

Indiana University School of Education
Committee on Teacher Education
September 22, 2008

Minutes

Present: Tom Brush, Brent Gault, David Estell, Anne Leftwich, Margie Manifold, Keith Chapin, Karen Wohlwend, Tim Niggle

Others Present: Jeane Novotny and Sarah Warfield

I. Welcome/Announcements

A. Introduction of CTE Members for 2008-2009

David Estell conducted the meeting. He led introductions of the CTE members present at the meeting.

B. Approval of April 22, 2007 Minutes

Handout: April 22, 2007 Minutes

David Estell opened the meeting by giving members an opportunity to review the April 22, 2007 minutes. It was motioned and seconded that the minutes be approved: MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

C. 2008-2009 CTE Meeting Dates

Handout: Meeting dates

Tom Brush reviewed the meeting dates for the 08-09 academic year, explaining that dates in bold are course program change dates.

II. Informational Items

A. Course Program/Review Process

Handout: 2008-2009 Course-Program Change Approval Process document

Tom Brush reviewed the course program approval process and encouraged CTE members to be proactive regarding program changes. The handout explains what should be submitted in a report. There are examples on the CTE OnCourse site. CTE members should share this information with faculty so that faculty members know that if they're going to be putting together a change in a teacher ed program, or creating a new program, that these are the guidelines for the documentation. Moreover, it is important to notify the CTE agenda planning committee early in order to put program changes on the agenda as early as possible.

B. NCATE Update

Using notes from Jill Shedd, Tom Brush shared information about the current NCATE review process. To date, all the program reviews have been submitted for every program. The programs that were approved with conditions have already been notified and the OTE will be working with programs throughout the year. Being approved with conditions is good enough for this part of the NCATE review, as long as there is a plan in place for meeting the conditions. Jill's office has already started working on some of the institutional things for the NCATE report. There are currently two NCATE leadership teams. The teams will hopefully meet sometime in October. Brent Gault queried whether there was a means to inform people not located in the Wright Building about NCATE. David Estell mentioned that various issues related to NCATE will probably come up in CTE meetings throughout the year, at least as an update if not an actual item.

C. CTE Public Resources for Faculty and Staff

Projector: OnCourse and Office of Teacher Education website

Tom Brush reviewed how to use the OnCourse CTE site, indicating where public forms and resources are kept. There is a folder for every meeting which includes all the documentation from each meeting. Regarding NCATE, the archives may be a useful tool for referring to previous CTE meetings. Karen Wohlwend queried if the forms can be made public. There was discussion about the possible existence of a link from the School of Education website. Tom Brush said that he would locate the link and share it with CTE members.

III. Discussion Items

A. Teacher Education Direct Admit Proposal (Tim Niggle)

Handout: Direct Admit proposal

Tim Niggle discussed a direct admit proposal that is an attempt to get students to identify with the school as quickly as possible in an attempt to increase enrollment in programs and to ensure that students meet the requirements needed to successfully be admitted to and finish the programs in which they show an interest. The proposal explains that a standard should be set for admitting students that will likely to be successful and identify them as guaranteed admits, regardless of how they rank within the university as a whole. The intent of the proposal is also to reward those students who decide early that they want to commit to a specific program within the School of Education.

A discussion followed the initial presentation of the proposal. Points addressed included how advising responsibilities would be allocated under the direct admit process, relations with the university division, and how to advise students on enrolling in general education classes. In addition, the question of how to troubleshoot issues such as (a) students entering the program with misdemeanors, thus making it impossible for them to do field work; (b) students who fail the PRAXIS or have a felony on their record, thus making it impossible for them to get teaching positions post-graduation; (c) advising students accordingly so that they have time to take the classes they need in order to finish a specific program; (d)

whether the direct admit proposal takes into account underrepresented students, who may rank lower in the university; and (e) how to help underrepresented students already in School of Education use the resources available for tasks, e.g. passing the PRAXIS.

David Estell queried whether a successful direct admit program could bolster enrollment, arguing that if students are identified early it may engender in them a feeling that they can continue successfully through the program. Anne Leftwich queried whether direct admit would create a sense of animosity among students. According to Tim Niggle, there is a risk of students having a sense of superiority and entitlement if they've been directly admitted, as opposed to having to earn your way in the traditional way. However, those feelings may already be present because of GPA requirements. Further, Tim Niggle pointed out that field experience is a great leveler

In regards to PRAXIS testing, David Estell argued that direct admit could lead to more students passing the PRAXIS, especially underrepresented students. The cost of the PRAXIS and tutoring for the PRAXIS were brought up as discussion points. Ideas that were suggested included: (a) making tutoring mandatory; (b) getting a pool of funds to help cover the cost of the test if students agree to receiving tutoring; and (c) encouraging students to take the PRAXIS early if their SAT scores are high enough to indicate they will probably do well. Under a direct admit program, there would be an education advisor who could guide students through the PRAXIS process early in a hopes to guarantee success.

David Estell suggested, and Tim Niggle agreed, that general requirements could be set higher, but lowered for certain recruits. David Estell and Tom Brush queried how the School of Education would make the decision of which students will be guaranteed admission to certain programs and how many. Brent Gault suggested, and Tim Niggle agreed, that, everything else being equal, it's acceptable to admit students by order of application. Further, it was agreed by all members of the committee that accepting students on a first-come basis (a) may provide incentive for people to apply early; (b) may create a sense of competition among students that could prove beneficial for enrollment; and (c) maximizes the features of the program from day one.

Tom Brush queried if there is a box on the application form where students can indicate their interest in a certain program. David Estell suggested sorting incoming students by different tags, much in the same way that freshman scholarships are identified for different disciplines. Tim Niggle said that the School of Education has a list of everybody who entered IU and identified education as a target.

There were no more questions. It was motioned to adjourn the meeting, motion seconded, meeting adjourned at 5:20.