

Committee on Teacher Education
April 19, 2011
4:00 - 6:00 p.m.
School of Education, Room 2277

In attendance: B. Gault, T. Niggle, M. Manifold, M. Remstad, T. Brush, J. Shedd, D. Estell, E. Galindo, P. Kloosterman, B. Edmonds, J. Novotny, G. Butera, A. Mobley, C. Medina, J. Bizarri, L. McCarty

I. Approval of March minutes (M. Manifold)

There was a motion to approve the minutes as written. The motion was seconded. The March minutes were approved as written.

II. Voting Items

A. Minors on degrees for secondary education majors (T. Brush)

This item originated from a discussion in Secondary Council regarding the issue that the SOE is one of the only schools on campus that does not have agreements with other colleges and schools to post minors on transcripts. In an effort toward creating greater campus cohesion, as well as the REPA requirement that all Elementary Education majors earn a minor, it was proposed that the SOE consider making a change so that transcripts reflect students' completion of the requirements to earn a minor from COAS (or another school). Upon further examination of the process to make this change, it was learned that an agreement must be negotiated between the colleges and schools involved. Once an agreement is reached, a proposal would need to be brought to and approved by the campus curriculum committee. Thus, the proposal to be considered by the CTE is whether the SOE should take action to pursue this process with COAS and other schools in order to determine what an agreement to post minors would entail. It was noted that currently, if so desired, education students can solicit a letter from the college/school to verify that they have completed the minor requirements as needed (e.g. to support resumes, job applications, etc.). The SOE offers a non-teaching minor for non-SOE students, but it is unknown by members of the CTE whether they are posted on transcripts. It was clarified that although this issue originated with secondary council, it would be a change to education majors in all programs.

P. Kloosterman motioned to vote on the proposal. B. Gault seconded the motion. The proposal to pursue the process of posting minors on transcripts was approved.

B. Special Education license addition for secondary CoT (G. Butera)

G. Butera explained that changes to the graduate program in special education have resulted in some effects on the secondary special education undergraduate students. Currently, the only way for secondary ed majors to earn a special education license is through the COT program. Ongoing discussions among SOE faculty and staff regarding the need to prepare more educators at the secondary level who are knowledgeable, experienced and licensed in both a content area and special education has raised the issue of whether a special education license addition for secondary ed majors should be developed.

The proposal at hand is to pilot a new license addition program in special education for secondary education majors in the COT program. If it is successful, future options to expand the opportunity to students in the anchor program could be considered. G. Butera reviewed details (on the handout) outlining the licensure required coursework, credit hours and timeline, which includes some summer courses. There was a discussion regarding some possible unintended consequences of this program, such that it may draw COT students away from pursuing a major in special education. It was noted that students could seemingly complete the license addition requirements through only one additional semester of coursework and summer courses. It was discussed that shared student teaching experiences are brief and often seem insufficient, but under the mentorship model of the COT program, these students would have both a content area mentor and a special education mentor.

D. Estell motioned to vote on the proposal. T. Niggle seconded the motion. The proposal to pilot a special education license addition for COT secondary education majors was approved.

C. Program Change: Reading License Addition Modifications to X425 (C. Medina)

C. Medina presented information on the reading license addition program. She explained the challenges of managing three different scenarios - elementary ed, secondary ed, and TAL - through a single license addition program. In order to respond to the needs and experiences of the different programs, the proposal would reduce the number of credit hours from 6 to 3 for the practicum requirement for secondary education and TAL students; the practicum would remain at 6 credit hours for elementary ed students. The handout outlines options for student teaching experiences for students in each of the three different programs to meet the practicum requirements. The reduction in credit hours is reflected by an adjustment to the assignments required for students in different programs. The proposal additionally reflects the integration of the state reading standards for teacher education into the realigned syllabi. It was clarified that this license addition is just for undergraduate students, and that other considerations would need to be made for T2T graduate students.

B. Gault motioned to vote on the proposal. J. Bizarri seconded the motion. The proposal to modify X425 practicum of the Reading License Addition program was approved.

D. Course name change: E339/E340 and L545/L549 (C. Medina)

C. Medina reminded the committee that, in response to REPA requirements, the elementary education program needed to reduce the number of credit hours in literacy by 3 credit hours. The agreement that was reached included eliminating E341 from the program and merging the content from E341 into E339 and E340 (L545 and L549 are the graduate level courses that cover the same content). Previously, E339 focused on writing, E340 focused on reading, and E341 focused on assessment. LCLE faculty have worked to redistribute the course content, so that E339 now will focus on language arts instruction and assessment in the early primary grades (K-3) and E340 will focus on intermediate primary grades (4-6). This realignment provided the opportunity to integrate the state teaching standards into the syllabi. It was noted that the proposal to change L545 and L549 will also need approval by the graduate studies committee.

B. Gault motioned to vote on the proposal to change course names for the undergraduate program. T. Niggle seconded the motion. The proposed name changes to E339 and E340 were approved.

D. Estell motioned to vote on the proposal to change course names for the graduate program, pending approval from the graduate studies committee. B. Edmonds seconded the motion. The proposed name changes to L545 and L549 were approved, pending approval at graduate committee.

III. Information Items

A. Praxis II prior to student teaching (J. Shedd, T. Brush)

J. Shedd shared with the committee that as IU campuses have been revisiting their programs to align with REPA, there are an increasing number of campuses, including IUPUI, that require students to pass Praxis II prior to beginning their student teaching. Historically, the faculty at IUB have been opposed to adopting this or similar requirements, but it seemed pertinent to share with CTE this trend observed across other campuses. Advantages to making this a requirement include affirming to school corporations, through the metric of a standardized assessment, that student teaching candidates possess the knowledge of content they will be teaching.

Additionally, it is a federal requirement to report the Praxis II pass-rate of the teacher education program, and this policy would ensure a 100% pass rate from the institution's graduates. Praxis II is a licensure requirement by the state. However, what the state deems necessary for licensure is a different matter from a faculty decision of what is required to confer a degree from the School of Education. It was noted that historically, IUB has a 100% pass rate, with few exceptions, although the state has established new cut rates. Passing Praxis II before student teaching poses a challenge to whether students would be taking the exam before completing their content coursework. Additionally, there were concerns raised regarding what to do with students who may not pass the first time, the school's obligation to remediate students who do not pass (which may become their responsibility as it is a program requirement), and whether students may have to delay student teaching. It was clarified that the policy established at the other campuses is for students to take and pass Praxis II. It was further clarified that re-takes do not factor into the pass rate; ETS only reports the highest score by each candidate. It was noted that there have been graduates from IUB who did not pass Praxis II for the state of Indiana, but were able to attain licensure in another state. Requiring Praxis II as a graduation requirement would further restrict options for some students. The committee reaffirmed IUB faculty's opposition to requiring Praxis II prior to student teaching.

B. CTE Chair for 2011-12 (T. Brush)

T. Brush thanked everyone for their service on the CTE this year. He announced that M. Manifold has agreed to serve as chair of the CTE for the 2011-12 school year. The committee enthusiastically accepted her appointment.

IV. Discussion Items

A. Dual-degree programs at IUB (T. Brush)

T. Brush presented information from the New Academic Directions committee that issued a report and recommendations for IUB. One of the recommendations that has been emphasized, especially for the SOE, is to increase options and possibilities for students to pursue dual majors

or dual degrees. It was noted that there are currently ways for students to earn a degree both in the SOE and COAS, but that there are some obstacles and perhaps it should be considered (both by the SOE and COAS) how to make the option more feasible. There are joint programs between the SOE and Music, Theater, Journalism, and Physical Education which have historically been more popular and successful than students pursuing a dual degree with COAS. Some of the difficulty with dual-degrees with COAS is inflexibility regarding the number of outside credits permitted and differences in general education requirements. A new possibility to consider further may be an interdisciplinary degree.