

Indiana University School of Education  
Committee on Teacher Education  
May 8, 2006  
Minutes

**Present:** Jill Shedd, Greg Mongold, Jose Bonner, Gerald Campano, Diana Lambdin, Keith Chapin, Brent Gault, Tim Niggle, Tom Brush, Laura Stachowski, David Estell

**Others Present:** Enrique Galindo to present UAS report, Jeane Novotny

**1. Approval of April 17, 2006 Minutes**

After briefly reviewing the April 17, 2006 minutes, it was motioned that the minutes be approved as amended with two typographical errors. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

**2. UAS Report: Theory into Practice K-6 Program**

Enrique Galindo presented a program review of the Theory into Practice Program (TIP). The elementary education program is the school's largest program. The report is based on mainly on a compilation of issues discussed by the elementary education council as well as data gathered from four surveys: two given to student teachers and two given to supervising teachers of student teachers.

Enrollment in TIP has ranged from 260 in 2000-01 to 200 in 2005-2006, with a bubble of increased enrollment in 2002-2003. Generally, students in the program give a positive report on the program. Challenges to the current program include:

- Access to schools for field experiences and articulation issues. Because of the large number of students in the program, it is difficult to find appropriate field experience placements for them. In addition, the program finds it challenging to meet requirements without duplicating efforts.
- Faculty involvement. The program would like to maximize the interactions between students and faculty, however, with a large program with multiple sections, it is difficult to staff courses with faculty members.

General survey results from 2003-04 and 2004-05 show that the most mentioned strengths of students in the program were their ability to plan lessons and their knowledge of state standards. Weaknesses include classroom management and assessment methods. The program review contains a list of changes to be implemented to address the issues and challenges described by TIP.

Gerald Campano asked for the reason behind the decision to the switch M201 and M301 clusters. Enrique responded that it was in part so that students would have more access to math and science content; however the biggest reason was the readiness issue. Many students felt that math and science were areas they found challenging to teach. This change would give students another field experience in teaching before requiring them to teach math and science.

### **3. Clarification of Elementary Education Prerequisites—Tom Brush**

Tom Brush initiated a clarification of an issue that was raised at the April 17, 2006 meeting regarding Elementary Education Program prerequisites. At the April 17 meeting, Jill Shedd questioned whether or not the March 23 minutes were accurate in stating that T102, T103, and Q202 would be enforced as prerequisites to the 201 cluster. The issue in question is whether the Elementary Education Program will require T102, T103, and Q202 as prerequisites to taking the 201 cluster OR as prerequisites to admission to the Teacher Education Program. Enrique Galindo clarified that when the motion was brought before CTE on March 23, 2006, the proposal was to require these courses for the 201 cluster. However, at a later Elementary Education Council meeting, advisors found that it would be easier to enforce this requirement by making it a prerequisite for admission to TEP.

Tim Niggle handed out draft of the TIP advising sheet reflecting this change. Tim Niggle reported that 70% of students come into TEP with these requirements already completed. Making this requirement allows the University Division to assist in moving students through these courses. The change may cause some complications for students, especially those struggling with math, although for these students a delay may not be a bad idea. Diana Lambdin suggested that the program may want to monitor how many problems this will cause for students, since another requirement is that students must received a C or better in these courses in order to qualify them for admission. Jill Shedd clarified that by Fall 2008, all students must have a C or better in all prerequisite courses in order to be admitted.

The current clarification requires that the minutes from March 23, 2006 be changed to reflect that T102, T103, and Q202 are required for admission into TEP.

Jill Shedd noted the need to be prepared for students who may not meet the requirements. If students are unable to meet these requirements, it may create a holding pattern for students between professional semesters 1 and 2. This could potentially create ebbs and flows in enrollment numbers. Diana Lambdin further noted that the program will need to consider whether students can get into the courses and pass them in time to enter TEP in a timely fashion. Students must have a chance each semester to meet these requirements.

### **4. Discussion Item: Articulation Agreement with Ivy Tech—Tom Brush**

Tom Brush discussed the results of the recent Education Council meeting. The Education Council includes representatives from the IU teacher education programs from the 8 campuses. The council meets twice a year to discuss general policies and questions regarding their education programs. The programs do not look the same, but the council seeks to maintain communication among the programs. The major discussion item at the meeting was an articulation agreement with Ivy Tech.

Ivy Tech has already established an agreement with Indiana State University so that an individual with a 2 year degree from any Indiana Ivy Tech can attend ISU and transfer all credits to the elementary education program. This is commonly known as a 2 plus 2 degree. ISU guarantees these students a 2 year program to get a teaching degree. Dean Gonzalez would like to have a similar agreement with all Ivy Tech campuses and IU campuses. This can be difficult because the requirements for the various teacher education programs are different among

campuses, and the form of the current Ivy Tech proposal is not acceptable to any of the IU campuses. Dean Gonzalez would like to propose an IU-initiated plan to Ivy Tech as a good faith effort toward making an articulation agreement.

Laura Stachowski asked whether a similar agreement has been made with Purdue or Ball State teacher education programs. Diana Lambdin responded that there is no agreement now, but the goal is to move toward each school having a 2 plus 2 program so that students in high school and community colleges will know what is required to participate in such a program.

Tom Brush gave to members a proposal given to the Education Council on the lower division programs for elementary education. Representatives from the Education Council were told to take the proposal back to their individual decision making bodies to begin discussions on how to make this happen. The goal is to develop a lower division program proposal that will be acceptable to all campuses, so that students at any Ivy Tech campus could, if admitted, transfer their courses to a 2 plus 2 program at any IU campus. Once a proposal is designed that is acceptable to all IU campuses, it will be presented to Ivy Tech.

Jose Bonner asked what the major difficulties were with accepting the current proposal from Ivy Tech. Tom Brush responded that one of the biggest problems is that several of the courses established in the articulation agreement are not offered at the lower division level (e.g. children's literature, an education and community course). IU is wary of allowing students to take a lower division course at Ivy Tech and transfer it to IU as an upper division course. Ivy Tech also proposes a functional math course, 8 credits of Spanish, and less flexibility in the arts and humanities requirements.

Greg Mongold asked if there were any compromises made by ISU in making an agreement with Ivy Tech. Tim Niggle responded that this agreement has been in place for some time now, so it is not known how the agreement was made. Tim Niggle also noted that only about half of the Ivy Tech courses listed in their agreement are already being offered by Ivy Tech and not all of these are on all the Ivy Tech campuses.

Tim Niggle and Diana Lambdin clarified that while the lower division agreement may be the same on all 8 IU campuses, GPA requirements, admission requirements, as well as 2 year upper division program may be different among the campuses.

Laura Stachowski asked where language and culture requirements could fit into the IU proposal. Jill Shedd and Diana Lambdin responded that instituting language and culture requirements are a hot topic in the School of Education and the university. There has been some discussion about adding a principle on diversity as a 7<sup>th</sup> guiding principle in the School of Education. Diana Lambdin also reminded members of a related issue being discussed by the Bloomington Faculty Council regarding common general education requirements for all majors, as discussed at the April 17, 2006 meeting. This would also be a place where diversity considerations could be considered. Jill Shedd noted that some of the other IU campuses are further along in the process of incorporating statements on diversity compared to IUB.

Dean Gonzalez would like for each campus to bring information back to the Education Council during the October meeting for examination. Before this time, the Bloomington proposal will be taken to the elementary education and other faculty to look at the proposal, its feasibility, concerns, and suggestions.

**5. Discussion Item: CTE Annual Report—Tom Brush**

Tom Brush gave to members a handout of items accomplished by CTE over the previous year and what should be addressed in the coming year. This report was given to the SoE Policy Council on April 24, 2006.

Tom Brush highlighted additional discussion items to be revisited next year, including the education minor, development of a non-certification education degree, continued discussion on the articulation agreement with Ivy Tech, and general education requirements. Tom Brush noted that CTE is up to date in its UAS reports and will see reports from new programs next year.

**6. Voting Item: 2006-07 CTE Chair**

It was recommended by CTE that Tom Brush stay as CTE chair for the Fall 2006 semester with assistance from David Estell. In the Spring 2007 semester, Tom Brush will be on sabbatical and David Estell would take over as acting chair. Approval was motioned by Tim Niggle, seconded by Brent Gault. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.