

Committee on Teacher Education Meeting
September 22, 2009, Room 2277

In attendance: Tim Niggle, Enrique Galindo, José Bonner, Jane Henson, Mitzi Lewison, Susie Gronseth, Melissa Fulford, Peter Kloosterman, Tom Brush, Jill Shedd, Sarah Warfield, Ben Edmonds, Anne Leftwich, Jill Shedd, Keith Chapin, Beau Vallance, Luise McCarty, Jane Henson, Janice Bizzari

I. Welcome and Introductions (Enrique Galindo)

Enrique Galindo, the 08-09 Chair, welcomed Committee members. The Committee members introduced themselves individually.

II. Approval of Minutes from April 2, 2009 (Enrique Galindo)

The Committee read over the minutes and made three suggestions for amendments to the minutes. Ben Edmonds motioned to approve the minutes with amendments. Anne Leftwich seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously, with amendments.

III. Information Items

A. Graduate Follow-Up Phone Survey (Jane Henson and Melissa Fulford)

Handout: PowerPoint presentation

Jane Henson, Coordinator of Teacher Education Assessment in the Office of Teacher Education, and Melissa Fulford, Graduate Follow-Up Systems Coordinator in the Office of Teacher Education, shared the results of a recent Graduate Follow-up Survey. The survey was developed in the Office of Teacher Education and was administered to 06-07 BS Education graduates. The survey was intended to gather students' opinions about their experiences in the Teacher Education program in the School of Education.

The respondents were divided into five different cohorts: early childhood and mathematics; elementary education and the sciences; social studies and secondary special education; elementary special education and world language; and English and visual arts. Respondents were interviewed over the phone by Melissa Fulford. The interviews are based around four main questions about the program in general. Several cities in Indiana are represented in the study, with the vast majority of graduates teaching in public, suburban schools. There were two main findings from the study. One, most respondents said they would recommend the education program at IU-Bloomington to others. Two, many respondents noted that they needed more instruction on classroom management as well as more preparation working in a classroom, e.g. more opportunities to visit classrooms while enrolled in the education program. In addition, the Office of Teacher Education was able to collect contact information on graduate students that was then given to the Alumni Office. There was a 56% rate of response for all the students that were contacted. For those who did not want to respond by phone, a survey monkey option was given. The Office of Teacher Education is currently compiling results from the open ended survey questions, which will eventually be distributed

to members of the Secondary Council. They are also preparing the questionnaire for the 07-08 cohort.

There was a discussion among Committee members on how to improve the survey in the future by incorporating additional questions that are more individualized to specific experiences, as well as sub-fields to existing questions. There was a discussion among Committee members regarding how to stay in touch with out-of-state graduates, as well as how to best prepare them for the professional classroom.

There was a discussion of teaching-related issues in the questionnaire and of how to elicit comments on the pedagogy that was taught in the program. The Committee also discussed the questionnaire within the larger context: the CTE is responsible for the school's assessment system, a part of which is to get feedback from graduates to get feedback on reflection of programs. Jill Shedd requested feedback from the Committee members on what will make the follow-up survey meaningful for faculty and staff in the School of Education. Feedback should be geared toward the next cohort, which is made up of 07-08 graduates. Suggested questions should also be related to specific programs in a way that is manageable, in terms of data collection, and conversational, in terms of interview protocol. Any questions that the Committee members would like to submit should be sent to Jane Henson.

B. NCATE Update (Jill Shedd)

Jill Shedd spoke about a revised process for NCATE review that will be implemented during the 2011-12 school year in an attempt to streamline the accreditation process. To that end, when NCATE visits the School of Education in April of 2010, as well as the IUPUI and Columbus campuses, those involved in accreditation will be assisting in piloting the new process. Regarding the submission of institutional reports on the six standards, it must be done 18 months to two years ahead of the campus visit. A group of NCATE board members will review the report and make a preliminary assessment. Individual departments are only required to meet two standards. If a department is able to meet two during the preliminary assessment an NCATE review team will not be sent. In the case that at least two of the standards are not met, an NCATE review team that comes to visit will only focus on those areas.

In sum, faculty and staff will now have the opportunity to know what areas an NCATE team will be focusing on, allowing individual departments to have the appropriate information available when a team does come to visit. Campus visits have also been shortened; a team will be coming in on a Sunday and they will be done by Tuesday afternoon. Currently, Jill Shedd and her team are piloting sending in their institutional report ahead of time; it is currently in drafts mode. Of the six standards, three have been drafted almost to the point of completion. The final report is slated to be submitted by November 1.

IV. Discussion Items

- A. Rules for Educator Preparation and Accountability (REPA) Update and Discussion (Tom Brush and Jill Shedd)

Jill Shedd and Tom Brush presented on the current status of the REPA process. The proposed rules for statewide changes in licensing were presented to the state on July 29, which began the clock for 365 days for approval of the rules. The state is now on a third draft on the rules, though there may be a fourth. The advisory board has approved initiating the process for public comment from October 1 to November 2. Then the advisory board will have the opportunity to process those comments and adjust them as they wish. After the advisory board, the attorney general will take over the decision-making process, followed by the governor of Indiana.

Regarding elementary education, the proposed changes include changing the K-6 program to a P-6 program. Regarding secondary education, the proposed changes would require students to have a major in their content area and an 18-hour minor. The proposed secondary license is inclusive of grades 5-12. Under the proposal there is no longer an option of an MS-only license or an MS addition. Regarding all-grade licenses, exceptional needs is an option as an all-grade license under the proposed changes. Should the faculty choose there could be an all-grade exceptional needs program. If REPA passes, the license exam requirements will change; an additional pedagogy test will be required of all licensed teachers. The testing requirements change as of July 1, 2012.

There was a discussion among the Committee members on how the new guidelines would change student teaching requirements. Another effect of REPA is the content area change in social studies. Currently, students have to have three areas of emphasis in social studies; under REPA only one is required. There was a discussion of how REPA would slightly affect Transition to Teaching requirements. Within the guidelines, there is no particular reference to how institutions will be approved or accredited. Further, there are no definitions or standards referred to for any of the content areas.

There was a discussion of where and how the public can comment on the legislative process and the best way to do so as IU faculty. It was mentioned that the advisory board is more likely to listen to teachers, principals, and superintendents, who may say they do not want to hire teachers if these are the standards that will be used to license professionals.

B. CTE Goals for the Year (Enrique Galindo)

Enrique Galindo asked the following questions of the Committee: What kind of committee is this? Do we just react to things that are brought to our attention? Are we a committee that can also be proactive and have goals for the year and what will those be? What do we all want to do with this committee this year?

The questions were opened for discussion among the Committee members. There was agreement that the Committee should be proactive regarding the REPA and NCATE processes. There was a discussion of how the Committee should consider what principles guide program restructuring and how the Committee makes decisions that then go on to Policy Council. It was noted that the Committee should be the group that at the very least

facilitates a formulation of principles that guide what the program looks like as it goes through a redesign.

There was also a discussion of how to review course and program changes given the proposed REPA changes. It was noted that faculty should be made aware that there might be changes coming, while at the same time being optimistic about the future of programs. Further, the CTE is a body that revisits programs regardless of changes imposed by REPA at the state level.

Beau Vallance motioned to adjourn. Peter Kloosterman seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 5:55.