

Indiana University School of Education
Committee on Teacher Education
October 26, 2005
Minutes

Present: Tom Brush, Tim Niggle, Genny Williamson, David Estell, Ben Edmonds, Jose Bonner, Jill Shedd, Tarrey Banks, Gerald Campano

Others Present: Diana Lambdin and Jesse Goodman to present ECGP Report, Jeanne Novotny

I. Approval of October 4, 2005 Minutes

Handout: October 4 Minutes (blue)

Tom Brush opened the meeting by giving members an opportunity to review the October 4 minutes. It was motioned that the minutes be approved. MOTION APPROVED. Jill Shedd gave an update on the development of an education honors program. Dr. Shedd is currently in the process of gathering and organizing information on how to go about developing the program. She has submitted information to the Honors College for their review.

II. Information Item: Introduction to Unit Assessment System presentations, including purpose, timeline, and relation to NCATE accreditation—Jill Shedd, Tom Brush

In preparation for hearing Unit Assessment System reports at the meeting, Jill Shedd and Tom Brush gave an overview of the system. The unit assessment system is based on NCATE Standard II, which states that the school must have a system of multiple assessments to evaluate the program, the school must use this system to provide regular and systematic information, and the school must use these data to improve its programs. The regular and systematic review of programs is the responsibility of the Committee on Teacher Education. The NCATE accreditation standards are the same as the requirements of the state of Indiana; thus, accreditation through NCATE equals accreditation through the state of Indiana.

IU School of Education programs are evaluated at both the school-wide and the individual program levels. The structure of the school-wide assessment system is established so that all candidates, regardless of the specific program they are in, are assessed at four school-wide benchmarks: at admission to TEP, retention in TEP each semester, eligibility to student teach, and eligibility for graduation/licensure. At the program level, each program is responsible for assessing itself and presenting these data to CTE. This is to be done in a constructive and informative way so as to foster improvements in those programs. Since the IU School of Education is a large unit (14 programs), the UAS is designed to give a systematic evaluation of each program yet be flexible enough to accommodate the needs of the individual program.

The UAS reports will be beneficial at the next NCATE accreditation visit. However, the purpose of the reports is not only for NCATE, but is intended to be helpful to the individual programs as they seek to improve their quality. Tom Brush asked that, as members hear the reports, they be conscious of strengths of the program, challenges to the program, proposed

changes to the program, and any recommendations given by the program to CTE for how the committee can be of assistance to them.

III. Discussion Item: Reading license addition for secondary education (revisiting the October 4, 2005 proposal)

Tom Brush reintroduced the topic of a reading license addition, which was discussed at the October 4 meeting. Gerald Campano was available at the meeting to give a further understanding on the difference between offering a reading license for elementary and secondary education students. The proposal approved by CTE on October 4th was only for a content reading addition for students in an undergraduate elementary program or licensed elementary teachers seeking the content reading addition. Those already-certified teachers in secondary education who wish to add a reading addition to their secondary license would take the graduate coursework approved for the licensed elementary teachers with two exceptions related to secondary-level reading (L535 for L559 and L517 for L549). The license addition is not available at this time for undergraduate secondary education majors who are not already certified teachers. It was recommended that the graduate level secondary education option be offered as a second report so as not to be confused with the undergraduate elementary license. This report would include information on who is eligible for the program, admission standards, etc. Members of the Committee recommended that the Language Education faculty consider the feasibility of offering an undergraduate/initial license secondary reading addition program, given a perceived need for reading teachers at the secondary level.

IV. UAS Report: Early Childhood Program

A representative from the Early Childhood Program was not present at the meeting to discuss the UAS report, thus, the item was tabled for a future meeting.

V. UAS Report: Elementary Certification Graduate Program—Diana Lambdin

Diana Lambdin and Jesse Goodman introduced the unit assessment report for the elementary graduate program. The full report can be viewed on Oncourse and is divided into three sections: Program Description, Program Review, and Program Challenges.

The UAS report notes the many strengths of the program, the first being the quality of the students in the program. Students are highly qualified students when they enter the program (average GPA is over 3.5 and admission standard is an undergraduate GPA of 3.0), and feedback from local schools who employ ECGP graduates endorse them as extremely successful. A small-scale survey of current and past students indicates that in general, students are satisfied with the preparation they receive from the program. Another strength is the regular meetings of the co-directors to review and improve the program; these directors are committed to addressing issues and concerns with the program quickly. Finally, the small size of the program creates opportunities for cohort collaboration and support.

Field placements remain a major challenge for the ECGP program. It is difficult to provide ideal placements for all students. Many cooperating teachers in local schools have been enthusiastic about working with ECGP students; what is needed is more cooperating

teachers and further guidance and support for these teachers. There is also the challenge of distinguishing the ECGP program from the 24 credit hour Transition to Teach (T-to-T) program for elementary certification. The T-to-T program is similar to the ECGP program, but is a non-master's route and requires fewer credit hours (as stipulated by the state legislation). It has been proposed that the two programs be folded into one program with two tracks; thus there will be a T-to-T certification track and T-to-T master's route. A third challenge is faculty available. Most courses are taught by tenure-track faculty rather than AIs; however, there is concern that this program will no longer be staffed solely by long-term faculty. The fourth challenge is related to the difficulties in gathering follow-up survey feedback data.

Deleted:

Members noted that in responding to state requirements to keep a program with a low amount of credits, it is important to note what is lost by having such a short training program. It is important to keep a program which will allow teachers to enter the field quickly while at the same time ensuring that they are fully prepared to meet the demands of the profession. Tom Brush and CTE committee members thanked the ECGP representatives for their thorough and thoughtful assessment of the program.