

Indiana University School of Education
Committee on Teacher Education
October 18, 2006
Minutes

Present: Alex Garn for Keith Chapin, Joby Copenhaver for Geraldo Campano (just for the first 15 minutes), Tom Brush, Laura Stachowski, Diana Lambdin, Brent Gault, Tim Niggle, Paulette Dilworth, Andrea McCloskey, Jose Bonner, David Estell, Enrique Galindo, and Andrea Mobley

Others Present: Jeane Novotny and Juliana Hallows

I. Welcome/Introduction: Tom Brush, chair, conducted the meeting and began with the introduction of members. After which he briefly reviewed items on the agenda.

1. Approval of September 13, 2006 Minutes-Tom Brush

Handout: September 13 Minutes (buff)

Tom Brush opened the meeting by giving members an opportunity to review the September 13, 2006 minutes. There was one grammatical correction. It was motioned that the minutes be approved it was seconded with Enrique Galindo abstaining: MOTION APPROVED.

II. Discussion Item: UAS Report, All Grades Physical Education

—Alex Garn for Keith Chapin

Handout: Program Review Physical Education Teacher Education (green)

Alex Garn, attending for Keith Chapin, introduced the unit assessment report for the Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) program. The full report can be viewed on Oncourse and is divided into three sections: Program Overview, Program Review, and Appendixes.

The PETE program serves 3 different types of student groups: physical education majors, dual athletic training and physical education majors, and majors seeking a cognate in physical education. There are 65 total majors with an average GPA of 3.17; however, to remain in good standing students must maintain a 2.5 GPA or better.

Some of the PETE strengths include program size, commitment to quality applicants and graduates, and programmatic assessments which included student teaching and an academic portfolio. Due to the relatively small program, students have an opportunity to develop relationships with high ranked faculty members. The PETE program has a multi-step admissions and review process to promote academic excellence. The final strength refers to a programmatic assessment process which is a three year developmental process that culminates into a mock interview and job portfolio. Alex Garn reported that faculty members work with students during this process and it is based on national teaching standards. This process allows for faculty to evaluate individual and group strengths/limitations and is a forum for students to accumulate their knowledge.

One challenge that PETE faces is diversity. Currently they are working with a diversity coordinator to address this concern by developing ways to recruit and retain diverse students. Students must take some courses that are not in PETE program because it is a small department. This has been a challenge for the

PETE program because they must work with faculty and students in developing ways in which these content area courses may be applied to the student's professional goals.

Some innovations that the PETE program is trying to accomplish are providing authentic situations where students can work with public school students. They are trying to revise courses so that they can incorporate field experiences and also create a structure within these field experiences so that the students have opportunities to observe and prepare for teaching in that domain.

Tom Brushed asked if the PETE student population has been stable. Alex Garn replied that it has been. Then Diana Lambdin asked if there was a professional organization that governs their standards. Alex Garn responded that they use the National Association for Sport and Physical Education who have developed standards for competence for current teachers and pre-service teachers. He remarked that the student's portfolios reflect these national standards.

Tom Brush then spoke about the challenge of dealing with courses that are outside of their program. He wanted more information about this process. Alex Garn stated that they work individually with students that are having trouble with these course after which he takes it back to his class room to share and integrate for future lessons. If they continually get the same complaints about a course then they try to develop a different course that will meet the needs of the students. Tom asked if they had had any instances where they need to make a course change. Alex Garn responded that they develop a lab component for a course that would cater to their students.

Andrea Mobley then asked if they offered courses in adaptive physical education. Alex Garn stated that they have only one undergraduate course. Diana Lambdin added that the state does require that all undergraduates have training in adaptive physical education.

Diana Lambdin asked if PETE had a database that stored the portfolio scores according to each professional standard. Alex Garn replied that they do have this process and in the future are moving to an online database.

III. Discussion Item: Common Lower Division General Education for Elementary Education —Tom Brush & Enrique Gallindo

Handout: Three Lower Division General Education Comparison (yellow)

The Common Lower Division General Education for Elementary Education as been discussed and revised in the Elementary Council. Enrique Galindo explained that this handout is a new comparison that includes the two different common ground proposals: the Schools of Education Common Proposal and the Bloomington Common Ground. He remarked that it may be an obstacle to finish the Schools of Education Common Proposal within two years. Laura Stachowski then added that Leana McClain and herself are working on a proposal to create a new area of concentration: World Cultures and Foreign Languages with some advice from Tim Niggle. This new concentration would be separated out from the current languages arts concentration. Diana Lambdin continued that the Elementary Education Council parceled out each of these areas to the respective faculty for their review and asked that they bring their concerns and recommendations to the Education Council. Tom Brush followed that the Schools of Education Common Proposal was more of a list of courses that would be accepted but do not necessarily equal 2 more years

for completion. The committee then discussed course concerns and differences among the proposals. Results from the upcoming Education Council meeting will be discussed in the following CTE meeting.

IV. Discussion Item: NCATE Program Review Update

—**Diana Lambdin**

Handout: Program Review Process Comparison (purple)

Diana Lambdin gave a brief overview regarding State accreditation, which must occur as a whole, and at an individual departmental level. Indiana State enacted a trial run of their proposed review process; however, these processes were too laborious and did not adequately reflect the quality of the programs reviewed. Recently the State has come up with a revised process (which is described in the left column of the handout). Diana Lambdin reported that in 2009 the School of Education is up for review and thus the school and its programs must choose which review process they would like to complete: a) Indiana Division of Professional Standards; b) the NCATE Specialty Professional Association (SPA). Diana Lambdin briefly reviewed each process and how it could be applied to the School of Education. A discussion followed about assessment data collection. Concerns arose about the PRAXIS II as an assessment tool and about implementing other assessment methods. Diana Lambdin explained that the School also needs to show how the data collected is used. She stated that the UAS report from PETE was an example of how a program uses a review process and the data collected to improve their program.

Paulette Dilworth reported that the State process was cumbersome and challenging. Diana Lambdin replied that the State has “streamlined” their process. David Estell added that the SPA route seems to be a better option. Diana Lambdin continued that some of the School of Education’s programs may align better with the State process. Tom Brush asked if SPA reports would need to be submitted to their respective organizations. Diana Lambdin replied that some SPA’S may not be prepared to handle that amount of work. She continued that programs need to begin to think of which process they will use and begin to work toward completing those processes and inform the CTE of the direction they will be going.

V. Discussion Item: Bachelor of Science in Education without Certification

—**Diana Lambdin**

Handout: Degree without Certification Process (pink)

Diana Lambdin reported that there is a rising issue with students who are no longer eligible, able, or wanting to complete their certification to become a teacher. These students are dealt with in a case by case manner with the goal of helping them get some type of college degree without teacher certification, which could mean a degree in general studies or some other areas. Diana Lambdin stated that the problem with this is that students must complete at least 20 credits to receive a general studies degree and may have to complete more/less credit hours if pursuing a degree in a different area. Currently there is an Academic Standards Committee that reviews the appeals of students who want to deviate from their program of studies. This committee has been hesitant to confer a degree on students who have not completed their requirements within the School of Education and so they have denied education students’ appeals. Students may then appeal to Diana Lambdin.

Tim Niggle asked if we should be granting a degree in education without certification. Diana Lambdin added the possibility of creating a committee that would deal with these appeals and perhaps create additional requirements for these students to complete their degree. Another option was to create a new

degree in Education that does not require certification. Paulette remarked that she worried that poor performing students could use this proposed new degree to get licensed in another State when the School of Education would not approve them. Tim Niggle agreed and remarked that this was his concern as well.

Diana Lambdin concluded that the handout is a draft of a policy that would implement a School of Education appeals committee to deal with these issues. Tim Niggle stated that this was an old draft and it needed to be revised. He stated that he would meet with the Academic Counsel to determine if this policy would address all the concerns and then he would draft a revised version of this policy.

VI. Discussion Item: Revisiting the Six Principles

Handout: Colorful Bookmarks

Diana Lambdin briefly spoke about the six principles that are the foundation of the Teacher Education Program. These principles describe the characteristics that underlie the program and are important for the students. For accreditation reviews, the Teacher Education Program must show how all the programs align with these principles. Diana Lambdin reported that these principles were created 10 years ago and some faculty members believe that they should be reviewed and possibly changed to reflect the current status of the Teacher Education Program. Diana Lambdin remarked that some principles that may be added or discussed are inquiry, diversity, and the programs global teaching focus.

Tom Brush asked if there were any other questions: none responded. He asked for a motion to adjourn, there was a motion, it was seconded, and the meeting was adjourned.