

Indiana University School of Education
Committee on Teacher Education
April 17, 2006
Minutes

Present: David Estell, Joby Copenhaver for Gerald Campano, Suzanne Eckes, Jose Bonner, Diana Lambdin, Dorshell Stewart for Ben Edmonds, Laura Stachowski, Jill Shedd, Brent Gault, Tom Brush

Others Present: Genny Williamson, Carrie Chapman, Jeane Novotny

I. Approval of March 23, 2006 Minutes

After reviewing the minutes, it was motioned that the minutes be approved with one addendum: to change a phrase in Item II (Revised Requirements for Elementary Math Concentration) from “Enrique responded that they anticipate adding just one section in the methods classes.” to “Enrique responded that they anticipate adding just one section in the new education course.” APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

II. Information Item: Date Change for May CTE Meeting—Tom Brush

Tom Brush announced a change in meeting dates. The next meeting of the Committee on Teacher Education will be on Monday, May 8 instead of Wednesday, May 10. Tom Brush also announced that Item VIII (Secondary Education Double Major Proposal) will be tabled per a request from the Secondary Education Program.

III. Voting Item: Special Education Proposal to Meet “Highly Qualified Requirements”—Carrie Chapman

Carrie Chapman presented a proposal from the Community of Teachers (CoT) program to further align its practices with movements in the state of Indiana toward the definition of “highly qualified” teachers in special education. What is understood as “highly qualified” is continually changing in the state of Indiana. Currently, state rules articulate that special education teachers must be highly qualified in at least one of three academic areas (English, math, and science). These are the three academic areas measured by the ISTEP test. Previously, students in the CoT program were required to have an area of concentration, but not necessarily in the areas of English, math, or science. Currently, the state requires a minimum of 24 credit hours in a content field to qualify them as “highly qualified.” Graduates who already have an undergraduate degree in one of the content degree in one of the content area may be able to use their undergraduate coursework to help meet this requirement. Students may also demonstrate qualifications by passing the Praxis II exam in English, math, or science.

Diana Lambdin asked if they are recommending or requiring that students take one of the three content areas. Carrie Chapman clarified that beginning in Spring 2006, undergraduate students must choose one of the three content areas. Tom Brush asked whether students

who take one particular content area are still able to work with teachers of other content areas. Carrie Chapman responded that a person does not have to be highly qualified in all areas in order to begin teaching all areas. The state of Indiana now requires that in order to teach diploma-track students in a special education self-contained classroom, a teacher can start the job being qualified in only one area, but must become highly qualified in all content areas within a certain time period. A special education teacher in the general education classroom does not have to be highly qualified in all areas to work with licensed general education teachers.

Diana Lambdin asked if the state specified what types of courses are included in the 24 credit hours needed to be highly qualified. The state of Indiana has not yet specified which courses should be included.

The Community of Teachers program strongly feels that these changes will allow students seeking a special education degree to become highly qualified in an academic content area and thus be eligible for employment in the state of Indiana.

It was motioned to approve the proposal as written. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

IV. UAS Report: Teaching All Learners Program—Genny Williamson

Genny Williamson presented unit assessment data from the Teaching All Learners Program.

The Teaching All Learners program is an undergraduate elementary program in special education. Students graduating from the program have a degree in special education and are eligible for certification in elementary education and special education in the mild intervention category. TAL was designed to not be housed only in the special education department; much of students' coursework is done within or parallel to the special education program. The program is unique to the School of Education in its emphasis on technology for students with disabilities; a collaboration and consultation course; an assessment course to help teachers assist with diagnoses, interpret assessment results, and assist with annual reports (though there is no practicum in formal assessment); an inquiry course; and an urban practicum—the only one of its kind in the SoE—in which junior level students spend 10 full days in diverse, low SES, Indianapolis schools to do social studies units, assessments, and reading with students.

The unit assessment sought to evaluate the program on how students felt about the program, how students looked to their supervising teachers, the impact of the urban practicum, and how well the required electronic portfolio met professional standards.

Students in program are primarily white females. The program aims for 48 students in every cohort, plus or minus several. This is the first year a waitlist was created. Ethnicity and gender of students in the TAL is of special concern because of the overrepresentation of minority students and male students in special education. There is a continued need for recruitment of culturally diverse students in program as well as men.

Overall, students reported feeling well prepared, though this was not universal throughout program. Program directors have also seen less confidence in some students; this may be a factor of having inconsistent faculty in the program in recent years. The program is hoping to gain more consistent faculty, especially in the area of behavior disorders and autism. The program is also requesting a change in the assistive technology courses from 2 credits to 3 credits to increase exposure to assistive technology. Genny Williamson noted that obtaining a technology lab for training has been difficult in the School of Education.

Supervising teachers felt that in general students were well prepared for their teaching responsibilities and were strong in individualized assessment, which is a key component of special education. Students are not, however, prepared in formalized assessment, which is sometimes required by districts.

Program directors had hoped that the urban practicum experience would encourage student interest in working in urban settings, where there is a considerable need. Qualitative data does not show an increase in student interest per se, but shows a subtle change in students' perception and sensitivity to the challenges of children in urban settings. There is a change from a deficit orientation to understanding disabilities in the child's context. This is a very positive change for students.

There is a good match between the program goals and IPSB standards. However, the program does not have strong language/communication instruction, which is central to special education. Transition planning is also not a major part of the program, however transition plans are typically part of secondary education and not elementary education. The program does not have specific social skills training, which is related in a way to language and communication issues. The program does not address ESL learners. Genny noted that it is difficult to assess students in some areas of IPSB standards because many of the qualifications are not seen until a student begins student teaching.

The program is pleased with the cohort system and consistency in the program. Directors are working on hiring more permanent instructors. TAL is lobbying for a full-time clinical faculty member rather than visiting professors. They will begin their search next year. Language instruction is needed in the program; a course change is being made to incorporate language into training in learning disorders. Students also reported interest in more special education practicum experiences and a law course.

CTE members inquired as to whether students could be trained to work with students with severe and profound disabilities. The TAL program is currently considering adding an intense intervention piece to the program. In the future, training in severe and profound disabilities may be offered as a track within TAL. This type of track would look different from Indiana state standards for highly qualified teachers, as students would not be teaching diploma track students.

CTE thanked Genny Williamson and the TAL program for their report.

- V. Voting Item: Integration of W201, W301, and W401 into TAL Program—Genny Williamson**
- VI. Course Change Request K370—Genny Williamson**
- VII. Course Change Request K361—Genny Williamson**

Genny Williamson presented to CTE a proposal which would, if approved, replace the 3 credit course W200 with 3 1 credit courses: W201, W301, and W401. The change would allow students to be exposed to technology education throughout their teacher education programs, instead of having on course early on. This benefits TAL students, who have an additional course in assistive technology, and must submit an e-portfolio as part of their program requirements. The timeline for the change is to begin with the Spring 2007 sophomore cohort, with the option of using W200 instead of W201 as a way to fade in the new course requirements. This will add 2 extra credits to students' course loads until the W200 course fades out. Advising sheets for the W courses must be updated to reflect this change.

In addition to the changes to technology requirements for TAL students, TAL will now allow students to take H340 at any time, rather than being taken during students' senior year. This will be reflected in the advising sheets for TAL students. TAL is requesting that K361, which is taken during fall of senior year, be changed from 2 credits to 3 credits. This change will take place in the fall of 2007.

Finally, TAL is requesting a change in the course name and course description of K370. The new title of the course will be Introduction to Language and Learning Disorders, and the course will have a greater emphasis on language processing and communication issues in learning disorders.

There was a motion to accept changes to TAL program, including the integration of W201, W301, W401, and approval of K370 and K361. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

VIII. Voting Item: Secondary Education Double Major Proposal—Jack Cummings

This item was tabled at the request of the Secondary Education Program.

IX. New Course Request: Math Area of Concentration—Diana Lambdin

Diana Lambdin introduced two courses to be required for new the new middle school math area of concentration and license addition: N310 and N510. The request is for a 300 level course for students seeking a mathematics area of concentration as well as a 500 level course for in-service teachers wanting a middle school math license addition. What is different from the 500 level course and the 300 level course is a curriculum project for the N510 designed to be more intensive for the graduate level students.

Jose Bonner commented on the need for hands-on, engaging experiences for middle school math students, and suggested making that concern a part of the course. Diana

Lambdin suggested adding a statement in the syllabus on the course's intent to encourage an interest and motivation in the learning of topics in mathematics.

It was motioned that the new course requests for N310 and N510 be approved.
APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

X. Voting Item: Honors Direct Admission Program—Jill Shedd

The School of Education has been strongly encouraged to create a process for direct admission of freshmen into the SoE. There is currently an honors program in the SoE, as recently approved by CTE and policy council. The honors program will create an option for direct admission of exceptional students into the teacher education program. The current proposal includes the criteria for and process of direct admissions.

The criteria for admission would be synonymous with that of the Hutton Honors College (HCC). As students note a career interest in education, HHC will notify OTE of these students and an education advisor will be assigned to these students. The student will work with both an education advisor and an advisor from HHC. The program coordinator of the student's program of interest will be encouraged to contact the student. Students doing direct admission into TEP will be required to pass the Praxis I in the first semester of their freshman year.

Tom Brush asked whether HHC has given any indication of how many students have requested this program. Jill Shedd responded that the same question was raised when working with HHC to develop an honors notation in education. It is believed that there are approximately 15–20 students per year interested in this option.

There was a motion to accept honors direct admission program as written. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

XI. Discussion Item: Proposed Revisions to General Education Requirements—Diana Lambdin

Diana Lambdin presented a proposal from the Educational Policies Committee in the Bloomington Faculty Council to have university-wide general education requirements. There is currently no core general education requirement for all majors at the university. Various forms of this proposal has floated around the university without coming to fruition. The Education Policies Committee has been working on this for 4-5 years. The university president and trustees are putting pressure on the committee to develop a proposal for general education requirements. The current version is the March 31st version with several amendments made today, April 17.

The notion is to come up with categories of general education competencies that all students at the university would be required to have as categories of experiences. There is little dispute about the value of having general education requirements in core categories; however, working through the details has brought the committee to several impasses.

The Technicalities and Supplementary Provisions in the written proposal are the main source of the dispute, particularly technicality 1 and 5. Technicality 1 states that there will be a general education committee and lays out how that committee will be formulated, who will be on it, what the voting process will be, etc. Proposals defining what fits into a category would have to receive the support of both the majority of the voting members, and at least some voting members from at least four of the Colleges and Schools; otherwise it fails. Most people on the committee were in agreement on this technicality. Technicality 5, however, has been the most significant source of contention. Technicality 5 states that for courses used to satisfy general education requirements, all or all but one of the courses must be taken in the College of Arts and Sciences. Other units do not want to agree to this, but the COAS will only agree if this is in place because they feel it is their purview to offer general education courses in the arts and sciences.

Members commented that there should be a process by which a course could be approved to meet a general education requirement if it met the spirit of the general education equivalent but was clearly designed to benefit a student in a particular program, not simply to retain tuition dollars for that particular school. Diana Lambdin noted that the intention of technicality 1 was to provide a way for a committee to review its courses to determine what courses would be considered acceptable.

Because of these impasses, the current proposal may be dead in the water; nevertheless, it will be proposed to Bloomington faculty council tomorrow. If proposal is not accepted, the trustees may take it upon themselves to draft something this summer and pass it. But it is unsure whether or not they will do this. The proposal may be revisited next year. This may also be approved as a starting point, by which the details of the technicalities can be worked out in the future.

Diana Lambdin noted that there is also currently a discussion taking place on allowing students to take general education classes from Ivy Tech, which holds bearing on this discussion as well. The issue will be further addressed in the May 8 meeting.