

Committee on Teacher Education Meeting October 22, 2009
School of Education, Room 2102

In attendance: Tim Niggle, Beau Vallance, Diana Lambdin, Pete Kloosterman, Ben Edmonds, Jill Shedd, Karen Wohlwend, Luise McCarty, Ben Chapin, José Bonner, Enrique Galindo, Jeane Novotny, Anne Leftwich, Jane Henson, Janice Bizzari, Andrea Mobley, Tom Brush

I. Approval of Minutes from September 22, 2009 (Enrique Galindo)

Tim Niggle moved to accept the minutes. José Bonner seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

II. Voting Items

A. Course change request (Luise McCarty)

Luise McCarty, Associate Professor in the Department of Education Leadership and Policy Studies, presented on a course change request for F205: The Study of Education and the Practice of Teaching. According to the Course Change Request the title, course number, and description would change if the proposal passed. The proposed course change number is H205. The proposed course change title is “Introduction to Educational Thought”. The proposed course description, which is detailed on the Course Change Request Form, is intended to reflect the content and purpose of the course.

Regarding justification for the course number change, because the course is a foundations course it should have the appropriate “H” prefix. The department is suggesting that the course title be changed because the course is no longer a general education course, as it was originally conceived. Additionally, the current course name is misleading for some students because the course is not about the actual practical things of teaching but about the teaching profession: what it means to be a teacher, ethics of the teaching profession, etc. Further, the description change is intended to reflect that the course is a 200-level, introductory course.

The course change request was opened up to the Committee members for discussion. In response to a question about the course title change, it was mentioned that the exact wording of the title had been thoroughly discussed among faculty in ELP, taking into account student feedback indicating that the current title was misleading. The Committee discussed how F205, inclusive of the changes proposed at the current meeting, had been approved for the common curriculum as a general education course by the University Division. It was mentioned that before the UD could be alerted about changes to a common curriculum course, they had to be approved by the appropriate channels in the School of Education.

Janice Bizzari moved to accept the proposed course change request. Peter Kloosterman seconded the motion. The proposal was passed unanimously.

B. Credit hour change for M301 field experience (Karen Wohlwend)

Karen Wohlwend, Assistant Professor in Literacy, Culture, and Language Education, presented on the proposal to change M301 from a variable 2- to 3-credit course to a 3-credit course. One rationale for the credit-hour change is that the course, as it is currently taught, is arguably a 3-credit course; instructors of M301 expect high amounts of high-quality work from their students. The second rationale is that the faculty want to ensure that they are meeting all curricular standards, as laid out by NCATE standards. The final rationale, that the faculty feel is the most compelling, is that if M301 were a 3-credit hour course it would ensure that School of Education faculty are present in local schools to nurture professional partnerships.

The proposal was opened up to the Committee for discussion. The members discussed at length whether the proposal would add an additional hour to the elementary education program, or whether it would require the subtraction of an hour from another part of the elementary education program. The question was raised of whether the course could be designed so that it could be counted by the instructor as a 3-credit course while at the same time counted as a 2-credit course by students. It was noted that the credit-hour change had been approved by the Elementary Education Council. In addition, the Elementary Education Council members had raised the question of what constitutes a credit hour, e.g. how many hours of classroom time. The Committee discussed at length how many hours both students and instructors spend in field experience courses. It was mentioned that perhaps standardizing the notion of a credit hour would better facilitate decisions about credit-hour changes.

It was noted that the rationale for the proposal lacked broader impacts on the elementary education program, as well as how the credit-hour change would affect programs in general. The question was raised of whether all programs should be notified of proposed credit-hour changes, and have an opportunity to be part of the decision-making process.

There was a motion to vote to table the current proposal and to refer back to the Elementary Education Council for clarification about the overall impact of the program. The motion was seconded. All were in favor of the motion, except for Karen Wohlwend, who voted against. The motion passed.

III. Discussion Items

A. Update on common core curriculum (Tim Niggle, Tom Brush, and Diana Lambdin)

Proposals for general education courses in the common curriculum may be submitted starting in Fall 2010. Tim Niggle, Director of Student Information and Management Services, has been working on what the common curriculum will look like and what the implications are for School of Education programs. Associate Dean for Teacher Education Tom Brush and Diana Lambdin, professor of mathematics, are both currently serving on the General Education Committee at IU. All three contributed to the update on the common core curriculum.

According to the common curriculum, most of the education programs are already in compliance. Math Modeling and World Languages are two of the common curriculum courses

that do not align with current education courses. In order to meet the math requirement, small changes in secondary and all-grade programs will need to be made; M118 is one course that could be used. However, the World Languages requirement is more of a challenge to the School of Education given that common curriculum requirements are mostly at the 100-200 level; the only education course that could count, Cultural Immersions, is a 500-level course. It was also mentioned that the list of courses for each category in the common curriculum is lengthy and may not include courses that education students would take. There is a coding process in place for the common curriculum that tags courses meeting School of Education requirements. School of Education advisors are making an effort to make clear to students what counts towards an education program in the core curriculum.

The discussion was opened up to the Committee. The Committee discussed how faculty as well as advisors can keep students informed about changing program requirements, specifically how to advise students on the math requirement. For example, it was mentioned that students will soon begin to take M118 instead of T102 and it will be useful for program areas to know what semester to begin phasing out those courses.

Diana Lambdin raised the question of what benefits the common curriculum will have for education majors and how the School of Education will advise students according to the new curriculum. Under the common curriculum, any unit can offer courses that meet curricular requirements. The College of Arts and Sciences may be able to propose the most obvious units, the ones that match more closely to the categories. It is also possible for the School of Education to propose courses that either education or non-education majors can take, e.g. courses in educational thought or an introduction to special education. Dr. Lambdin pointed to a draft of FAQs developed by the new Office of Undergraduate Education, which will be overseeing the transition to the common curriculum. In early November, the Office of Undergraduate Education will send out a call for proposals for courses. The proposals are due by February 1. Dr. Lambdin also gave the Committee members a handout on how to propose a course; the rules and regulations for course approval; and what the Office looks for in the approval process. Again, it was mentioned that common curriculum courses have to be courses at the 100- or 200-level. Because most of the education courses are at the 300-level, new courses may have to be proposed for the general education requirements.

The discussion went back to the Committee members. The question was raised of which education courses can be added to the common curriculum. The IU General Education Committee is open to proposals from a wide variety of disciplines and they tend to accept course proposals as long as they meet the set requirements, which include the course level and a stipulation that courses be available to any student. Course approval takes approximately one year. The question of whether to design new courses or to look at courses that currently exist was discussed. It was noted that if all requirements are met, the IU General Education Committee tended to accept most courses. In addition, once course proposals are made, all departments are given the chance to comment. For example, education faculty may comment on proposed education courses taught by other colleges.

Tom Brush noted that the reason to bring this discussion to the CTE is to request that members share this information with faculty. Also, education faculty should be thinking about what

courses they might want to propose, as a college, to incorporate some of the particularly lower-division classes into the general education curriculum, hopefully getting more students interested in education.

The Committee discussed whether education majors would be able to take courses in the common curriculum and still fit in their major requirements. If the potential audience for common curriculum courses is composed of non-education students it could create an opportunity for students to work toward an education minor. It was noted that the common curriculum has the potential of enrolling thousands of students in education classes from outside the program.

B. M420 - Student Teaching Seminar (Jane Henson)

Jane Henson, Coordinator of Teacher Education Assessment, presented on M420: Student Teaching Seminar, Understanding Schools. The purpose of the seminar is to allow the student teaching triad to examine and evaluate student teachers' own learning along with what they have accumulated in terms of professional demeanor. The course also instructs student teachers on how they can review the student teacher's impact on student learning, as well as the classroom in which they have been operating. Upon completion of M420, the expectation is that students be reflective on the practice of student learning as an entry-level teacher. Further, the goal is for students to be able to prepare individual units and lesson plans that correlate with a beginning or entry-level teacher.

There are four key seminar assignments: weekly journal, instructional snapshots, the creation of a unit plan, and critical analysis on the implementation of the unit plan. An additional and fairly recent component asks students to register with IU Education Careers and to develop a resume. The course operates entirely through OnCourse. Another component which will soon be added is the incorporation of iRubric. In the future, supervisors will evaluate the culminating activity online using the rubrics that are already in existence. Also, all of the rubrics that guide university supervisors in evaluating the culminating activity will soon be available online. The online evaluation is a result of a request by several university supervisors that students have a better understanding of what constitutes professional writing.

The discussion was opened up to the Committee. There was a question about how grades are assigned to students in M420. It was noted that university supervisors evaluate at least two of each students' weekly journals as well as an instructional snapshot. Each are done prior to the midterm assessment in order to facilitate conversations about how well individual students doing and or what they need to focus on for the second half of student teaching. The second journal assessment and instructional snapshot are done from midterm to the end, giving students the opportunity to talk about and demonstrate on how they have improved on things that were discussed. The Committee discussed the writing rubric and what should be used in the definition of and assessment of writing. It was noted that the rubrics are developed by the Student Teaching Office, which is informed by annual workshops with supervisors. Further, it was noted that the Student Teaching Office is careful to remain consistent so that students are getting appropriate feedback and also to ensure that across student teaching experiences across the state components are being applied in a similar manner.

The Committee discussed results from M420, specifically in the development critical writing skills among students. It was noted that over two years of data on M420 have been collected to date, but not analyzed. In addition, faculty interest in any results from M420 has been low, which is part of the reason why the topic came before the CTE. In the future, some programs applied to this data may be used to develop knowledge bases. The Committee discussed whether student teachers have the opportunity to comment on distribution among students regarding performance. It was noted that thinking critically about performance distribution in the critical reflection component may need to be stated more explicitly in the syllabus. The Committee also discussed including curriculum development in the syllabus, asking students to reflect on lessons and asking themselves if they could have done something better or different, or perhaps used something different in instruction. It was noted that the current rubrics are intended to help students reflect constantly and understand that they have an entire community of students in any classroom, who help determine how individual teachers talk about a lesson or concept.

C. iRubric Presentation and Discussion (Chris Bezzy and Jill Shedd)

Enrique Galindo moved to table the last item and to adjourn the meeting.
Tim Niggle seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned.