Illinois State University  
Council for Teacher Education  
Tuesday, September 17th, 2019 3:30 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.  
DeGarmo Hall, Room 551

Minutes


Absent:  J. Chrismon, T. Davis, S. Parry, L. Sutton

Guests:  J. Donnel, E. Jones, J. Hobbs, B. Jacobsen, M. Monts

I. Call to Order by Chair:
Chair J. Wolfinger called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

II. Roll Call:  A. Mustian conducted roll call.

III. Approval of Minutes from September 3, 2019:  Motion to approve the minutes from September 3, 2019:
T. Crumpler  Second:  S. French  Minutes were unanimously approved with no abstentions.

IV. Information Items:

A. NCBC:  T. Hinkel not present.  J. Hobbs, T. Hinkel’s assistant gave an update on the NCBC process.  They have been very busy.  In August, completed over 1400 NCBC.  Approximately 20 hits and C. Borders has been meeting with these students to clear them.  About 30 students completed incorrect boxes on the forms, 61 still pending – Bushue is having a difficult time with Cook County and DuPage County.  The NCBC notification to professors indicated over 500 were going to expire and now that number is down to 200.

B. Catalog – Clinical Hours:  C. Borders indicated that all program coordinators would have received an email asking them to confirm their courses which have clinical requirements.  This information has been sent to the Registrar’s Office.  NCBC will be a pre-requisite for all clinical courses.  This must be updated in the catalog for all courses with clinicals.  If there is an issue with how a course is listed, it will need to be fixed through the curricular process.

C. CAEP Advanced Programs:  C. Borders informed the CTE members that all three advanced programs have voted to seek accreditation through CAEP.  J. Wolfinger asked what the timeline was.  C. Borders responded Spring 2021, but not certain and will bring timeline for advanced program accreditations to next CTE meeting.  C. Borders thinks advanced programs have three years to complete for accreditation and will do so through a virtual site visit.

D. CTE Subcommittee Representation Needs:  C. Borders stated that there is still not full
representation for the CTE sub committees. C. Borders sent email to program coordinators to pass along information to their faculty. Still need a UCC and a GCC representative for Curriculum Committee, CTE/Non-CTE students; one additional non-CTE teacher education faculty/staff member needed for the Vision Committee and one more non-CTE teacher education faculty/staff member on UTEAC. C. Borders encouraged the CTE members to spread the word.

A. Hurd commented the representative for GCC is typically the Chair of the committee and only comes to CTE for concerns related to graduate proposals.

V. Discussion Items:

A. Paid Student Teaching: C. Borders indicated that paid student teaching has always been allowed in school code. Bill passed at state, Public Act 101-0220 that clarified that it is allowed. In the past, paid student teaching at ISU was not allowed and is indicated in the handbook that paid student teaching is not allowed. Do we move forward into exploring this to allow paid student teaching?

Discussion:

J. Wolfinger: There are a couple of issues to think about conceptually:

- Equity – preparing teachers to go into Illinois and under-resourced districts do not have the funding to pay their student teachers, while more financially privileged districts do. Managing 800 student teachers a year; how to be equitable in who gets paid student teaching opportunities and who doesn’t.
- Prioritize candidates in most financial need to gain student teaching opportunities and what to do about the parents that raise questions.

Other colleges of Education around the state have addressed through policies for student teaching placement where typically “your student teaching placement is final – where we place you is where it stays”.

B. Hatt: We have a lot of ISU low-income students that can’t afford going into teaching as they cannot afford student teaching and not getting paid for it. It gets further complicated by districts who offer and don’t offer paid internships. If districts want to pay, can we tell them no? B. Hatt posted on FB for feedback, shared anonymized student response:

“I just finished student teaching, and I’d love to talk about this! I can think of some pros for paid student teaching. It would cover a majority of meals and gas money. I travelled to ***** every day and there were times when I had to choose between meals and driving to class. Because, student teaching is a huge time commitment, I didn't have enough energy and time to get a second job. I had free weekends, but I used that time to lesson plan and grade for the following week. Additionally, we must consider that there are college students who come from low-income families. They do not have much financial support from home. Many of these students are also paying rent and other bills at their universities, and student teaching costs about the same as a regular class at ISU. Additionally, we have to pay for edtpa, our licenses, graduation, etc. Finally, I'm being a little picky here, but a paid experience will cover some supplies and materials needed for a classroom. Such as pens, markers, and even a laptop. Many of us relied on technology as many local schools switched towards using google classroom and other online services to communicate with their students. Of course every situation is different, but it will benefit a majority.”
This stood out to B. Hatt and she indicated we need to ask what is best for students and not what is convenient.

**J. Wolfinger:** Stated he is a parent of a daughter who is a junior in college. If he found out that she was offered $10k for student teaching and the university said “no”, he would have an issue with that. The leadership team has been discussing increasing the recruitment scholarship amount on the front end and adding $1000 scholarship in student teaching.

**A. Mustian:** National Louis has application online for paid student teaching opportunity. Maybe we should reach out to see how they are doing it. Teach for America prepares teachers and they have paid student teaching and paid interns. If students are in Chicago, why would they come to ISU if they can get it fast through Teach for America and ISU does not have paid student teaching? We need to ask other institutions if they have paid student teaching, and, if so, how they are doing it.

**M. Ely:** Can we capture those funds being dispersed at the university level so that we can distribute to students more equitably?

**J. Wolfinger:** Indicated these are district funds, not university funds and districts would use as they see fit.

**M. Noraian:** Rockford is offering paid student teaching.

**V. Graziano:** Explore the expectations being placed on students in districts where the pay is being offered; want to be sure the student teaching experience is not diminished in any way.

**C. Borders:** Reiterated the complex process to place student teachers – it is an iterative process.

**C. Bazan:** Has anyone thought of a lottery for interested students? Maybe we need to bring in Career Center and professional practice on how they approach paid/unpaid internships. It is about the competition and likelihood of getting a job.

**C. Borders:** We look at it from the lens of district partnerships – it is also one of the stipulations we need to lift in CAEP.

**B. Hatt:** Arizona State has interesting approaches to paid student teaching. There is more co-teaching; 3 candidates-to-1 CT. University of Milwaukee give provisional licenses to student teach.

**J. Wolfinger:** If they complete student teaching in fall in a SW suburb district, they can get hired for the spring semester. It is not a paid student teaching semester, but they get 50% of what they would get paid when they get hired. The handbook needs to change to be in compliance with the state law regarding paid student teaching.

**E. Mikulec:** Scenario – Barrington pays $10,000 for student teaching, but family does not live in Barrington, how much of the money is going towards rent. She also stated that A. Mustian had a good idea to investigate other institutions doing this work.

**C. Bazan:** Can we get a list of districts offering paid student teaching?
C. Borders: Indicated no one has really gone on record of saying they will offer paid student teaching.

J. Wolfinger: I don’t think ISBE has a list; maybe some placements are paid and some are not (the high-demand fields). J. Wolfinger will talk with my other contacts at other universities. The only real policy I have heard of if “your student teaching placement is final”.

B. Hatt: Can connect with State Superintendents Associations.

P. Hash: Are guidelines in place? - sounds like we need a better bridge of communication because it is likely districts do not know what colleges are dealing with on this issue.

M. Noraian: There are stipulations of having students.

S. French: The dual role of student and employee is really sticky.

J. Wolfinger: Short-term, I think we need to address the handbook and empower C. Borders to ensure the handbook is in compliance with state law. Does this make sense? I would entertain a motion for Christy to revise the handbook.

Motion to allow C. Borders to revise the handbook to make sure it is in compliance with state law regarding paid student teaching:

P. Hash
Second: S. Hildebrandt

Motion unanimously passed with no abstentions for C. Borders to revise handbook to make sure it is in compliance with state law.

B. Basic Skills – Student Teaching Agreement: C. Borders indicated our district contracts and the student teaching agreement form still have reference to pass the Basic Skills. Legal Counsel has agreed to remove the Basic Skills and criminal background to change from CBC to NCBC.

Motion for C. Borders to change and correct language for student teaching agreements and district contracts:

A. Mustian
Second: J. Thomas

Motion for C. Borders to change and correct language for student teaching agreements and district contracts passed unanimously with no abstentions.

IX. Action Items: None

J. Wolfinger raised consideration to have a conversation in the Executive Committee for a student appeal of dispositions concerns. The process needs to be more systematic so the students understand how to write their appeal and we determine how we judge the appeal.

X: Subcommittee Reports

A. Curriculum Committee: No Report
B. **Student Interest Committee:** B. Hatt reported they looked at their charge and not a lot of students know about CTE. The committee discussed conducting a survey for teacher education majors.

C. **University Liaison and Faculty Interests Committee:** S. Hildebrandt reported there doesn’t seem to be much on faculty interest in description of their charge. Conversations were initiated about dispositions concerns and edDispositions, intentions of their use, and how the data is used.

One of the committees primary responsibilities is the Spring Colloquium, which has not been well-attended in the past and the committee is trying to determine a better way to engage constituents without it being a Colloquium.

D. **UTEAC:** P. Hash reported the committee discussed the formative Pedagogy common assessments and coming up with a formative Pedagogy that has to do with Danielson Domain I. CAEP indicated we need better and common assessments across all areas. They also indicated we do not have enough people looking at AAR data, especially small programs that don’t have many faculty, students and K-12 teachers, stakeholders and ST supervisors. If any of the CTE members would like to volunteer at some point to assist with the AAR date, please send an email to the committee stating you would like to volunteer to review AAR data from the smaller programs.

E. **Vision Committee:** No Report.

**X. Announcements and Last Comments**

√ J. Wolfinger informed members to congratulate K. Appel if they see her on the tremendous job she has done developing relationships with districts for the New Teacher Conference on October 18th. There are 350 signed up and we had to cap the registration. Next year we will reserve more space.

√ J. Wolfinger announced Maria Luisa-Zamudio, NCUE has two bus trips from CPS and one from Elgin coming done for recruitment purposes. The Lauby Center, TCH, and SED are supporting the underwriting costs.

√ J. Thomas is looking for students to do panels for the New Teacher Conference on October 18th.

√ C. Bazan wants to email everyone in CAST to have them assist at the New Teacher Conference as she feels a lot of them are passionate about recruitment. C. Borders added that information needs to truly get out to all teacher education faculty.

√ C. Borders announced that the CTE agenda should always have a legislative update. Tomorrow is ISBE meeting. They bumped the edTPA score debate (stay at 41 or go back to 39) discussion to October. A lot of public comment from special education opposition to the 4 area licensure requirement other than the 18-hour endorsement requirement. She added there was a shout-out from President Dietz for the CCRC conference.

√ A. Mustian announced that proposals were being accepted for the CCRC until XX. She noted there was a shout-out from President Dietz for the CCRC Conference.
J. Wolfinger reminded members that the T21Con is coming up on September 27, 2019 from 8:30 – 3:00 at State Farm Hall of Business. There are 1700 students in the Provosts’ column that are undeclared. Most are all undergraduates. I asked K. Appel to develop some kind of program to entice undeclared majors to come to COE. M. Noraian will be brought in to fold for secondary.

XI. Adjournment

1. C. Borders

2. P. Hash

Meeting adjourned at 4:24 p.m.