Illinois State University  
Council for Teacher Education  
Tuesday, October 1st, 2019 3:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.  
DeGarmo Hall, Room 551

Minutes


Absent: M. Ely, B. Hatt, E. Mikulec, A. Roberts

Guests: J. Donnel, T. Hinkel, B. Jacobsen, M. Monts, C. Rutherford

I. Call to Order by Chair:
Chair J. Wolfinger called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

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

III. Approval of Minutes from September 17, 2019:
Motion to approve the minutes from September 17, 2019:
C. Borders
Second: P. Hash
Minutes were unanimously approved with one abstention.

IV. Information Items:

A. CAEP Advanced Programs (C. Borders):
C. Borders indicated the letter from CAEP regarding the advanced program accreditation outlines the timelines for the due dates. The self-study report is due January 3, 2022. ‘The virtual site visit is due Spring 2020 and must be concluded by June 30, 2022, decision will be made by October 2022.

J. Wolfinger added a number of people went to CAEP conference in Washington, D.C. (C. Borders, S. Jones-Bock, A. Bates, J. Donnel, L. DeMartino, G. Banicki, R. Brown, and T. Hinkel) and asked if any of the attendees would like to inform the committee about what they learned about the CAEP process.

C. Borders stated the timeline was interesting for us to hear – over 50 programs on this cycle for the advanced program accreditation. Rules on what has to be considered advanced and what isn’t continues to change. Programs, such as Principal, Superintendent, DOSE, etc. will require data across all standards of the expected programs. Master’s in SED and Reading Specialist in TCH will need data combined to cover all required elements.

L. Sutton debriefed with Guy and Nancy; asking for norm-referenced test or reasons why you should or should not use it.
C. Borders responded that if it’s not proprietary and already normed, our institution creates our own assessment tool and is required to prove validity and reliability. Due to our institution being
at the 3-year mark, most of the self-study reports can consist of plans, without a full set of assessment data. Graduate numbers are not the same as undergraduate numbers and therefore, programs will need to think about how to define their data cycle. For undergraduates, a semester was considered the cycle, but graduate programs may want to consider their cycle as a year. Will probably need to have created and piloted by the 2022 time in order to collect 3 cycles of data prior to the next full accreditation cycle.

S. Jones-Bock stated that CAEP was a little hesitant with answering some of the questions. Will need to look at their manual repeatedly in case any changes come through. Their will be a new manual fall 2019.

B. Student Representatives (B. Hatt): B. Hatt not present today. J. Wolfinger stated that they had to shift some students around on the sub-committees. There are two new student CTE representatives: Sophia Zoltek, who will also serve on the Vision subcommittee and Abbie Roberts, who will serve on the Student Interests subcommittee.

C. Bylaws – Committee Charges (J. Wolfinger): S. Hildebrandt indicated that the titles of subcommittees and their charges do not necessarily match. University Faculty and Liaison subcommittee is responsible for the bylaws and colloquium. Who is the committee liaison to? S. Hildebrandt also added that the workloads across the subcommittees seems to be inequitable. Revisions to the subcommittees may need to happen.

P. Hash stated that when we try to revise our bylaws, they must go to Academic Senate. Suggested we rewrite our charges as we currently function and send to Academic Senate but operate on those committees’ charges.

S. Jones-Bock asked J. Wolfinger if he wanted us to go back to our committees and revisit our titles and charges.

J. Wolfinger responded that was the consensus of the executive committee.

A. Mustian added that the subcommittees that do not have a demanding workload could possibly serve as an Adhoc to another subcommittee (like UTEAC) on their tasks.

C. Bazan asked if we are in need of reimagining all subcommittees?

S. Hildebrandt responded that she can only speak on behalf of University Faculty & Liaison committee.

C. Borders stated that related to the bylaws, questions came up with Academic Senate but the bylaws were approved. Maybe we need to evaluate the bylaws as they do not match what the subcommittees do right now.

J. Wolfinger indicated the Executive Committee is working out a strategy and re-thinking how to get this done. Take A. Mustian’s thought into consideration and look at other work as needed by CTE. That way when there is a critical imbalance of work load, there is some flexibility.

D. Teacher Education Communication – Listserv (C. Borders): C. Borders stated that previously all communication has fallen solely on the CTE members to take back to their respective programs and colleges. There have been times where the information did not get
disseminated out to all faculty teacher education members. We are creating a Listserv that will include all teacher education faculty. A survey has been sent out to programs to ask for all names and emails for teacher education faculty.

V. Graziano asked if the survey went to anyone in the lab schools?

C. Borders responded that it did not but will send it to the lab schools. She will send to S. Meyer to send to the lab schools.

E. TEC Document Updates (C. Rutherford): C. Rutherford indicated that recent legislation requires the removal of language that says student teachers cannot get paid and modification to language from Illinois State Police to NCBC for criminal background requirements.

F. Community Colleges (J. Wolfinger): J. Wolfinger stated that he has reached out to 5 or 6 universities regarding paid student teaching and they were undetermined how they were going to handle it and asked how ISU was going to handle the situation. We are unsure at this time what the process will or will not be and how we are going to handle paid student teaching.

J. Wolfinger indicated that K. Appel will be hosting the Future Teacher Education Conference. There are 350 attending. Media, state representatives and presidents of six community colleges (will be attending for the first 30 minutes). J. Wolfinger will then be meeting with the presidents afterwards to discuss dual credit, teacher pipeline and how we can become better partners. K. Appel will be the recruiter and additional people in the meeting will be A. Bates (TCH) and C. Borders (TEC). President Dietz wants us to take our partnerships with community colleges serious.

V. Discussion Items:

A. Teacher Education Review Board Disposition Concerns Appeal Process (S. Hildebrandt): S. Hildebrandt indicated TERB had their first appeal of this year. We need to create a systematic process for appeals to ensure it is the same procedure for each case and the student’s case is presented in the same manner and TERB supports their argument in the same manner.

J. Wolfinger stated that this process is going to be given to the Vision Subcommittee to establish a protocol. If a student has three dispositions concerns that are flagged and they appeal, do we say they are “in or out” of teacher education and/or do they start over?

T. Hinkel added that he reads every single disposition that comes through. Four years ago, there was no such thing as a resolvable disposition. T. Hinkel has to reach out to professors to request more evidence, better documentation to make the disposition valid.

T. Davis indicated that if student appealed a second disposition, there is no language in the document.

C. Bazan teaches two programs: one teacher education and one non-teacher education. In the non-teaching programs, they do the same behaviors that would warrant a disposition in teacher education, but they do not have the disposition system.

J. Donnel: Does TERB have a historical document that we could view to see what kind of
appeals have come through?

A. Mustian added that there is a larger conversation that needs to take place regarding disposition concerns. If we have a good student by a broad set of norms – it is punitive of how it becomes. On the forms, it is not formative anymore, needs to be a part that creates a support plan. How many good future teachers are we keeping out; it needs to be a good research-based disposition.

C. Borders indicated that the state committees are looking at disposition concerns across the state. Collecting data from the institutions and the work is being done at the state level.

J. Donnell stated that TCH tracks their dispositions internally; 90-95% are about taking responsibility and they do require their professors to write a plan of action.

P. Hash added the everyone should be using the same dispositions concerns form as it was CTE approved.

C. Borders stated that some staff, faculty, etc. drift from the form they are supposed to use, programs pick up and modify the forms.

S. Jones-Bock indicates that we need to look at the process of the dispositions and the language and what we are measuring – resolvable/unresolvable.

J. Wolfinger stated that we want our the dispositions to be fair and a transparent appeals process.

J. Chrismon will take these issued to the Vision Subcommittee so that we have fairness and a due transparency process.

C. Borders will send documentation to the Vision Subcommittee.

J. Wolfinger added real guidance is needed to support students in how to appeal; inconsistencies in how long students have to complete the resolvable dispositions and the right to legal counsel.

T. Hinkel added that there are 40,000 disposition milestones and only 246 dispositions concerns on file to date.

B. Video Permission Form (L. Sexton): C. Borders indicated this form is needed and we requested to be translated into languages reflected in the student body of schools where our teacher candidates are placed. It was determined that all the video permission forms are in a variety of different versions, especially pre-clinical. edTPA video permission form is the main one and has been adapted into other languages. When this occurs, it has to go to Legal Counsel. We are working on more standardization for the permission forms.

XI. Action Items: None

XII. Subcommittee Reports

A. Curriculum Committee: S. Parry reported the committee met on September 24, 2019 and approved the following two proposals:
1) Revision to Chemistry 161: Introduction to Teaching Science
The course is adding 15 clinical hours and is removing the statement that the course is “Also offered as BSC 161” because it no longer is cross listed.

S. Parry would like to propose, on behalf of the committee, that the following proposal be done as a written vote.

2) Revision of the Technology and Engineering Education major
They are adding SED 344 as a requirement and removing EAF 228/231/235 as a requirement. They have added 10 clinical hours to TEC 305 and supplied information on how the IPTS alignments will be met.

Motion to approve adding SED 344 to Technology and Engineering Education major and removing EAF 228/231/235:

Second: S. French

Motion to add SED 344 to Technology and Engineering Education major and removing EAF 228/231/235 approved unanimously;
15 – Approve
1 – Rejected
3 – Abstentions

L. Sutton asked how the changes in sequences impacted faculty – would like information/updates moving forward.

A. Mustian added that she feels this is important to know. The concerns on how it has been impacted has not been fully addresses.

S. Jones-Bock stated that B. Hatt had talked about the process of when a department decides to create a new course, they talk about this with units impacted before course is formally submitted.

C. Borders indicated that if we drop TCH 216, two out of the four key assessments collected will fall on the programs to collect.

J. Thomas agrees with A. Mustian and added that it is important to note that secondary programs are not one size fits all.

S. Parry added that the committee also started discussing the new graduate program in Low Vision and Blindness from Special Education, but are waiting on some of the curricular pieces before we can vote on it.

B. Student Interests Committee: T. Crumpler reported here has been a lack of awareness among students about disposition concerns. What can our committee do to raise awareness? The survey of student needs will be going out in approximately two weeks and a question about dispositions will be added. They will be revisiting the three strikes, you’re out, rule. They will be returning to the topic on Tuesday.

C. University Liaison and Faculty Interests Committee: S. Hildebrandt reported the committee has a bit of an identity crisis. They are brainstorming aspects of their work that they could more accurately represent faculty interests. Most of the members at the table represent faculty interest. They are in the process of helping review scholarship process.
D. UTEAC: P. Hash reported the committee looked at a couple different options and narrowed it down to one for the formative pedagogy. Hopefully, will have something to bring to CTE soon. At the next meeting, R. Seglem will talk about assessment for technology for CAEP that she has worked on that may give useful data.

E. Vision Committee: S. Jones-Bock reported that the committee went over their charge in the bylaws and realized the language does not really fit, either. Areas are: research for paid student teaching, dispositions – gathering information for CTE, NCBC – having an external committee to look at the hits that TEC has been getting and determining a process for that.

XIII. Legislative Updates: C. Borders reported that HB 256 has been revived (video-taping bill). The bill passed the House in the last session and has been reassigned to special interest committee. It was picked up by Senator Murphy (chief sponsor) and co-sponsor, Bill Cunningham. C. Borders and J. Lackland are to meet with Senator Murphy on 10/16/19 to find our why this is being picked up. Part 25 changes passed ISBE and have been moved on the JCAR - looking at 18 hours and the content test score for all subsequent endorsements with the exception of SED.

IX. Announcements and Last Comments

√ M. Noraian informed the committee that the IDS 274 course: Preparing for the edTPA will be taught online for the winter session. The course will run from December 14, 2019 through January 12, 2020. She will send the flyer to S. Conner to email to the CTE members so they can distribute within their programs.

√ L. Sutton wanted to know how many students have we reached out regarding the TAP/ACT test no longer required? C. Borders responded that we are still collecting data as the data pull is much more extensive. The state has reached out to students who only needed the TAP test to pass to into student teaching. L. Sutton suggested that this does not have to be a centralized process and asked if program coordinators could do it. C. Borders responded that if the students were in a program then the program coordinators could do it. M. Noraian added that History sent an email to all students for history education and non-education that indicated if they got flagged due to TAP or ACT, please contact their advisor. C. Borders stated that an email with language to send out to program coordinators will be sent so the programs can send out to their students.

√ J. Wolfinger informed the members that T21 Conference was last Friday and M. Noraian added that it was a very energetic meeting. J. Wolfinger also added that a pipe busted underneath the stage at Metcalf and they have a nasty issue going on. Making alternative arrangements for their students and ours.

X. Adjournment

1. P. Hash
2. S. Parry

Meeting adjourned at 4:24 p.m.