**Educator licensure and degree**

**TIMELINE**

**September 6, 2011** (discussion item)

Legislation passed and the assessment will become effective statewide in September 2015. Discussion ensued and teacher education programs should add this assessment to their requirements in Fall 2013.

**September 20, 2011** (action item)

Motion was to adopt a campus deadline of Fall 2013 for implementation of the teacher performance assessment for assessment of competencies in student teaching due. Due to lack of a 2nd for the motion, the motion died. The item will be an action item at the October 18th council meeting.

**October 18, 2011** (action item)

Motion was to adopt a campus deadline of Fall 2013 for implementation of the teacher performance assessment for assessment of competencies in student teaching due, 2nd by Temple, motion passed unanimously

**April 2, 2013** (discussion item)

ISBE/IBHE clarification: A. Adkins distributed the joint letter from the Illinois State Board of Education and the Illinois Board of Higher Education. The letter is a clarification for students completing degree requirements in a course of study leading to a degree in education, but not completing the necessary requirements leading to completion of an approved teacher preparation program. Beginning September 1, 2015, the edTPA will be required for completion of an approved Illinois teacher preparation program. Our institution must clearly designate that the student has completed the degree, but has not met the requirements leading to completion of an approved teacher preparation program. We may consider a variety of approaches in making this designation.

Examples of such approaches include but are not limited to:

· Designating on the transcript or degree that a candidate has completed an approved teacher preparation program or has not completed an approved teacher preparation program.

· Adopting a written policy and process for keeping and checking graduation records for all candidates in order to verify and sign off on program completion for any in-state or out-of-state requests. This process must be approved by the president and dean of the institution verifying support of the process, and requiring that training regarding the policy and process would be ongoing for current and new staff working with teacher licensing.

· Awarding an alternative degree (e.g. BA in Elementary Education with Entitlement Recommendation vs. BA in Elementary Education without Entitlement Recommendation) or placing a student in an alternative major (e.g. BA in Spanish Education vs. BA in Spanish Language and Literature) may be an approach.

Discussion ensued. J. Rosenthal indicated we could use IDS majors as we now do. The Registrar’s office does not want to see a BA in Elementary Education without Entitlement Certificate on the transcript. There will have to be some remediation for edTPA. Remediation needs to be put on hold until we see how the scoring is going to be evaluated and then Pearson will have to go through the logistics.

**April 2, 2013** (information item)

edTPA implemention: If a program chooses not to implement, the teacher candidate will be stopped at Gateway 3.

**September 16, 2014** (Information item)

Reminder - As of September 1st, 2015, it becomes consequential (must be passed to get teacher licensure).

Provost edTPA task force (Parry) – the Provost identified this group to discuss policy issues (such as non-passers) and report to the CTE. The committee is small and meets regularly to make sure we are doing what’s right for the students. It is recognized that edTPA is an addition to the faculty workload. The committee is comprised of P. Schoon, S. Parry, A. Adkins, J. Rosenthal, D. Garrahy, and E. Palmer.

**January 20, 2015** (information item)

S. Parry reported the edTPA working group is working on parameters for one re-take vs full re-take. They will be proposing a policy to CTE soon. Any questions for the working group to consider should be directed to S. Parry. They could also contact D. Garrahy, E. Palmer, A. Adkins, J. Rosenthal, or P. Schoon. J. Rosenthal, E. Palmer, and S. Parry worked on worst case possible scenarios.

The options are or could be:

* University Studies Degree
* Non-Teaching Degree in the major
* Creation of a new non-teaching degree

A. Adkins emailed Jason Helfner regarding program completion.

**February 3, 2015** (discussion item)

1. Program Completion: A. Adkins distributed a hand-out on “Program Completion” and “Guidelines for Retake Support”. The goal is a plan to acknowledge pedagogical preparation while creating new non-licensure majors for students who have completed all requirements except passage of edTPA. The ISBE-IBHE letter from 3-26-13 states, in part;

“*For students unable to successfully complete these (APT & edTPA) requirements, an institution may issue a degree provided all required credits have been earned and graduation requirements have been met. However, the issuing institution must clearly designate that the student has completed the degree, but has not met the requirements leading to completion of an approved teacher preparation program.”*

Communication with ISBE’s Jason Helfner approves the following:

 “*One thought is to create a new on-licensure sequence in each major that would be identical in all requirements to the current TE programs except for a passing score on the edTPA. We would transcript this sequence as, for example, ‘English: Pedagogy Emphasis’ or similar wording. For students passing all requirements for licensure, transcripts would read (as currently): ‘English Teacher Education: Student has completed a state and CAEP approved program in Teacher Education’.”*

Therefore, departments will determine options for candidates:

* IDS degree
* Non-teaching major
* Create a new sequence not leading to endorsement

S. Parry stated that creating a new sequence/major will be up to individual programs, and not for CTE to determine. A. Adkins strongly suggested that college representatives from CTE take the message to their respective programs. Some programs have separate majors, others do not. J. Rosenthal stated that it is highly recommended to create a sequence and not a new major. Creating a sequence is handled on campus and takes less time. T. Lorsbach added that it is perfect timing for them to create an International degree. L. Eckrich asked how the implication would affect statewide stipulations, specifically could a student get a non-licensure degree here and then go to another state and become licensed. J. Rosenthal stated they would work closely with the Registrar’s Office and ISBE on this to not have unintended consequences and that there could be unforeseen circumstances. L. Steffen added if the candidate demonstrates coursework and has the stipulations in support, this allows the candidate’s degree to be more transportable. J. Webster will not entitle them before they have completed their undergraduate program. After completing a first degree, a student could return for entitlement only. L. Steffen gets a form sent to her on occasion for master’s programs to see if the student has completed an approved program.

1. Guidelines for Re-take Support: A. Adkins referred to the handout already distributed which includes information from a previous presentation by E. Palmer on guidelines for re-takes of edTPA.
* 3.B.1 – Task Analysis
	+ Fails more than one task = complete retake, most likely requires new placement
* 3.B.2 – Unless within 3 points of passing
	+ 2ndary analysis to identify a task for resubmission
* 5 – Mentoring for retake
	+ Resources yet to be determined
	+ Most likely, full cost recovery from IDS 274: Preparing for the edTPA
* More than one retake?
	+ Pending department approval

Item 3.B.2 indicates a student should find a task to re-submit since they are very close to passing. Hopefully, this is a task that does not require a placement because they should have oversampled on their data collection. In addressing Item 5, A. Adkins noted that the revenue from the edTPA preparation course may be able to pay for mentorship. The procedure to deal with the situation of more than one re-take needed is still being discussed. The University is committed to assisting with one re-take and will consult with departments/schools on a second re-take. E. Palmer stated that the procedure may be similar to when a student wants to re-take a course for a third time which requires department/school approval. R. Seglem asked about a situation where the video is good but the write up is bad. The response is that they must use new video that has not already been submitted. L. Eckrich asked about the timeline for re-takes. A. Adkins stated there is an approximate four-month window available in order to make the next graduation cycle. K. Hamann asked about the difficulty for a student in identifying “good” video for re-submission. A. Adkins replied the video simply has to be “good enough” in terms of showing student engagement. E. Palmer noted that last fall ISU had an 83% pass rate and all of the non-passers were just 1 task re-takes. A question was posed as to how Pearson handles re-takes. E. Palmer stated there is a re-take submission process in place. Guidelines exist as to what has to be re-submitted and the cost is $100.00 per task. Scoring schedules exist for re-takes also and these are coordinated by E. Palmer’s office. Scorers do not know they are scoring a re-take. A. Adkins advised that these two items (Program Completion and Re-Take Guidelines) will be action items at the next CTE meeting. Information on these items was sent with the agenda. S. Parry reminded everyone that any questions should be directed to the edTPA working group (D. Schoon, S. Parry, A. Adkins, J. Rosenthal, D. Garrahy and E. Palmer). College representatives were strongly urged to help engage and educate their constituents about this process. L. Eckrich asked about graduation for non-passers. J. Rosenthal responded that a non-passer cannot graduate until they pass but they can walk. A window exists between commencement and graduation and a non-passer could potentially finish in time to make that cycle.

 **May 3, 2015**

edTPA: Program Completion – This was a discussion at last CTE meeting and this is a reminder that teacher candidates have options if they do not pass edTPA and not want to pursue a re-take.

Their options are:

* Graduate from IDS
* Revert to a different sequence in their program (i.e. English Ed to English) Some programs can do this seamlessly, others require more coursework
* If programs choose to create another sequence/program (not a new major) and the candidate can switch to it
* Academic Affairs Subcommittee of the Academic Senate recommended another option: Discuss students being allowed to graduate with a teacher education degree but not recommend them for licensure and no transcript notation that they have completed an approved program. D. Garrahy responded and informed everyone that when it says “teacher education” it is misleading when they are actually not qualified or licensed to teach. She finds this misleading and problematic. J. Rosenthal noted some issues with the state level if we were to pursue this. There was no comment in support of this option.

Advantage of Option 3 is that the ISBE has already approved it. S. Otto asked how students will get help navigating these options and A. Adkins responded that programs will take care of it since each program will have a policy in place. Programs have to make a decision on which option to follow.

Motion made by A. Adkins: CTE acknowledges three options available to programs for candidates who do not fulfill licensure requirements: 1) IDS option (Human and Educational Services sequence); 2) non-teacher education sequence/major; 3) create a new sequence in their major (for example: French: pedagogy emphasis). Friendly amendment (J. Rosenthal): it would be an “appropriate non-teacher education major”. Accepted by A. Adkins. Second: M. Noraian Sara Semonis raised the question if any of these options include student teaching? A. Adkins indicated it is up to individual prog

**CURRENT STATUS**

Currently, ISU is one of a few (if not the only) state institutions that continues to have educator licensure and degree linked together. This requires all education graduates to have an audit of licensure requirements prior to their degree audit. This audit (for initial licensure, undergraduate programs), is conducted by a licensure officer within the Registrar’s office.

**CURRENT MOTION**

We recommend that the process be initiated for separating educator licensure from degree requirements at ISU. This process will require presentation to and vote by the Academic Senate as this change impacts degree. This process will further require applications to ISBE and IBHE for approval.