. After the first year, all students will take M301 first.

V. Voting Item: Middle School Licensure Extension—Jack Cummings*Handout: Licensure Extension Program Description*

Jack Cummings presented a proposal to add a middle school licensure extension for inservice elementary teachers.

The Secondary Education Council has spent time discussing the middle school license addition for elementary preservice teachers. Plans for a block for preservice teachers were made last spring and summer, however, there were not enough willing faculty to sustain the program. The council continued to receive interest in adding a license addition for middle grades. Two doctoral students from the Curriculum and Instruction Department became interested in teaching the course and, together with the council, developed a proposal for the program. The Secondary Education Council approved a proposal for *inservice elementary teachers* (i.e. those who are already teachers). The program would consist of a 9 hour summer block for practicing teachers wishing to extend their license to middle school, using S505 (3 credits), S500 field-based seminar (3 credits), and P516 adolescent development course.

The current discussion uses math as a target subject area, although other subject areas may be pertinent to the program as well. Members noted ESL and reading as two more areas that should be developed into programs, as they too are high need programs.

In the future, the program may wish to expand the program to include preservice teachers; however the current program will only accept inservice teachers, who, because of their status of licensed teachers, can be fit into field experiences more easily than preservice teachers.

Since the inservice teachers will be coming into the program from various undergraduate institutions with course requirements other than those required by IUB, CTE members inquired as to the content requirements that would be required for teachers to participate in the program. Jack Cummings responded that the content requirements would be determined by individual departments. Student entering the program would give evidence of their content field taken at their undergraduate institution. Tim Niggle suggested also including passing the test required in the state of Indiana for middle grades licensing as evidence of meeting the content requirement for the program.

Several members showed concern as to what will happen to the program after the doctoral students responsible for teaching the program leave IUB. Jack Cummings recommended that doctoral students with experience in teaching middle grades be sought out to continue the program after these associate instructors leave.

It was motioned that the proposal be approved with the following revision: the student must pass the test required for licensing in the middle grades as evidence of meeting the content requirement. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

VI. Voting Item: Secondary Education Post-Baccalaureate Program—Jack Cummings and Cathy Brown

Handouts: New Course Request A308 (goldenrod); Course Change Request A508 (white)

Jack Cummings and Cathy Brown presented a proposed revision to the graduate certification program, submitted on behalf of the Secondary Education Council

There are a number of people coming back to school seeking a teaching license who have bachelor degrees but do not qualify for T2T (e.g. engineer wanting to teach mathematics but doesn't qualify for T2T, or student who doesn't want as intense a program as T2T). Some students want to go on to obtain a masters in education; others are simply going for a license. In response to this interest, the Secondary Education Council has proposed a graduate certification program for graduate hours that would meet state standards for licensing and allow students significant progress toward a masters degree (at least 24 hours).

The requirements for the program were modeled after the undergraduate program as much as possible. The program differs from the undergraduate program in the following areas: an initial S501 seminar and field experience to be done within the first 2 semesters; A508, a new course which would mirror the undergraduate A308; and the graduate level courses S508, Y5ZZ, W501, and P510 as the required P course. The program would total 37-38 credits, with at least 24 of the credits which could toward a masters degree if the student is interested in more than the basic certification. The field experience included in the program would be in schools, but would be primarily observational.

CTE members suggested that the program have a program director who would work with the schedule, determine who would teach courses, etc. This could be the secondary education coordinator, the S503 coordinator, or another faculty member able to take a lead role in the program.

The program would go into effect for students admitted after Fall 06, with the first course running Spring 2007. Because the old program ends this year (June 30), students in the old graduate certification program must apply for a license this year or transfer their coursework so as to demonstrate that they meet the new program requirements; otherwise they are not eligible for license. These students will need individual advising attention.

It was motioned that the revised graduate certification program be approved. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

VII. Information Item: Changes to Secondary Anchor Program—Jack Cummings

Handout: Information Item on Secondary Education Program (purple)

Jack Cummings presented to CTE information on several changes to the Secondary Anchor Program. Students and instructors of S303 have requested more training in school law. The Secondary Education Council discussed this need and found strong support for the following changes. The S303 School Law course would change from a 1.5 credit course to a 3 credit course with a new course number, A308. The S303 Classroom Management course would change from a 1.5 credit course to a 1 credit course (still titled S303), but will be attached to the Block II practicum so as to connect the course with a field experience.

Diana Lambdin emphasized the need for the school law course and noted that previous course evaluations have been incredibly positive

CTE motioned to approve the course A308 as a part of the changes to the secondary anchor program (the program changes themselves need not be approved by CTE). APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

VIII. Discussion Item: Faculty Governance and Service

Handout: Faculty Governance and Service 3/23/06 (white)

Tom Brush summarized the discussion on faculty governance and service from the February 28 CTE meeting, in which he gave an initial request for information. The purpose of the current discussion item was to get more feedback on these concerns and offer suggestions via a written report to the policy council.

It was noted in the previous discussion that the service load in the School of Education is higher than other colleges within IUB, primarily because there are so many accredited programs which require systematic review, oversight, etc. Suggestions that resulted from the last discussion include.

- Look at redistributing merit percentages, increase percentages for service
- Look at actual committee member attendance at meetings or chair evaluations of member contributions
- Discuss issues of disparity for minority faculty (minority faculty are often asked to serve on more committees)
- Offer financial compensation.

Suzanne Eckes inquired as to whether any of the current committees could be combined into one body. Tim Niggle suggested appointing people from the elementary and secondary education councils to serve on CTE. This would be a double service load for people in those committees, but may ensure members who are more invested in the issues at hand and more informed on the items. The difficulty in this option is that CTE is an independent body which is unique in that it has representation of faculty and staff from outside the School of Education. Members then suggested that meetings of the full council be reduced for program review and UAS assessment, and allow a small representative group from the elementary and secondary education councils to represent other agenda items.

CTE members also noted that there is currently no accountability on faculty/staff annual reports whether members were actually active on the committee. It was suggested that percentages of meetings attended be included in annual reports. The committee chair could report the attendance of faculty members at committee meetings. Members felt this would be an appropriate starting point.

Another issue to consider is the distribution of faculty involved in service. Some members serve on multiple committees while others have no service commitments. There are also councils within the School of Education and the university that are not Policy Council governed organizations (e.g. elementary education, secondary education, academic standards committee); thus policy council may not recognize these commitments and assign faculty and staff to additional service on Policy Council committees. Service on a diverse selection of committees under the university should be recognized and valued by Policy Council.

These suggestions will be taken into consideration when Tom Brush reports to the Policy Council.