Illinois State University  
Council for Teacher Education  
Tuesday, October 15th, 2019 3:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.  
DeGarmo Hall, Room 551

Minutes


Guests:  J. Donnel, S. Finley, T. Hinkel, B. Jacobsen, M. Monts, C. Rutherford, A. Thoennes, J. Watson

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

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

III. Approval of Minutes from October 1, 2019: Motion to approve the minutes from October 1, 2019:  
T. Davis  
Second:  S. Arnett-Hartwick  
Minutes were unanimously approved with no abstentions.

IV. Information Items:

A. Basic Skills Email (C. Borders):  C. Borders stated an email was sent to all program coordinators last week to forward an email with potential language to forward to their students and past students to let them know that the Basic Skills is no longer required and their option of readmission to their sequence. They will need to contact their advisor for guidance and the next steps.

V. Discussion Items

A. Formative Pedagogy (P. Hash/C. Borders):  D. Barker indicated that UTEAC recommends using the formative assessment that is used in TCH 216 and based on hand-out distributed, Formative Pedagogy, putting forward UTEAC’s recommendation to be used for all programs.

Discussion:

C. Borders:  For clarity purposes, use tool for a couple of semesters  
P. Hash:  Rubrics are from TCH 216 planning and not reflection and instruction. If adopted, can use pedagogy.  
C. Borders:  Every program has different assignments they use within formative pedagogy. We need to determine common points and scores for annual assessment. CAEP’s requirement is a common assessment and we need to come up with something that can be applied to any number of assignments and multiple lesson plans that all programs would use. Students from a real group or
case study would look at a particular written context, commentary in lesson plan. Assignment fit rubrics.

T. Davis: How many times will programs be assessed?
C. Borders: Programs would assess formative pedagogy one time. Programs can grade assessment based on the three rubrics. If students are taking TCH 216, then the formative pedagogy will already be embedded. Programs that do not have 216, the assessment rubric would need to be used. Across the 28 programs, we had six different formative pedagogy assessments.

B. Clinical Attire Guidelines (C. Borders): Hand-outs were distributed for ELED Clinical Handbook (page 7), QEB Dress Code Statement, and article on gender inclusive dress codes. C. Borders indicated that this topic was brought up in the CTE Executive Committee regarding the concern of our students in clinicals not dressing in professional attire. This brought up the idea to bring to CTE a discussion about whether departments have policies in place to address.

Discussion:

B. Hatt: There is a lot out there about how dress code policies should be – tend to target girls.
A. Hurd: There is a dress code policy at the University level but has been sitting at Academic Senate for two years with no movement.
P. Hash: The Music program specifies what their students should wear. P. Hash indicated he brought it up in the Executive Committee as to him some of the students do not dress professionally like teachers.
C. Bazan: Indicated she had an incident with a student at Metcalf as the lab school did not think she was dressed appropriately so was given a scarf. C. Bazan received an email about the inappropriateness of her dress.
B. Hatt: Everyone has their own issue, not appropriate to say to a female student’s attire that you would not say to a male student’s attire.
S. Jones-Bock: Found a K-12 student dress code but not a teacher dress code. Metcalf is for children. There was a conversation and student dispositions for dress code as a student had a spaghetti strap on under a cardigan and her strap was showing.
J. Thomas: A male student who was presenting got docked points for not wearing a tie.
B. Hatt: That’s another example of bias in dress code.
M. Ely: What about school partners that we are begging to take our students and they have dress code policies.
B. Hatt: If the school partners have inequitable policies then we need our own policy.
J. Thomas and P. Hash: We need to work with the lab schools to create a policy rather than one being dictated to our students as they have a dress code for our students but not their teachers.
C. Bazan: There would be some issues with dress code depending on the content area.

C. Borders: One of the things the Executive Committee discussed was that there are content areas that require specific dress. If we craft a policy, we would allow for content-specific variance.
J. Thomas: Added that is the case for some of her Science Education majors; content-specific.
B. Hatt: One of the items discussed was does every program have written guidelines and that U-High needs a written policy.
C. Borders: Moving forward we will reach out to lab schools to see if they have a dress code policy and then go from there.
J. Thomas: On TCH 216 course site, provide document that might have some guidance.
B. Hatt: Do we want to officially adopt the queer ed birds guidelines or at least indicate we support it?
A. Mustian: Partnerships are critical. Where do we draw the line for dress code? At what point do we have some autonomy in being able to support our students who are experiencing bias in a
school placement’s dress policy. We should advocate for our students; queer ed birds go beyond.

**K. Mountjoy**: Does this need to be broadened beyond the lab schools? We need to think about our school partners as to not infringe.

**C. Borders**: We need program’s responses that do not have many options.

**B. Hatt**: What she likes about the Queer Ed Birds statement is that it is really inclusive. At some point, we need to educate our partners on inclusive policies. S. Jones-Boek: We have a dress code policy for the student teaching handbook, but what about pre-student clinicals? The policy should be guided by the faculty dress code at their assigned school.

**M. Noraian**: They ask their students to go over and beyond for dressing appropriately as the students do not have jobs yet.

**B. Hatt**: What if a female wanted to wear a tie? There needs to be an equitable policy.

**P. Hash**: A bigger issue will be when a man wants to wear a skirt.

**B. Hatt**: How would we create a policy that would allow a person to dress in alignment with their gender identity.

**M. Noraian**: We cannot force a school to adopt a policy that is counter to their culture, but we can move placements.

**M. Noraian and K. Mountjoy**: For transgender, appears education is not comfortable with having the student. K. Mountjoy added she had one and was a good student. Need to make the connection.

**S. Zoltek**: Indicated her best friend is transgender. The goal should be acceptance. Queer ed bird statement – should not be able to be reprimanded based on ethnic or gender identities. M. Brixius: In her actual TCH classes, she does not think she has ever seen written guidelines about what is considered appropriate attire or what is not appropriate attire. Agreeing with B. Hatt, having written standards for dress would be helpful in guiding what is expected of students. If a school disagrees, then address it.

**K. Mountjoy**: Some of the intercity schools have guidelines because of gangs and certain colors are not allowed. Maybe we should consider that as well if we create guidelines.

**C. Fall Gateway Completion Date (A. Thoennes)**: On the website, there is a 12/15/19 completion date for all gateways. A. Thoennes stated that the issue is registration closes 12/13/19. Students following the 12/15/19 deadline will be late and will not be able to register until spring. The question is, “does the 12/15/19 deadline each year have to be a set date or can it be a general deadline that better aligns to registration closing.”

**Discussion**:

**C. Borders**: A. Thoennes, S. Finley, and S. Alford are the ones that track the gateways and impacts them as they are tracking down students.

T. Davis: It makes sense to indicate the deadline is by the close of registration each December.

**M. Noraian**: We have been clear about the firm dates of July 15th and December 15th for the deadline of the gateways being completed.

**C. Borders**: If we change the deadline date, we need to make a communication plan about it.

**J. Watson**: As a placement coordinator for student teaching, if we are going to connect it to a date that moves (based on Registrar’s registration dates each year), do not allow it past 12/15/19 as partners need two weeks of December to plan for moves. If their gateways are not completed, the student should technically be pulled.

**M. Noraian**: I think we should keep the dates we have of July 15th and December 15th.

**M. Ely**: Why don’t we move the deadline date to December 10, 2019?

**J. Thomas**: I would have students rioting.
C. Borders: This is also about content test passing, scores being received, etc. – all part of gateway completion.

J. Thomas: In the last couple of years we have gateway 2 requirement that CBC must be active but now it is the ROE’s job to do that, does this delay student teaching?

C. Borders and T. Hinkel: Gateways are only internal to us, which would be our NCBC.

T. Hinkel: This year, we will still accept external CBC to save students money, however, moving to NCBC. I see both sides of it. We put those dates as solid dates so the Freshmen through Senior know the dates and can stick into the student teaching application. Static date is best than fluctuating from semester to semester. If CTE agrees to set it earlier, that’s fine. But, we always make exceptions for students.

C. Borders: M. Noraian mentioned if we make the gateway completion deadline 5 days prior to registration deadline date, we would have to create a communication plan. TEC has no say on the date, this is a CTE decision, so we brought it to you for discussion.

P. Hash: Would it help if we move the date to 12/10/19?

A. Mustian: If the student does not procrastinate communicate over and over 5 days before registration closes.

J. Thomas: It will take a lot of time and communication.

P. Hash: What would the Lauby Center like to see happen?

J. Watson: Maybe CTE could give power to the Lauby Center to change date when needed.

C. Borders: The people who have to chase students down would like that date moved back.

S. Jones-Bock: So are you proposing a new date?

C. Borders: I would like to see it 5 days before the close of registration.

J. Watson: Juniors are currently applying for student teaching. The signing agreement indicates they will have it completed by 12/15/19.

C. Borders: They would not be able to register then until 1/6 which means they cannot go into their student teaching placement.

M. Ely: They would be irresponsible need to look at the deadline dates.

J. Thomas: Why didn’t the Registrar look at our deadline dates?

P. Hash: This seemingly simple solution seems far more complicated. What if we leave the dates the same but program coordinators this year informed the students they cannot wait until 12/15/19.

T. Davis: There are a couple of issues. PDS students might have to come in on January 2nd. Not all students are procrastinating on the content test. BTE has one student that is talking it for the 6th time (ADA issue with exam). The cost is $122.00 each time.

S. Hildebrandt: Some content tests are not offered at that time.

P. Hash motioned to move changing the gateway deadline date from Discussion Item to Action Item.

Second: T. Davis

Motion to move changing the gateway deadline from Discussion Item to Action Item unanimously approved with no abstentions.

P. Hash motioned to leave the gateway registration date as 12/15/19.

Second: M. Noraian

Motion to leave the gateway registration date as 12/15/19 was unanimously approved with no abstentions.
VI. Action Items:

P. Hash motioned to leave the gateway registration date as 12/15/19.
Second: M. Noraian
Motion to leave the gateway registration date as 12/15/19 was unanimously approved with no abstentions.

VII. Subcommittee Reports

A. Curriculum Committee (S. French):  No report

B. Student Interests Committee (B. Hatt/M. Noraian):  M. Noraian reported that they did not meet but sending out a survey.

C. University Liaison and Faculty Interests Committee (S. Hildebrandt):  S. Hildebrandt reported that the committee did not meet but would like to request that each committee put in their list of tasks, a list of their current duties and responsibilities (descriptions) and send to S. Hildebrandt so they can be as accurate and equitable as possible in the bylaws.

D. UTEAC (P. Hash/C. Borders):  P. Hash reported that the formative assessment was discussed earlier. Tuesday Bylaws review and will be looking at tech assessment for CAEP requirement.

E. Vision Committee (J. Chrismon):  J. Chrismon reported the committee met and discussed disposition concerns and are researching teacher dispositions in general. Also, they are researching paid student teaching. C. Borders added that we have a GA researching paid student teaching data outside of Illinois.

VIII. Legislative Updates (C. Borders)

C. Borders reported that Jonathan Lackland and C. Borders will be meeting with Senator Murphy on the videotaping bill.

Please see attachment for the updates.

IX. Announcements and Last Comments

✓ C. Borders announced that Part 25 is going from 24 to 18 credit hours. This was approved by ISBE and now moves to JCAR.  J
J. Thomas asked if it that was only for subsequent after their first teaching license?
C. Borders responded that it was.
J. Thomas also asked if C. Borders has heard anything about middle school endorsement?
C. Borders stated the language is in Part 25; must be approved by JCAR and then put into the rules and ISBE has to give guidance.

✓ C. Borders requested the subcommittees please send the minutes from their subcommittee meetings to her, April or Suz.

✓ L. Sutton asked if program coordinators have had any success in reaching students who had barriers due to the basic skills tests or has the adhoc committee been unsuccessful? I keep asking the question, feels like collectively this body is not interested.
C. Borders stated she had one and the data pull is very time consuming. She recommends the programs identify these students.
S. Jones-Bock indicated she met with M. Zamudio, P. Williams and E. Skinner in Waukegan to look at students who had to go IDS due to basic skills to re-engage them.
A. Mustian asked if there a lot of programs who haven’t gotten to this?
P. Hash stated his program do not have students that qualify.
M. Noraiian sent out an email before the support email and received two. She will have the secondary programs share at the secondary meeting.
B. Hatt asked if we are collecting data on the numbers of students who do come back and earn degree after initial. A. Bates and S. Hildebrandt are collecting data,

X. Adjournment

1. P. Hash
2. B. Hatt

Meeting adjourned at 4:17 p.m.