

**Illinois State University
Council for Teacher Education
Tuesday, September 4th, 2018 3:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.
DeGarmo Hall, Room 551**

Minutes

Members Present: J. Anderlik, S. Arnett-Hartwick, A. Bates, C. Borders, M. Brixius, T. Davis, M. Ely, S. French, D. Garrahy, V. Graziano, S. Jones-Bock, K. Laudner, C. Lawton, E. Mikulec, M. Noraian, S. Osorio, S. Otto, S. Parry, J. Regnier, J. Rosenthal, L. Sutton, A. Victor, D. Wilde, S. Williams, M. Winsor

Absent: P. Hash, K. Mountjoy, C. Zimmerman

Guests: K. Fansler, J. Jung, W. Matejka, E. Palmer, M. Parker, D. Renn, M. Walbert

Call to Order by Chair:

K. Laudner called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

In lieu of roll call, committee members introduced themselves.

CTE Member Introductions: K. Laudner asked the committee members to introduce themselves, indicating their department/school.

- I. Nominations for Vice Chair:** J. Rosenthal nominated S. Parry
Nomination was approved unanimously.
- II. Nomination for Secretary:** K. Laudner indicated this person would also serve on the Executive Board.
T. Davis indicated she was willing to be the secretary.
Nomination was approved unanimously.
- III. Approval of Minutes from May 1, 2018:** Motion to approve the minutes from May 1, 2018:
L. Sutton
Second: S. Parry
Minutes were unanimously approved with two abstentions.

Subcommittee Reports: Assignments/Responsibilities/Selections of Chairs:

A hand-out was distributed indicating sub-committee assignments to CTE members. Each committee met to elect a chair. D. Garrahy and K. Laudner reminded all that each chair also serves on the CTE Executive Board and the chair must be a CTE voting member and faculty member.

Chairs were elected as follows:

A. Curriculum: Chair: S. Parry
Secretary: S. Arnett-Hartwick

B. Student Interests: Chair: S. Otto

C. University Liaison and Faculty Interests: Chair: V. Graziano

D. Vision: Chair: D. Garrahy

K. Laudner indicated that D. Garrahy will be the chair for the fall and will hopefully have a faculty member for the spring.

E. UTEAC: Co-Chairs: S. Williams and C. Borders

K. Laudner thanked everyone.

IV. Information Items:

1. e-Portfolio and Assessment System: Spring 2019 (D. Garrahy)

On August 14, 2018 the University Purchasing Office notified D. Garrahy that Watermark will only support the current LiveText C1 platform through spring 2019. It is imperative that CTE members get this information out to all teacher education faculty within their College, not just a specific program.

- What are the ePortfolio and Assessment needs of Teacher Education at the Programmatic level?
At the EPP Level: AAR/ Future Accreditation cycles?
 - UTEAC used the data in LiveText for AAR, but there were some program data accessibility issues in LT for the CAEP Self Study Report.
 - CTE will need to make a decision regarding the next steps related to an ePortfolio and assessment system. Then it becomes University a procurement process, adhering to the rules and regulations to secure a new platform.
 - The university will need to bid out for an ePortfolio and assessment system and if we need to integrate with Campus Solutions, that programming could take months.
 - Discussion
 - M. Noraian:* Is a list of vendors available.
 - D. Garrahy:* The first question: Do we need an ePortfolio system? If yes, we will need to determine what the system will be required to do.
 - S. Otto:* The graduate programs in EAF use LT for the Principal Preparation and Superintendent Programs. If a committee is formed, representation from those programs would be appreciated.
 - J. Rosenthal:* Is Watermark not supporting any platform?
 - D. Garrahy:* Watermark has VIA, but it is an entirely different program and looks nothing like C1.

C. Borders: M. Walbert to explain the procurement process. If you are choosing an ePortfolio and assessment system, we would bid out. A requirements matrix is mandatory if we go with an ePortfolio and Campus Solution integrations. Potentially could be 16 vendors.

M. Noraian: Is there is a list used by other Universities?

M. Walbert: There is but Watermark bought three of them.

C. Borders: Reiterated to the committee do we think teacher ed needs ePortfolio or not.

J. Rosenthal: ePortfolio was driven by NCATE.

A decision is needed by January 1st at the latest. The earlier the better.

K. Laudner: Is January 1st was enough time?

M. Walbert: It will bid out to vendors and is out for 30 days. They will be scored then come to campus. Requirements must be very clear. It could take 6-9 months.

D. Garrahy: This means faculty training would have to take place in the summer.

S. Williams: Should programs stop requiring LiveText?

The response was that it is a program decision.

T. Davis: Can data be gathered in other places?

D. Garrahy: Programs use it in unique ways. We may need to bring D. Meyers and R. Smith.

K. Laudner: How does LiveText impact students?

E. Palmer: edTPA uses LiveText and it is a robust system that provides historical records. Students submit their edTPA portfolios through LiveText. LiveText eases the process for retakes and is smoother on students.

L. Sutton: Envisions AdHoc committee and would like to know if the vendors can demonstrate their platform.

M. Walbert: There is a Specs Drive on what we can and cannot do. The top three will be able to show their product based on the requirements matrix and then scoring of the matrix.

T. Davis: BTE used LiveText edTPA as a teaching tool for videos; only access is via LiveText.

C. Borders: AAR process through UTEAC could not have been done. We would have to get data somehow.

M. Noraian: History used LiveText with students.

S. Jones-Bock: Is there is another way to use edTPA in an ePortfolio?

M. Walbert: We do have ReggieNet and OneDrive, but there is not an upload/submit to SCALE for edTPA.

S. Parry: CTE representatives please ask your respective programs and bring back to CTE if they want electronic portfolio or not, then we will go with an AdHoc committee. Programs need to indicate how they are currently using LiveText.

2. SB2692: TAP Test/Gateways

D. Garrahy stated on August 17th, 2018, ISBE contacted ISU that we can no longer require the basic skills test until the semester prior to student teaching, per legislative mandate. This is a State Legislature requirement, not an ISBE requirement D. Garrahy indicated that this is problematic. Her office secures student teaching placements a year in advance and will have to call our districts and retract student teaching placements when the teacher candidate does not pass the Basic Skills/ACT.

C. Borders added that this bill was signed by the Governor and effective immediately.

D. Garrahy stated that CTE needs to determine when to require passage of TAP during the semester prior to student teaching. This issue needs to be an action item as soon as possible, Might this requirement be completed within the first week of the semester prior to student teaching? D. Garrahy asked that it not be later in the semester, giving consideration to the teacher candidate and our school partners.

L. Sutton stated that we need to be proactive for our students. He asks that CTE talk to Springfield about making this a demand-side issue and not a supply-side issue.

S. Arnett-Hartwick asked if this requirement will now be a Gateway 2 requirement.

D. Garrahy is unsure at this time, but it can no longer be a Gateway 1 requirement.

J. Regnier asked if the students can still use the ACT in lieu of the TAP.

D. Garrahy responded the students can substitute the TAP test with ACT, but must have a minimum score of a 22plus writing. CTE members were asked to discuss this with their respective college's and report back at our next meeting regarding a proposed date.

3. edTPA Plagiarism Protocol:

D. Garrahy indicated we had two teacher candidates found to have committed plagiarism on the State required edTPA assessment. The Vision Committee will be revising the CTE approved edTPA Plagiarism protocol, given recent changes as to how Pearson specifically identifies where the infraction occurred. Previous notifications did not include this information from Pearson/ISBE.

4. CTE Bylaws and the Academic Senate

D. Garrahy stated that S. Kalter, Chair of the Academic Senate announced at the Administrative Retreat that Senate will be reviewing the revised CTE Bylaws submitted to the Senate in March 2017. K. Laudner added the Academic Senate had a busy agenda in the spring.

5. CAEP Accreditation Site Visit: April 6th – 9th

D. Garrahy indicated the CAEP Site Team arrives on campus April 6th, with the official visit taking place on April 7th through April 9th, 2019. The CAEP Self-study was submitted July 10, 2018. There were 81 pieces of evidence uploaded to support the Self-Study Report.

D. Garrahy thanked C. Borders, J. Rosenthal, R. Smith E. Palmer, B. Meyer, T. Hinkel, K. Fansler, herself and family. T. Hinkel uploaded all the evidence. The next CAEP requirements include a “Call for Third Party Comments,” due October 9th; Formative Feedback is due from CAEP by December 8th, with ISU’s response due February 6th, 2019; factual corrections are due May 21st, 2019 and the CAEP Rejoinder is due July 3rd, 2019.

V. Discussion Items: None

VI. Action Items: None

VII. Announcements and Last Comments

A. Chair:

√ K. Laudner informed the members that Shirley Steinberg will be speaking tonight at 7:00 p.m. Shirley Steinberg is the editor of many books in critical pedagogy.

B. Vice – Chair: None

C. Members: None

VIII. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn: S. Otto

Second: J. Rosenthal

Meeting adjourned at 4:06 p.m.

**Illinois State University
Council for Teacher Education
Tuesday, September 18, 2018, 3:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.
DeGarmo Hall, Room 551**

Minutes

Members Present: J. Anderlik, S. Arnett-Hartwick, A. Bates, S. Boesdorfer, C. Borders, M. Brixius, T. Davis, M. Ely, S. French, D. Garrahy, V. Graziano, P. Hash, S. Jones-Bock, K. Laudner, C. Lawton, E. Mikulec, K. Mountjoy, A. Mustian, M. Noraian, S. Osorio, S. Otto, S. Parry, J. Rosenthal, J. Regnier, L. Sutton, A. Victor, D. Wilde, S. Williams

Absent: C. Blum, M. Winsor

Guests: K. Appel, B. Broad, J. Chrismon, K. Coats, C. De Santis, L. Eckrich, V. Evans-Winters, H. Goldsmith, A. Haas, B. Hatt, S. Hildebrandt, T. Hinkel, P. Hoff, B. Jacobsen, J. Jung, T. Kaczorowski, L. Lienhart, A. Lin, P. McCluskey-Titus, M. Monts, M. Morris-Davis, M. Nur-Awaleh, H. Olsen, E. Palmer, M. Parker, D. Renn, C. Rutherford, B. Vietti

Call to Order by Chair:

K. Laudner called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Roll Call: Conducted by T. Davis

I. Approval of Minutes from September 4, 2018: Motion to approve the minutes from September 4, 2018:

Motion to approve: J. Rosenthal

Second: S. Otto

Minutes approved with one abstention.

II. Subcommittee Reports

A. Curriculum Committee: S. Parry reported the CTE Curriculum committee met on Tuesday, September 11 and reviewed the bylaws connected with the committee. We then discussed the program revision proposal from English to replace EAF 228/231/235 with SED 344. The department had both SED and EAF present information to the departments, and there were two department meetings prior to an electronic department vote, at which the proposal was approved by a two to one margin and sent on to the CTE. This change will bring English into compliance with state standards connected with students with special learning needs. An alignment of the program with state standards was done, and a course that was introduced a couple of years ago, ENG 194, Introduction to English Education, meets the standards connected with “culturally responsive teaching.”

We move to approve the English proposal.

B. Student Interests Committee: The committee met and reviewed their charge for the year. The committee discussed what was done last year and the agenda for the upcoming year.

C. University Liaison and Faculty Interests Committee: No report.

D. Vision Committee: The committee met. It is working on revisions to edTPA plagiarism protocols

due to the way Pearson reports originality issues. A draft of the new protocol is with General Counsel for review. ISU was made aware that our old protocol was no longer valid due to two student teacher originality issues reported by Pearson to ISU last spring.

E. UTEAC: The committee met and reviewed their charge for the year. A plan was set for the year. The committee sent the template for AAR to the program coordinators along with an invitation to Teams. The due date for AAR from the programs to the committee is November 15, 2018.

III. Information Items

Reports from the Colleges about e-portfolio needs and uses.

S. Parry reported that most thought it was a good idea. Math was against trying to use ReggieNet as a replacement.

L. Sutton reported that EAF hopes an e-portfolio can have uses for employability. Wants to use LiveText for two cycles of the Superintendent Program.

E. Mikulec reported that TCH wants to use an e-portfolio for data collection.

M. Ely reported that SED has a list of requirements to share.

M. Noraian reported that from discussions at the Secondary Education Faculty meeting, that there is a desire for a full-time support person for whatever system is selected. There needs to be support for faculty to use an e-portfolio for edTPA.

T. Davis reported that business uses an e-portfolio for required COE assessments and edTPA.

P. Hash reported that music only uses it for edTPA. Others in Fine Arts use an e-portfolio for edTPA and student teachers.

K. Laudner stated that he would create an ad hoc committee to review e-portfolio needs. The committee charge will be to collectively assemble what are the needs of the programs. Work of the committee is to be completed by the end of the fall 2018 semester. He wants representation from as many colleges as possible and suggested the following:

- 2 members for CAS
- 2 members from CAST
- 1 member from EAF graduate programs
- 1 member from CFA
- 1 member from TCH
- 1 member from SED

CTE members are to ask for volunteers from within their colleges and report names at the next CTE meeting.

J. Rosenthal asked if LiveText will be around after the support ends and the end of the contract date. D. Garrahy stated she would follow up with the Procurement office.

IV. Action Items: None

V. Discussion Items: English Education Program Revision

P. Hoff reported that she had concerns and asked to discuss the memo sent to the UCC (memo attached). She stated that the EAF and the SED departments had met on September 17, 2018, to discuss the issues surrounding the secondary programs eliminating EAF courses for the new SED 344 course.

P. Hoff, EAF, spoke from her prepared notes:

This is not the first time we have been in this very room, to discuss this very same issue. Students, of their own volition, representing the most vulnerable groups on campus filled this space to express opposition and concern of the removal of foundations courses from the secondary curriculum. I do not want to rehash our concerns clearly articulated in our letter. However, in the wake of our mediation meeting, shifting and changing stories, feigned collegiality I feel compelled to clear the air so to speak.

My colleagues in EAF and around the campus are here to speak, as they have been, present in the dialogue; but have not had the opportunity to speak. I will be brief to make sure they have the opportunity to speak. We have mad respect for those programs that have sought ways to retain foundations and add other courses that benefit their students, as they deem necessary. I want to be clear our resistance to the proposed SED course and removal of foundations from SOME secondary programs is not is contingent on our worry that our summer income will be diminished. We, like all of you, are committed to our discipline and our charge.

As a faculty, we stand on common ground in our belief that faculty and programs have the right, and responsibility to do what is beneficial to ensure that pre-service teachers are prepared in their respective content areas. We are not opposed to change, given that our discipline centers on issues of equity, hope is what compels us to do the work of foundations, and this hope begets change.

We respect the expertise situated in this room and across campus. I incorporate literature and have a deep appreciation for Ebonics. However, that does not mean that I am an English educator nor am I a linguist. I value and incorporate music to spark and engage students in a process of social analysis, but it does not make me a music educator.

Whether intentional or unintentional the thought that incorporating diversity or culturally responsive curriculum or pedagogy in a course is surmountable to the critical exploration of the ways in which education and schooling create and maintain inequity is arrogance at best and ignorance at its worse. This line of thinking is rooted in a grandiose thinking that discounts, demeans and undermines our training, work and knowledge. I would go so far to say this line of thinking is aligned with intellectual apartheid that works to rank and order knowledge along the lines of whiteness.

I would also like to note the ways in which this dialogue, in and of itself, positions foundations against special education. This line of thinking blurs and perpetuates racist, elitist, ablest, dominating binaries and agendas. This line of flawed thinking is predicated upon the assumption that students who benefit from special education do not also represent racialized, classed groups or have intersecting identities. It also erases the ways in which special education is used to perpetuate intentional or unintentional racist, classist, ablest and/or dominating agendas in the protection of fragility and normalize inequity.

We all want what is best for students within these walls and outside of them. For many of us it is deeply personal, as we have had children, currently have children or we, ourselves have experienced trauma, been devalued and dehumanized in the act of teaching and learning. My daughter, Anisa, is a senior at BHS. Since the 4th grade she has written what I call "love letters" to her teachers. She said that she wanted her teachers to know she is a nice person. The assumptions that ground her skin, hair and body causes teachers to believe that she is not nice person. She is graduating this year and what should be one of the happiest times in her life, she is happy that her sentence is ending. She refuses to attend ISU because she

does not want to see anyone from school. To say that she has experienced racism and sexism is an understatement.

What we take issue with are the ways in which what was initially presented as “choice” and “change” has rendered foundations expendable. I cannot help but to explore the underlying possibilities. As a faculty member whose intersecting identities are from historically marginalized positions I have first hand knowledge and supported pre-service teachers of color who have had some of the racist experiences in COE courses. I have experienced white students’ dissonance as they dissect my whole person, from my hair to my clothes. I have also witnessed the exodus or dismissal of faculty of color from throughout the college. Based on these experiences, in addition to the data collected from sitting administrators throughout the region, I cannot help but question the ways in which race and other “ism” has played out in these discussions and decision-making. The reality is anti-Black sentiments are real and have manifested in numerous ways throughout the college. If we are truly who we say we are, these issues should compel us to at least dialogue in very real ways.

C. DeSantis, Department Chair English, spoke from his prepared notes:

Statement for CTE Meeting
9/18/18

I’d like to briefly add my perspective on how this proposal came about. For those who don’t know me, I’m Chris De Santis, Chair of the Department of English.

This past March, our English Education proposed to the Department this change in our teacher education curriculum, with the rationale that our program was not meeting several standards for accreditation and licensure related to the teaching of exceptional learners required under Illinois Professional Teaching Standards and NCTE. The committee explained to the Department that we needed to approve changes by April 20 in order to comply with College of Education deadlines for creating the new Special Education Course.

The quick turnaround on this decision was reinforced when faculty in English were told that a failure to vote before the April 20 deadline would result in the status quo for the next ten years-that is, that the department would continue to not meet licensure and accreditation requirements for a very long time.

The Department discussed the proposal on April 11, with an intention of voting immediately after to comply with the April 20 deadline, and decided to delay a vote until additional information was received. Between the Department meeting and the final department vote on April 27, I and a few others from the Department met with faculty in EAF to learn more about their research and courses. Also during this time period, I received numerous messages from students, including some of our most accomplished students of color, as well as recent graduates and the Director of the Chicago Pipeline, urging the Department not to delete EAF from its curriculum.

On April 23, I arranged a Department forum for further discussion, and I presented the information I had learned from faculty in EAF and provided a summary of the numerous statements I had received about the proposal.

On April 27, the Department approved the proposal in a vote of 23 in favor, and 11 against.

As a Department Chair, one of my many obligations is to ensure that the process of shared academic governance, as articulated in departmental by-laws, is followed. This includes proposed changes to my curriculum. There are times when I personally disagree with a decision that the Department makes, but I

nevertheless am bound to support that decision.

This is one of those moments. I believe that this proposal was made to the Department with much thought and the best intentions of our students in mind. However, I also believe that the whole process was rushed, perhaps due to mixed messages about the urgency of the decision and an absolute deadline that turned out to be a bit slippery.

In meeting with EAF faculty and hearing from our students and recent graduates, I learned more about how EAF courses are so vital to teachers in training. Just as professors in English would be uncomfortable with, say, faculty in History or Anthropology claiming adequate coverage of English literary studies because they teach a novel or two in their courses. I became more and more convinced that limiting to a few units in existing English classes issues of diversity, inclusion, and historical/systematic practices of marginalization of otherness in education would be a detriment to our English Education students. (I've referenced American Indian boarding schools in my own classes, for example, as well as Booker T. Washington's program and ideology of domestic and industrial education for African Americans in the post-Reconstruction period, but I have not pretensions of covering in literature classes systemic oppressions of educational systems in the way an EAF course might!)

Many in our Department wondered, during debate, whether some compromise might be reached – whether there was some way to add a special education course to our curriculum without deleting EAF. I continue to wonder about that. If this proposal is ultimately approved in the university shared governance process, I will continue to discuss with our directors and faculty possibilities for future curricular revisions that might enable the reinstatement of EAF in our English Teacher Education sequence.

J. Jung from English believes that the process was rushed due to the April 20 deadline. She also discussed the timeline within the English department. In her opinion, the deliberations could have been more robust. J. Jung spoke from her prepared notes:

Julie Jung—comments delivered at CTE meeting, 18 Sep 2018

Note: Extemporaneous comments (as best as I can recall them) appear in brackets

[I'm Julie Jung, the Director of Undergraduate Studies for the Department of English and also a Professor of Rhetoric and Writing. The "rhetoric" part of this will be important later.]

- I'm guided today by two commitments: to respecting shared governance and democratic processes; and to making decisions in the best interests of our students and, in the case of our teacher ed students, our students' future students.
- The department followed processes of shared governance, but from my perspective, they were rushed—at the department level.
- From this committee's [CTE's] perspective and those of our English Ed committee, I imagine those processes didn't feel rushed. [In looking over email exchanges in advance of this meeting, I reread one sent from our former English Ed Director, who noted that folks have been working on this issue for six years.]
- So, in saying I experienced the deliberations as rushed, I don't mean to undermine the hard work of this or our English Ed committee.
- I mean to focus attention on how a misunderstanding of what the April 20th deadline meant inevitably led to rushed deliberations at the department level.
- I understood that by Apr 20th, the faculty needed to have voted on how we intended to work the SED class into our teacher ed curriculum or else—this is important—we risked putting our students in the position of not meeting Illinois and NCTE standards for teacher licensure.

- It was in the context of this urgency that I participated in the sole department meeting focused on deliberating the proposal you see before you.
- Immediately after the meeting, which occurred on April 11th, the electronic voting window was set.
- In the days following the department meeting, I and other department leadership members received emails from students, EAF faculty, a former English Ed faculty member, and others, articulating their opposition to the proposal. I found these perspectives to be compelling and vital to our deliberations, especially those from students who rank among the most impressive students I have worked with in my nearly 20 years at ISU.
- In the days following the department meeting, department members also received (on April 16th) a clarification on the meaning of the April 20th deadline: we did not, in fact, have to vote on a proposal by then; rather, program coordinators needed to communicate an advisory decision by the end of the semester.
- In light of the additional perspectives and this clarification, the Chair in consultation with department Council extended the voting to April 27th.
- The Chair also held a discussion forum to discuss the above; however, this was not a department meeting, akin to our first; it was an informational session, and it's possible that not all faculty who attended the department meeting and voted on the motion also attended this forum.
- The results of the vote were announced on April 27th: 23 in favor; 11 against.
- My concern: had we understood what was meant by the April 20th deadline, I believe the department's deliberations would have been more robust; we would have, as our past practices indicate, likely had multiple department meetings and considered with greater care as a department possible alternatives and their implications. For example, during our department meeting, a few faculty asked whether we could have both courses—SED and EAF. There were quick replies but no time for extended dialogue. [It seemed to me like people in the meeting were figuring things out in the moment and still thinking things through.]
- [Here is where I will now appeal to my expertise as a scholar of rhetoric.] Processes of deliberation that yield solutions that serve the best interests of a community as a whole need to (1) include the perspectives of a diverse range of stakeholders; (2) consider carefully possible effects of the proposed action; and (3) research possible alternatives and their effects.
- Because of the misunderstanding about what needed to be done by April 20, these processes, which occurred in some forums, were not undertaken in what I consider to be a substantive way at the department level—which is the level on which this proposal was approved.
- I find this concerning.
- As such, I remain unconvinced that the proposal you see before you is indeed the best solution to the problem at hand. I am not convinced that it serves the best interests of our students and their future students.

K. Coats, former English Ed Director, stated that she aligned the standards from ITPS and their SPA to all of the courses taught in the English Education major. She gave that information to the department. All standards from EAF are met within the required English coursework except one—working with exceptional learners—and indicated that the SED 344 class would address this standard. The decision was made based upon data with the goal of meeting accreditation and state requirements. This is why the removal of EAF for SED decision was made.

At this point, K. Laudner asked for a motion to officially move from information into discussion on the topic at hand. L. Sutton moved and S. Otto seconded. Motion carried. Discussion continued.

L. Eckrich EAF, spoke from his prepared notes:

Our EAF courses are the *only* teacher education courses at ISU where *all* levels (PK-12) of future district colleagues meet and teach and learn from each other as pre-service teachers. They also bring together

pre-service teachers from *all* subject areas, something that only happens—but *not* as completely—in a couple other teacher education courses (ed psych & TCH) here. Thus, the diversity of our courses themselves will be compromised by this curricular change. The students, schools, and school districts of all these future teachers will bear the biggest negative impact. Below are specific ways the PK-12 diversity in EAF courses matters for the education of all.

- There are rich pedagogical values and approaches that child-centered early childhood educators teach middle level and High School teachers, and well-informed disciplinary perspectives that HS science, math, or drama educators, for example, teach early childhood and elementary school educators. Special education students raise the awareness of mainstream pre-service teachers to the varied needs of some students. Foundations faculty foster and witness this kind of inter-colleague dialogue between and among our PK-12 pre-service teachers all the time in our three EAF classes.
- Common Core standards and the Framework for Teaching (Danielson, 2007) emphasize teacher (and thus pre-service teacher) awareness and knowledge of the inter-related roles that teachers at each level of PK-12 education play in the literacy, numeracy, subject knowledge, and educational, social, civic, and ethical dispositions of PK-12 students. EAF courses are the only academic space where pre-service teachers have this educational exchange and collaboration with, and develop mutual understanding and respect among, potential future district colleagues.
- Public and private schools in the US are organized in districts or organizations the vast majority of which are K-12 or PK-12. These future colleagues need to know the needs and resources each level brings to their collective table.
- Public school districts are organized and accountable at the state level, with their (increasingly limited) funds coming mainly from local and state resources and a small % of federal funds targeted for achieving greater equity across racial, economic, and ability groupings. Pre-service teachers are entering a profession that achieves public education, if it does, collectively and with society's commitment, not merely at the classroom level. EAF courses one the only academic space where this sense of the greater professional and societal whole of which each teacher is a part is fostered and critically informed.
- **This opportunity for cross-fertilization across PK-12 grade levels (and across *all* subject matters) will not only be a loss to those students whose programs drop the EAF requirement. Their departure will also lessen the diversity of the learning experience for those who remain. This will be a huge loss for all of their educations, and, thus in turn, also for that of their future students.**

B. Broad, Former Director of English Ed, stated that he thinks we are deliberating the wrong topic—the value of EAF. The importance of EAF has never been questioned. He stated that English Ed conducted extensive research. Instead, he said the topic that we should be discussing is if the CTE should overrule the decision of the English faculty who made the decision with great care. Some may believe that this was a way to discriminate. Instead, there was no proposal of how to have both EAF and also meet the state requirements for an exceptional learners course. The urgency is real. Springfield has been turning a blind eye to the fact that secondary education programs have not been meeting state requirements. We don't know how long ISBE will continue to turn a blind eye. The vote by the English Department was to ensure that the English Education program met the state requirements. The vote was a 2 to 1 margin in the English Department. He asked CTE to not overrule the informed decision of the department. The proposal may be imperfect, but it is the best they have at this time.

M. Norian clarified how she heard things. To answer the question: Some programs have eliminated content courses. Some have dropped TCH courses. It is the departments' choice on how to go forward to meet the requirements. All choices are difficult.

A. Haas, English, stated that she attends to issues of diversity and equity in her classes, but does not teach students how to teach a diverse student body. Although she respects her colleagues, she felt that she did not understand everything that was being discussed and felt rushed to make a decision. She doesn't feel like the entire department had full knowledge even though she thinks that the English Education committee did deliberate thoughtfully.

She then read an e-mail from Paula Ressler who supported the continuation of EAF classes in the major. She stated that she believes that both SED and EAF are needed in the major.

Letter from P. Ressler, English, read by Angela Haas on her behalf:

Dear CTE Members and other attendees,

I write this letter to add my voice to those who do not think it advisable or helpful to ISU students to eliminate the required foundations elective from the secondary teacher education course sequence. As a former director of ISU's English Education program, K-12 teacher, secondary methods teacher and supervisor, and English Education scholar with 25 years' experience in teacher education, I saw that these foundation courses added critically important aspects of our students' preparation that were not, and still are not available elsewhere in their college curriculum. Not having these courses would leave our students ill-prepared to serve their students, as they would not have had access to any systemic understanding of the deep socio-political, historical, and philosophical issues that they will confront.

Taking methods courses that may contain one or two brief readings from core texts in the EAF sequence cannot substitute for those courses, and methods teachers are not adequately prepared to teach such content. Foundations courses are taught by faculty whose scholarship and dedication to teaching for social justice gives them expertise in the core issues of education.

Arguments about other courses meeting the same requirements fall flat when we recognize the difference between in-depth learning and superficial learning. Educators know that learners take away so much more from a focused intensive course taught by well-prepared teachers than one in which teachers may (or may not) "cover" some of these topics in a class session or two. Furthermore, trying to supplement methods courses with such foundational curriculum would cut into what are already seriously over-packed curricula.

A new teacher who has taken a foundations course focused on key issues in education is better prepared to resist the forces today trying to privatize education, whitewash curricula, and overemphasize standardized testing to the detriment of meaningful educational experiences, than is a new teacher who may have read about the issues facing public education in a newspaper article on TV, or in a short discussion in another education course. Even students taking social justice-oriented gen ed courses have little to no exposure to how the issues they study there manifest in school settings.

It is true that secondary teacher education students have few electives available to them. This lack of choice is frustrating for teacher education students and any students who carry a major and minor and crave to broaden their knowledge base. But to satisfy their desire by eliminating the foundations requirement and replacing it with the special education course would be a travesty. Both are equally necessary. Which is more important: having the choice to study now topics of particular interest to individual students, or receiving adequate preparation to practice a profession that so many young teachers leave within the first five years? Too often they leave because they do not understand and therefore cannot cope with the systemic pressures they face when teaching their diverse student populations within the constraints of contemporary educational reform and politics.

The move to eliminate foundations indicates that many in the university do not understand the value of foundations courses in education and the important contributions that the foundations faculty at the university make. Thanks are due to those faculty members. I urge you all to consider other alternatives to eliminating the foundations requirement, and save this precious component of the teacher education curricula. We should resist all efforts to undermine the quality of our teacher education program, which prepares some of the best teachers in the country.

B. Hatt showed a YouTube Video (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=e0k7mzD0JvY&feature=youtu.be>) that is not available to the public. The video was approximately two minutes of the CTE meeting last spring where students in EAF classes came to speak in support of the EAF courses.

B. Hatt stated that this is an issue of ethics and that the subject matter was very personal to her. B. Hatt shared stories of her own children, who are bi-racial, being discriminated against in schools: the university lab schools.

A. Mustian spoke from what she hoped was a unified standpoint. SED says that the faculty are uncomfortable that the needed SED course comes at the expense of foundations courses. She feels pitted against EAF and that it is a troubling situation because she sees the value of the foundations classes. This should not be a conversation about which discipline is more important.

V. Evans-Winters spoke from an emotional stance. She stated that she is grateful for historical figures who fought for the rights and freedoms that allow her to stand where she is today because without them slavery would still be a reality. She stressed that students of color are most overrepresented in SED and least represented in gifted programs. Students of color are more likely to be expelled, more likely to be harmed by the police, and that females of color with disabilities are more likely to be expelled from school at higher rates than any other demographic. She specifically asked that the proposal for program revision from English Education be rejected.

K. Coates acknowledges that there were disagreements within the English department. She stated that English Ed did consider other alternatives such as eliminating an English content course, but rejected because it would be removing content required for the teacher candidates to be successful within their field. It was also discussed to eliminate TCH 219; however, it was determined that the content of TCH 219 is aligned with English teacher needs in relation to technology and literacy. The decision was made after much debate. They also talked to students in the English Ed program. Most students agreed with the decision and those who did not, understood the reasons.

M. Nur-Awaleh stated that we must think about how we teach students on a global scale, not just in Illinois. He told a story about Somali immigrants who had entered the school systems where the teachers were not prepared to teach them. He stated that most of his students were white females. He also stated that all intersections are viable and we must look beyond Illinois. He asked us to think carefully about how this decision will impact future students on a global scale. He then read a letter from a student. He gave several more examples and asked CTE to think about this decision.

The discussion was tabled due to time. The CTE will return to this topic at its next meeting.

VII. Announcements and Last Comments

A. Vice-Chair: None

B. Members: None

VIII. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn: J. Rosenthal

Second: S. Jones-Bock

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

**Illinois State University
Council for Teacher Education
Tuesday, October 2, 2018, 3:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.
DeGarmo Hall, Room 551**

Minutes

Members Present: J. Anderlik, S. Arnett-Hartwick, A. Bates, C. Blum, S. Boesdorfer, M. Brixius, T. Davis, M. Ely, S. French, D. Garrahy, V. Graziano, P. Hash, S. Jones-Bock, K. Laudner, C. Lawton, E. Mikulec, A. Mustian, M. Noraian, S. Osorio, S. Otto, S. Parry, L. Sutton, D. Wilde, S. Williams, M. Winsor

Absent: C. Borders, K. Mountjoy, J. Regnier, J. Rosenthal, A. Victor

Guests: H. Goldsmith, T. Hinkel, B. Jacobsen, L. Lienhart, M. Morris-Davis, H. Olsen, E. Palmer, M. Parker, H. Verticchio, B. Vietti

Call to Order by Chair:

K. Laudner called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Roll Call: Conducted by T. Davis

I. Approval of Minutes from October 2, 2018: Motion to approve the minutes from October 2, 2018:

Motion to approve: S. Otto

Second: P. Hash

Minutes approved with one abstention.

II. Subcommittee Reports

A. Curriculum Committee: S. Parry reported the committee looked at 10 curriculum proposals. They have decided to table discussion of any program revisions that include SED 344 until it is approved and sent on to the CTE. So at this point they are tabling the program revision proposals for English Education, Physical Education Teacher Education, Family and Consumer Sciences Teacher Education, and Biological Sciences Teacher Education.

The committee also talked about the revisions in the sequences in Special Education, which needs to be sent back so that CSD 212 can become an associated course. CSD 212 is currently at the UCC.

There was a revision of Middle Level Education to add Economics 101 and 102 as choices within the Economics category. That needs some clarification.

Special Education proposed to add two sequences to their master's program and they need the financial implication form for that.

The details will be in the minutes. After this meeting we will be in touch with the various departments about specifics connected with program revisions. They did not approve any proposals to either be voted on or presented as information items.

B. Student Interests Committee: S. Otto reported the committee met and are continuing the discussions and setting an agenda for the year on items to work on.

C. University Liaison and Faculty Interests Committee: C. Blum is the new chair for the committee. L. Sutton reported that they are planning for the spring colloquium and took recommendations from CTE to bring in scholars. They also talked about ways to bring school leadership into CTE. Some principals are more in line with edTPA and appears to be a disconnection between the preparation and partnerships.

D. Garrahy mentioned that S. Boesdorfer went to the meeting and it was not in its assigned room (DEG 218) and shared with S. Boesdorfer that the committee had not yet met as a Chair had not yet been identified. Please make sure S. Conner knows if the room is changed for that day's meeting.

D. Vision Committee: D. Garrahy reported the committee met and is working on edTPA plagiarism revisions on protocol that were made from general counsel and returned.

E. UTEAC: S. Williams reported the committee met and is working on the AAR report to present the data from teacher education programs to CTE.

III. Information Items

A. Communications Concerns Gateway

D. Garrahy indicated the current policy is the form is completed if a faculty/staff member completes one due to a concern.

- H. Verticchio, Director of the Speech and Hearing Clinic, reached out to D. Garrahy and T. Hinkel regarding the Communications Concerns Assessment.
 - Currently completed when a candidate has a communications concern
 - Graduate students in Speech Pathology and Audiology must have clinical hours in the area of screening for speech and hearing
 - The Center provides screening during specified times in the Fall and Spring for their own student and anyone we can get to come in for them
- Per H. Verticchio's email: "We screen for concerns for fluency, articulation of speech sounds, voice/resonance issues, and hearing. It takes about 10-15 minutes to conduct our screening."
- Director Verticchio writes "I'm writing today to see if there would be any interest in brainstorming the possibility of having education students completed a speech and hearing screening through our department. I know there would be logistical issues to consider but I thought there might be a win-win solution. If you think this is something worth considering, I'd love to set up a time to meet to see if we can come up with some options."

M. Noraian asked if they had the manpower to handle over 3500 teacher education students.

S. Parry stated historically it was a requirement.

H. Verticchio responded stated that they would be willing to meet the need if it was desired.

D. Garrahy asked, "What would be the catalyst to switch this gateway as complete?" She indicated her staff would need to manually enter completion of the Communication Assessment into the gateway system and documentation would be required. D. Garrahy also asked what would happen if a teacher candidate receives a concern from the Speech and Hearing Clinic?

L. Sutton asked if it hasn't been done for 20 years, why would we do it now.

D. Garrahy responded that in the 5 years she has been Director she recalls one communications concern being

submitted by a department.

L. Sutton asked about the procedure if a concern is filed. We also have for filing a concern.

S. Jones-Bock and A. Mustian: In SED, they have a process for students who are hard of hearing or have trouble speaking.

T. Hinkel: This assessment goes through speech in Fell Hall.

S. Otto: We need to think about this carefully. Maybe students could volunteer. We need to consider the equity issues raised in requiring all teacher education students to complete the screening (as a gateway requirement). How would we ensure the equity issues raised by such an instrument and requirement were addressed?

H. Vertichhio: Her students need clinical hours. It would be beneficial for her students who need the hours.

S. Parry: Could we advertise that this service is available. Maybe H. Vertichhio can provide a flyer to advertise the service.

D. Garrahy: Indicated she would send the flyer to all faculty.

A. Mustian: The form on the website has issues. When was the form last revisited/reviewed? The creator of the form is no longer in existence. She echoes what S. Otto mentioned about the items on the form possibly having some cultural equity issues and would recommend revisiting/reviewing it if it is going to be used more frequently.

Motion:

S. Otto moved to remove the form until it can be investigated more.

Second: D. Garrahy

Motion to remove the form was approved unanimously with one abstention.

Motion:

L. Sutton moved to move the information item to an action item.

Second: S. French

Motion to move the information item to an action item passed unanimously with one abstention.

T. Hinkel stated that he cannot facilitate removing it from milestones very easily. He will remove it after CTE makes a recommendation to eliminate it from the Gateways.

B. TAP Test

K. Laudner stated the new rule from ISBE is that the TAP test cannot be required until the semester prior to student teaching.

S. Parry indicated that CAS faculty prefers day one of the semester.

S. Osorio stated that TCH prefers December 15th since it aligns with the content exam deadline.

D. Garrahy stated a concern is that this would require a student to be pulled from a student teaching placement days before the student teaching experience begins.

S. Jones-Bock: SED had questions and concerns:

- What will the university and/or TEC provide in the way of targeted supports to assist students in meeting the teacher licensure requirements (need to focus on retention with more students admitted below the requirement as the law now stipulates it cannot be used as an internal admissions requirements)?

- Suggestion: make it a GW1 requirement that students attend a mandatory test prep workshop series for ACT/SAT or TAP (offered through Visor Center or TEC?). Requirement could be waived to students who already meet the Basic Skills Requirement.
- If we make the cut off for the ACT/SAT/TAP requirement the first week of the semester prior to student teaching, what is the consequence to the student?
 - Do they then not get to register for student teaching?
 - What happens if they meet the requirement after the cut off but prior to the current student teaching registration deadlines?
 - Currently, GW2 must be met in order to register for student teaching and students can register up until December 15th or July 15th. Perhaps, the GW2 deadline should be moved up so that it is not tied to the last opportunity to register, but instead is tied to the opening of advance registrations (typically Oct. 15th and March 15th).
 - Keeping the current GW2 deadline could potentially harm relationships with school partners if student teacher candidates are pulled as late as Dec. 15th and July 15th due to not meeting the requirement.

D. Garrahy stated that many students do not struggle with content exams, but the current TAP equals an approximate score of a 26 on the ACT. Many students do struggle with passing the TAP and ACT scores take weeks to be published.

S. Jones-Bock stated that we need to be proactive in offering supports to help students meet the requirement since 40% of students are entering without the required score.

M. Noraian indicated that we need an option to help support students pass the ACT.

S. Otto added that maybe there can be community partnerships.

S. Williams asked how much of a bump can be gained with the supports.

S. Otto thinks the difficulty of passing means that we need an early deadline.

D. Garrahy stated we need to be aware of how this will impact our school partners and our students who struggle to pass meeting all other requirements, but cannot student teach due to this test.

S. Jones-Bock added we don't know these numbers but they will grow due to the late deadline.

P. Hash asked if we can require them to take the test earlier.

The response was that programs can encourage an earlier completion. Programs can state that it is an expectation to pass.

S. Boesdorfer is worried that this and the content exam being at the same time may cause more anxiety.

C. Blum added that there are some ACT prep programs that are less expensive.

T. Hinkel indicated that under test resources on our website they have a \$39.99 option. ISBE has changed the ACT three times and may eventually get rid of it.

L. Sutton asked what the purpose of the test is. What are the other ways to meet the purpose? Can some Gen Ed courses be used as a substitute? Standardized tests failure rate are primarily in known.

D. Garrahy stated the tests are expensive and our candidates take multiple exams.

S. Parry added timing also impacts scores.

A. Bates stated that accommodations may also help.

A. Mustian asked if the law is during the last semester then why do we need to set a date.

S. French stated that the library has practice test and study guides available online. The ACT and SAT are under College Admissions and Placement, and the Illinois Licensure exams are under Teaching. The library's database is called the Mometrix E-Library, and students can search for it under the Databases tab in the main search box on the Milner home page. They can also use this link: https://portal.mometrixlibrary.com/?_acct=835, but may need to be logged in to their university accounts to access it. The spaces are just underlines.

E. Mikulec asked how many students would be impacted and are there situations where students are pulled from a placement?

M. Noraian responded that students do get pulled and have to be advised.

T. Hinkel added that 15-25 students are impacted by content exam. With the new content exams the pass rate is averaging 60%. He can't come up with good data due to super scoring.

S. Otto asked if this is even a questions since it is the law.

D. Garrahy stated that we need the CTE to vote.

Motion:

S. Otto moved to move this to an action item.

Second: M. Noraian

Motion passed to move this to an action item unanimously with one abstention.

Motion:

M. Noraian moved to make ACT/TAP a Gateway 2 requirement.

Second: S. Otto

Motion passed to make ACT/TAP a Gateway 2 requirement unanimously with one abstention.

Motion:

S. Otto moved to make student supports a discussion item on next agenda.

Second: S. French

Motion passed to make student supports a discussion item on next agenda unanimously with one abstention.

B. ePortfolio and Assessment AdHoc Committee

K. Laudner stated the deadline has been moved but wants to continue with the AdHoc Committee. He is requesting the names of those on the committee:

- TCH - Kristina Falbe
- CAS - Sue Hildebrandt
- CAS - Linda Lienhart
- CAST - Sally Arnett-Hartwick
- CAST - Mary Henninger
- EAF - Venus Evans-Winters
- SED - TBD

IV. Action Items: None

V. Discussion Items: None

VII. Announcements and Last Comments

A. Vice-Chair: None

B. Members:

√ T. Davis informed the CTE members that Master's of Business Education has been approved.

√ A. Mustain informed the CTE members the CRCC Conference will take place October 30-31st at the Uptown Normal Marriott Conference Center. Information about the conference, including the registration link, can be found at crcc.ilstu.edu.

√ L. Sutton asked what our administrators know about student teachers acting as a substitute.
D. Garrahy stated that it is ISU's policy that student teachers cannot be a substitute teacher.

VIII. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn: L. Sutton

Second: S. French

Meeting adjourned at 4:23 p.m.

**Illinois State University
Council for Teacher Education
Tuesday, October 16, 2018, 3:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.
DeGarmo Hall, Room 551**

Minutes

Members Present: J. Anderlik, S. Arnett-Hartwick, A. Bates, C. Blum, S. Boesdorfer, C. Borders, T. Davis, M. Ely, S. French, D. Garrahy, V. Graziano, P. Hash, S. Jones-Bock, K. Laudner, E. Mikulec, K. Mountjoy, M. Noraian, S. Osorio, S. Otto, S. Parry, J. Regnier, L. Sutton,

Absent: M. Brixius, C. Lawton, A. Mustian, J. Rosenthal, A. Victor, D. Wilde, S. Williams, M. Winsor

Guests: H. Goldsmith, T. Hinkel, B. Jacobsen, M. Morris-Davis, H. Olsen, E. Palmer, M. Parker, W. Smith,

Call to Order by Chair:

K. Laudner called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Roll Call: Conducted by T. Davis

I. Approval of Minutes from October 2, 2018:

Motion to approve: S. Otto

Second: S. French

Minutes approved with no abstentions.

II. Sub-committee Reports

A. Curriculum Committee: No report.

B. Student Interests Committee: No report.

C. University Liaison and Faculty Interests Committee: C. Blum reported that the committee met and V. Graziano is the secretary. The by-laws are with the Senate. Questions were asked and the committee responded. C. Blum stated that he will recuse himself from all votes because he is on the Rules Committee; however, it will be a cleaner process if he does not vote. He will act as a facilitator for the group.

L. Laudner appreciates and thinks it will be good for C. Blum to act as facilitator

D. Vision Committee: D. Garrahy reported that the committee met. CTE members received a plagiarism protocol last week. Pearson now notifies the institution the specific task and part where the plagiarism happened. The new policy has been reviewed by the General Counsel.

S. Otto asked about this being a one-strike and you are out policy. Dispositions Concerns is a three-strike policy. D. Garrahy responded that if Pearson voids the scores then the university cannot make the scores be accepted. The department is asked if the student needs to repeat student teaching. If the scores are voided, then something must happen. S. Otto asked if the policy needs to be specified that the decision is at the program level. D. Garrahy stated that there are two options. The student can repeat student teaching or the student can walk away. Documentation must be created stating the

outcome. S. Otto's concern is that the language appears to be if the student has voided scores, then they are out of the program. D. Garrahy asked for clarification about where the concerning language is located. S. Otto will send it to D. Garrahy. S. Osorio believes that Section 3 may be where S. Otto has the concern.

This discussion will return to the Vision Committee.

E. UTEAC: C. Borders reported that the committee met and worked on the formative pedagogy assessment and that work will continue at the next meeting.

III. Information Items: K. Laudner stated that information should be coming from the CTE members. Send the items to any member of the Executive Committee.

National Criminal Background Check: The Vision Committee is resuming the work on transitioning to a National Criminal Background Check. The current check is an annual Illinois State Police fingerprint check. The problem is that it is only checking on criminal activity in Illinois. The current process is that the student must complete a new background check before the current background check expires. If it is not renewed, then an email is sent to the student and faculty members. The student goes to a vendor for the background check and a fax is sent to the Lauby Center. A clean check means that the student just needs to bring the background check to the Lauby Center. If there is a hit on the background check, then the student must meet with D. Garrahy. If there is a felony conviction, then it is a big deal. If the school district does a broader check and finds a felony conviction that is from outside of Illinois, this is a problem. The National Background check would be a one and done process and is proposed to be completed prior to the first enrollment in a clinical placement. The National Background check is a broader net that will find most problems. All schools are required to have their own background check that is broader than the ISP background check.

The templates are drafted and the processes have been proposed within the Vision Committee. It has been proposed that a Criminal Background Check Committee would provide due process for those students who are found to have a felony. It was also proposed that a pre-requisite be placed on all clinical courses to have the background check complete.

This process will be better for teacher education and ISU. School districts will also require a background check.

J. Regnier asked if there was a cost yet. The estimate from two years ago was \$40. This amount may have changed.

W. Smith, General Counsel stated that post-secondary schools are not allowed to conduct a federal fingerprint check. School districts are required to have a federal check. After the National Background Check has been completed, students would be required to report if they receive a conviction. If they fail to report a conviction, then action can be taken against that student when a school district finds the conviction.

M. Parker asked if Campus Solutions has the ability to search for clinical courses. D. Garrahy stated yes, CS can handle that. If the catalog is accurate, then the COE can add the pre-req to courses. Program revisions are not needed to add this pre-req.

Get Deb's notes to be complete.

Tap Test Discussion: S. French presented about test preparation. A handout was presented about Mometrix elibrary. From the Milner homepage, click on the Databases tab. Type Mometrix and search. Click on the Mometrix elibrary link. A database of study guides and practices will be opened. The College Admissions and Placement Category has practice tests and study guides for many of the placement tests, such as the ACT and SAT exams.

Under the Teaching category, students can search for ILTS practice exams for content exams. The database is current.

Contact S. French with questions.

S. Otto asked if the database was available off-campus. Yes, but you will have to log into the system.

IV. Action Items: None

V. Discussion Items:

VI. Announcements and Last Comments:

a. Vice Chair: None

b. Members:

√ D. Garrahy reported that October 30 is the 5th Tuesday. No CTE activities.

√ T. Hinkle reported that the Gateways are updated and have about 98% accuracy currently.

√ C. Borders reported that tomorrow morning at 9:00 a.m., ISBE is having a board meeting. There are three recommendations to the General Assembly. ISU has submitted paperwork to President Dietz and all of the appropriate deans. Some of the recommendations are of concern to ISU. ISBE is recommending that agencies outside of higher education could recommend licensure, competency-based licensure, drop the TAP test as of June 30, 2019 and replaced with a portfolio assessment. Anyone applying for a license who has a bachelor's degree would not need a TAP. All recommendations coming from ISBE are linked to the Teach Illinois Report. Higher Education, in general, is concerned about many of the recommendations. Board packet materials are available on the ISBE report. See page 60+ for the concerning items. Several visits to Springfield are being planned. There is a great deal of opposition to many of these recommendations.

VII. Adjournment:

Motion: L. Sutton

Second: P. Hash

Meeting adjourned at 3:49 p.m.

**Illinois State University
Council for Teacher Education
Tuesday, November 6, 2018, 3:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.
DeGarmo Hall, Room 551**

Minutes

Members Present: J. Anderlik, S. Arnett-Hartwick, A. Bates, C. Blum, S. Boesdorfer, C. Borders, M. Brixius, T. Davis, M. Ely, S. French, D. Garrahy, V. Graziano, P. Hash, S. Jones-Bock, K. Laudner, C. Lawton, E. Mikulec, K. Mountjoy, A. Mustian, M. Noraian, S. Osorio, S. Otto, S. Parry, J. Regnier, A. Victor, S. Williams, M. Winsor

Absent: R. Quinlan, J. Rosenthal, L. Sutton, D. Wilde

Guests: W. Smith

Call to Order by Chair:

K. Laudner called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

I. Discussion Items:

A. National Criminal Background Check: D. Garrahy stated that the CTE Executive Board met on 10/23/18 and approved beginning the procurement process for NCBC vendors. It was discussed at the Executive Board meeting on 10/23/18, that if the CTE did not approve moving forward with the procurement process on 11/6/18, the work would immediately stop. However, in order for the NCBC to be launched in fall 2019, there are 24 steps for the procurement process, with 12 steps having to be completed by 1/7/19. Dean Laudner asked members of the Executive Board to be on the Ad Hoc committee, along with members from Information Security Office, General Counsel, ADA, Information Technology, and 3 staff members from TEC. The members from the Executive Board and TEC consist of:

- D. Garrahy (Chair)
- T. Davis
- S. Williams
- S. Parry
- J. Rosenthal
- T. Hinkel
- S. Conner
- J. Hobbs

W. Smith, General Counsel, stated that discussion can be today and vote at the next CTE meeting, which is December 4th. The NCBC process must be completed by April 1, 2019. If CTE votes to move forward with the procurement process, the Ad Hoc committee would need to continue to complete a series of tasks outlined by the university's procurement specialist.

K. Laudner stated that the timeline made it difficult. They had to act fast. The process can be stopped if

CTE votes it down.

S. Arnett-Hartwick asked if this is for fall 2019.

D. Garrahy responded that it is for fall 2019 but it will not be a pre-requisite until spring 2020.

W. Smith added that everyone who needs a background check in August 2019 would obtain the NCBC.

Students enrolling for fall 2019 and never had a CBC would be in the first wave of NCBC. The NCBC will be a one-time CBC requirement for Illinois State University. Candidates will still be required to meet the CBC requirements of each district in which they complete Pre-STT Clinical placements and Student Teaching. A letter would be drafted to go out to all students explaining the NCBC procedure. D. Garrahy added she believes this would be a relief to students to only pay one fee for a background check versus an annual CBC for Illinois State University.

W. Smith indicated that there appears to be two decisions to be made:

1. Procurement process to continue; and
2. NCBC decision

P. Hash asked if we needed to vote.

M. Winsor stated why would we not proceed with the procurement process?

M. Noraian asked would it cost more?

W. Smith responded that she could not guarantee the cost would be less but she has never seen it to be more expensive.

W. Smith explained the concession process. It is still a bid process. An RFP has 3-4 more steps. The procurement specialist is guiding the process.

C. Borders indicated it just seems different than the LiveText procurement process.

S. Parry motioned to move the procurement process from a discussion item to an action item.

Second: S. French/C. Blum

Motion to move the procurement process from a discussion item to an action item approved with no abstentions.

S. Williams moved to approve to move forward with the NCBC Ad Hoc committee and the procurement concession process.

Second: S. Parry

Motion to move forward with the NCBC Ad Hoc committee and the procurement concession process approved unanimously with no abstentions.

S. Otto moved from discussion item to action item to vote on NCBC.

Second: A. Mustian

Motion to move from discussion item to action item to vote on NCBC approved unanimously with no abstentions.

S. Otto moved to approve the NCBC for teacher education candidates.

Second: S. French

Motion to approve the NCBC for teacher education candidates was approved unanimously with no abstentions.

Roll Call: Conducted by T. Davis

II. Sub-committee Reports

A. Curriculum Committee: S. Parry reported the committee met.

The committee approved the following:

New graduate sequence in Special Education. This is actually the current masters' program. They plan to offer an additional sequence. Because the sequence already exists as a graduate program, per Bruce Stoffel, a Financial Implication Form is not required. We move to approve it.

Revision of THE 281 Arts for Elementary Education

Proposed to combine THE 281 and THE 282; call new course: THE 281 Arts for Elementary and Early Childhood Education; THE 282 will be deleted at a later date.

Revision of DAN 283 Arts for Elementary Schools

Within the description, THE 283 and THE 229 should read as DAN 283 and DAN 229 in four places. Consult with Jeri Ryburn for editorial fix after approval.

Course Revision of THE 385 Principles of Theatre Education

Proposed to add TCH 240, Principles of Stage Direction, as a Prereq.

Revision of Middle Level Education

Add ECO 101 and 102 to be reflective of current ECO offerings, and changed Middle Level Social Science Endorsement to (24-25 hours) to account for ECO 105 (4 credits).

Revision of Masters in Special Education to create a sequence, which is basically the current master's program.

Revision of Major in Special Education in the following sequences

Revision of Special Education Specialist in Deaf and Hard of Hearing Sequence

Revision of Specialist in Learning and Behavior Sequence

Review of Specialist in Low Vision and Blindness Sequence

Added CSD 212 as an associated course with memo of concurrence from CSD Chair
Revision of sequence proposals need to fix catalog copy to include only its sequence information.

The committee is sending back:

Revision of THE 185 and THE 285

Proposed to reduce 2-year long course into a single semester; this will add 1 credit hour to each class. Concerns: Clarify how much time meeting with the students. Need a financial implications form because adding hours to the major.

The committee is holding on to:

Revision of Major in Technology & Engineering Education and the Major in School Health Education. Both propose to drop EAF 228, 231 or 235 and add SED 344, and are being held pending until approval of SED 344.

C. Blum asked procedural question: If the CTE curriculum committee see the changes as minor or non-controversial, they offer it as an information item.

S. Parry responded that if anyone decides a curriculum proposal is controversial he or she can ask for a vote.

S. Otto asked for clarification of the difference between a sequence and degree.

M. Ely explained that the SED Master's program could add additional sequences in the future.

M. Noraian asked what the state is of SED 344.

K. Laudner responded that SED 344 is at the college curriculum level and waiting on letter from EAF.

- B. Student Interests Committee:** S. Otto reported the committee met and referenced the email from the Executive Board about LiveText and the change in the professional education sequence. There was a great deal of discussion and concern/confusion from students if they would need to buy LiveText as it is a gateway requirement. S. Otto took it to the Executive Board and the email that was sent should have taken care of the concerns.

Social media presence is requested. They are working on a proposal to collaborate with other social media outlets to share what CTE is and what they do.

The committee is looking at potential stickers for laptops, water bottles, etc. with CTE logo.

- C. University Liaison and Faculty Interests Committee:** C. Blum reported that the committee did not meet but the Rules committee met and he skyped in from Florida to talk about CTE. The college bylaws go to the Rules committee. S. Otto will go over and meet with the Rules committee to answer questions on behalf of CTE. Bylaws are moving forward. D. Garrahy, K. Laudner and C. Borders will meet with the full Senate about the annual report.
- D. Vision Committee:** D. Garrahy reported that the committee met to go over Dr. Otto's request for B2 unresolvable disposition regarding the edTPA Plagiarism Protocol. The word "may" was added to the sentence, as recommended by the Vision committee on October 23, 2018.

S. Otto moved approval of newly revised edTPA plagiarism protocol to an action item.

Second: C. Blum

Motion to move approval of newly revised plagiarism protocol approved unanimously with no abstentions.

S. Otto moved to approve amended edTPA plagiarism protocol.

Second: D. Garrahy

Motion to approve amended edTPA plagiarism protocol approved unanimously with no abstentions.

E. UTEAC: No report

III. Information Items

A. CTE Bylaw – Chair Selection: K. Laudner reviewed the CTE chair selection. The chair person is selected by the Provost and Deans. Over the summer, the Provost and Deans need to nominate the chair of CTE. The deans vote and send to the Provost and Senate. Usually the Chair is the Dean of COE. The Executive Board of the Senate is asking if we want to continue this process or change it.

There is a timeline when we select a chair.

C. Blum stated that we could do it a year before all elections are decided.

S. Otto indicated it does not have to be a dean.

A. Mustian asked what the term was.

K. Laudner responded one year.

E. Mikulec asked if there was a reason to change the process.

It will not change this year. CTE will have to think about it and have it come back as a discussion item.

B. CAEP: Advanced Programs Update/Call for Third Party Comments: D. Garrahy distributed a hand-out on advanced programs and CAEP accreditation. D. Garrahy shared documentation dated 11/15/17 from CAEP stating Advanced Programs would not need to be included in the 2019 Accreditation cycle. If ISU's Initial Programs were to receive accreditation in 2019, the Advanced Programs would also receive accreditation designation due to the Initial Program decision. However, ISU was informed by other institutions this was no longer the case. ISU contacted CAEP and received verification on 11/1/18 confirming ISU Advanced Programs will need to submit a modified Self Study Report (SSR) in January 2022 to maintain their current accreditation status. This would include a "Virtual site" visit by CAEP for the Advanced Programs.

D. Garrahy discussed the "Call for Third Party Comments" required by CAEP as part of the accreditation process. She stated notification were sent to CTE on 10/17/18, IMPACT (ISU Teacher Education Faculty and School Partners), and Program Coordinators on 10/18/18. Information included the link to the CAEP Call for Third Party Comments located on two prominent Web landing pages: College of Education and the Lauby Teacher Education Center web sites. Third Party Comments close in either February or March.

IV. Action Items: None

V. Discussion Items: None

VI. Announcements and Last Comments:

a. Vice Chair: None

b. Members:

C. Borders shared ISBE legislative update. ISBE recommendations were passed by the board on 10/17/18. These recommendations included 3 legislative recommendations and 13 for immediate action by ISBE. A joint letter with strong opposition is being drafted from public and private deans from every institution, the Illinois Board of Higher Education, the Council for Community Colleges, and University Presidents. The primary opposition is to the recommendations allowing other entities outside of higher education to license teachers. Dean Laudner, J. Lackland, C. Borders, and J. Rosenthal will be making several legislative visits over

the next few weeks to meet with members of several education committees, the higher education working group, the appropriations committee, and local legislators.

c. Chair:

K. Laudner informed the committee that the sub-committees will meet on 11/13 and that CTE will not meet on 11/20/18 and the last CTE meeting will be 12/4/18.

VII. Adjournment:

Motion: S. Parry

Second: C. Blum

Meeting adjourned at 4:07 p.m.

**Illinois State University
Council for Teacher Education
Tuesday, December 4, 2018, 3:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.
DeGarmo Hall, Room 551**

Minutes

Members Present: J. Anderlik, A. Bates, C. Blum, S. Boesdorfer, C. Borders, T. Davis, M. Ely, S. French, D. Garrahy, V. Graziano, P. Hash, , K. Laudner, C. Lawton, E. Mikulec, K. Mountjoy, A. Mustian, M. Noraian, S. Osorio, S. Otto, S. Parry, J. Rosenthal, L. Sutton, A. Victor, D. Wilde, S. Williams, M. Winsor

Absent: S. Arnett-Hartwick, M. Brixius, S. Jones-Bock, , J. Regnier,

Guests: B. Jacobsen, T. Hinkel, A. Hurd, H. Olsen, C. Rutherford

Call to Order by Chair:

K. Laudner called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m. and indicated there were snacks and drinks and to please help yourself.

Roll Call: Conducted by T. Davis

I. Approval of Minutes from November 6, 2018: Motion to approve the minutes from November 6, 2018:

Motion to approve: J. Rosenthal

Second: S. Parry

Minutes approved with no abstentions.

II. Sub-committee Reports

A. Curriculum Committee: S. Parry reported the committee met and several proposals. The minor ones do not need a vote. If any members want to vote, we certainly can vote on the proposals.

Committee will wait to review the following Program revisions until SED 344 has been approved:

- a. Theatre Teacher Ed.
- b. Physics Teacher Ed.
- c. Music Teacher Ed.
- d. Earth and Space Science Teacher Ed.
- e. Geography Teacher Ed.

The Committee approved the following curricular proposals:

- 1. German Teacher Ed.:

Replace TCH 219 with LAN 321

2. French teacher Ed.:
Replace TCH 219 with LAN 321
3. Spanish Teacher Ed.:
Replace TCH 219 with LAN 321
4. LAN 320:
Level of OPI needed is Intermediate high or above
TCH 216 can be taken concurrently with this
5. LAN 319
TCH 216 can be taken concurrently with this
6. TCH 257
Science methods course, add prereq of TCH 247
7. TCH 427
a. New course: Biliteracy Development in K-12 classrooms
8. TCH 419
New course: The Study of Bilingual/Bicultural Education
9. Theatre Teacher Ed. Program revision
a. Remove THE 101 and TCH 212, this fixed the hours problem posed by the change in hours of THE 185 and 285 and removing TCH 212
b. Reduces time to gradation hours
10. Special Education program revision
a. Replace TCH course with SED 342
b. Reduces the number of hours
11. Special Ed 344
New course: Teaching Secondary Content to Students with Disabilities

A. Mustian asked since SED 344 has been approved, will the committee go back and approve the five proposals that were tabled.

S. Parry responded that there are now 8-10 that were tabled and that they will be discussed by the committee at their next meeting, now that SED 344 has been approved.

The committee rejected:

TCH 267 because catalog description is more than twenty words

B. Student Interests Committee: S. Otto reported the committee met and they have been working on themes for the Student Excellence Award. The award is \$3000 and will be given to three students. The theme is: Lesson Plans – using technology and related to sustainability. They will be sending out an email to programs to ask for nominations. They will be due March 18th. They will be asking any CTE members if they would like to assist in the reviewing process.

An email was sent to the CTE members asking them to add the approved CTE logo on their signature line. The committee would like to remind the members to add it and if anyone needs the logo again, to contact S. Otto or S. Conner.

C. University Liaison and Faculty Interests Committee: C. Blum reported that the committee met and the Bylaws will be reviewed again in January. There have been requests by the Academic Senate:

1. Wording about Administrative Professional be changed to Coordinators or Directors. Their concern of Administrative Professional taking place of faculty.
2. C. Blum role: went back to 1965 and reviewed how CTE body was created initially. It was set up similar to other curriculum committees. The rules committee intended a CTE representative, faculty liaison to be ex-officio to Academic Affairs.
3. Nature of how to remove a CTE member. Looked at creating a rule that is a CTE member is absent more than four times per academic semester, the position would be considered vacated. The person could be reappointed back onto CTE.

D. Garrahy asked if this would be applicable to sub-committees.

C. Blum responded that it would be applicable to the CTE members on the sub-committees. Ex-officio would not apply and would be up to the Chair of CTE how they wanted to administer it.

D. Garrahy stated she thinks these are very reasonable requests.

The committee also discussed the Spring Colloquium. They are asking for suggestions for a speaker and to email C. Blum. C. Blum will send out an email reminder to the committee.

D. Vision Committee: D. Garrahy reported that the committee did not meet. D. Garrahy updated CTE about the National Criminal Background Adhoc Committee. Work continues to move forward with the procurement process. The RFP is nearly complete and will be sent out from the Procurement Office. D. Garrahy thanked S. Parry, S. Williams, and T. Davis who will continue to work on the project and review through the winter break.

E. UTEAC: No report

III. Information Items

A. Annual Assessment Review: C. Borders and S. Williams did a presentation on AAR for 2017-2018. They thanked the programs who met the deadline. Aar Process is 4-5-4 Plan for Annual Assessments. There are 4 key assessments and 5 areas. The committee asked each 28 programs the status on each, rationale, goals and action plan and resources and submitted to UTEAC. They asked for feedback from the programs. Changes for 2018-2019: Solicit feedback, revised submission form, removed NTASC, no goals if maintenance of performance, storage of data and submission (last year submission was through formstack and was a cumbersome process). They will be using new SharePoint, parts of teams to store longitudinal data. They will be asking CTE for additional reviewers. Training will be provided. There are 12 committee members for 28 reports. D. Garrahy volunteered to be a reviewer.

IV. Discussion Items

A. Chair of CTE Selection Process: K. Laudner indicated the current process for selection of the CTE Chair at the last meeting as an Information Item. Current chair selection is nominated by the Dean's then approved by the Deans, Provost, and finally Senate. The Chair can be faculty or AP. Usually it is the Dean of COE, but it does not have to be.

M. Noraian stated the current process seems to be working and if others are interested in serving as chair they could contact their dean for a possible nomination.

C. Blum suggested adding "and confirmed by CTE".

A discussion of timing by Academic Senate took place. C. Borders feels like CTE should confirm the CTE chair.

V. Graziano asked what happens if CTE or Senate does not confirm the chair.

K. Laudner asked if we should vote at our last spring meeting. Also, stated that we could conduct this process in mid-spring then the deans, provost, and senate could all approve by end of spring semester. This would allow for an "official" chair to be in place for first meeting in fall, which currently has not been happening since Senate does not see chair nomination until fall.

J. Rosenthal asked if UCC Chair confirmed?

D. Garrahy stated if CTE and other committees are following the same format, great. If not, then we need more discussion.

K. Laudner asked if we want to change or keep the selection process the same? Is there a motion?

J. Rosenthal indicating there is a timing issue. Spring vote is old CTE members voting for a chair for the new members.

A. Mustian asked if other committees also have a 1-year Chair? Formalization may be needed. The more steps, the longer it takes to approve.

Motion to move Chair of CTE Selection Process from Discussion Item to Action Item: C. Borders

Second: S. French

Motion to move Chair of CTE Selection Process from Discussion Item to Action Item passed with no abstentions.

V. Action Items: CTE Selection Process

Motion to move that CTE approves the Provost's appointment of Chair then to Academic Senate: C. Borders

Second: P. Hash

Motion to move that CTE approves the Provost's appointment of Chair then to Academic Senate approved with no abstentions.

VI. Announcements and Last Comments:

a. Vice Chair: None

b. Members:

D. Garrahy indicated she informed the Dean at the beginning of the semester that 2019 would be her last year in the TEC. D. Garrahy's last day will be August 15th.

K. Laudner thanked D. Garrahy for her service. A search will begin in the spring and the replacement will start August 1, 2019.

M. Noraian indicated the Secondary Education meeting will be 12/4/18.

c. Chair:

K. Laudner indicated that a formal search for the Coordinator of Teacher Education Assessment (E. Palmer's position) will also take place and the replacement will start June 1, 2019.

K. Appel has been named as Director of Enrollment & Transition Services.

A. Hurd will be the Associate Vice President of Undergraduate Education beginning January 1, 2019. J. Rosenthal is retiring December 31, 2019. There is cake and snacks to celebrate.

VII. Adjournment:

Motion: D. Garrahy

Second: C. Blum

Meeting adjourned at 4:04 p.m.

**Illinois State University
Council for Teacher Education
Tuesday, February 5, 2019, 3:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.
DeGarmo Hall, Room 551**

Minutes

Members Present: J. Anderlik, S. Arnett-Hartwick, C. Blum, S. Boesdorfer, C. Borders, M. Brixius, J. Chrismon, T. Davis, M. Ely, S. French, D. Garrahy, V. Graziano, P. Hash, A. Hurd, K. Laudner, C. Lawton, E. Mikulec, K. Mountjoy, A. Mustian, M. Noraian, S. Osorio, S. Otto, S. Parry, J. Regnier, A. Victor, S. Williams, M. Winsor

Absent: A. Bates, S. Jones-Bock, L. Sutton

Guests: B. Jacobsen, T. Hinkel, H. Olsen

Call to Order by Chair:

K. Laudner called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and welcomed new members, J. Chrismon and A. Hurd.

Roll Call: Conducted by T. Davis

I. Approval of Minutes from December 4, 2018: Motion to approve the minutes from December 4, 2018:

Motion to approve: S. Parry

Second: S. Boesdorfer

Minutes approved with no abstentions.

II. Sub-committee Reports

A. Curriculum Committee: S. Parry reported the committee met and there were 16 curricular proposals. There are four curricular proposals that were approved by the CTE Curriculum Committee on January 22, 2019 and are informational only:

1. **New Course: TCH 424** Methods and Materials for Bilingual and English Learners. This course focuses on the methods and materials used to meet the needs of individual English learners.

This course will prepare current teachers to meet the needs of English learners by focusing on materials and methods that are most effective. This course is required for the bilingual and ESL teacher endorsement by ISBE. It will replace the graduate version of the current co-listed TCH 321.

2. **New course: TCH 420:** The Assessment of Bilingual Learners and Bilingual Program Design: This course focuses on the assessment of bilingual learners and the design of bilingual education programs. It will replace the graduate version of the current co-listed TCH 320.

3. **Revised course: TCH 267:** Language Arts Methods in the Early Childhood Classroom: course description changed to better reflect the content of the course as well as to better reflect the criteria for acceptance by Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) evaluators.

4. **Revised course: TCH 2387:** English Language Arts Literature Methods for Middle School: course prerequisite changed from 30 to 60 hours completed before the course can be taken.

Sending back the additional 12 proposals to programs. A memo has been sent to program coordinators indicating the programs will need to identify ITPS alignment and where clinical hours are located.

S. Otto wants the Foundations coordinator to be notified.

B. Student Interests Committee: S. Otto reported the committee did not meet. However, requesting nominations for the Student of Recognition of Excellence Award.

K. Laudner asked what the process is.

S. Otto indicated there are three awards given, \$1000 each. Faculty nominates students and the winners are determined by the committee and notified in May and attend the Fall COE awards.

C. University Liaison and Faculty Interests Committee: C. Blum reported that the committee has been working on the spring colloquium to come up with ideas. The committee is suggesting that it may need to be moved to a fall colloquium and considering partnering with other groups. The committee is asking for guidance on what CTE wants.

D. Garrahy indicated that when S. Jones-Bock planned the Colloquium she partnered with other groups. There is a maximum of \$3,000. There used to be a Colloquium in spring and fall. D. Garrahy asked if a spring or fall semester colloquium might be better.

E. Mikulec stated that Fulbright Scholars may be able to provide a speaker at a reasonable price. We need to put forth a PR effort to promote the event.

C. Blum asked if this is something CTE would embrace. The committee wants to find something of interest. We need to put forth a PR effort to promote the event.

S. Otto suggested looking outside education for a speaker and perhaps looking at fall considering CAEP site visit.

M. Noraian added that maybe we shift to student exhibition. Several years ago, it was focused on student initiatives on interdisciplinary teams/lessons.

C. Blum stated the committee really needs input from CTE so it is available to students and faculty.

S. Otto suggested checking to see if COE stakeholders value this event.

E. Mikulec indicated that the International Office has speakers every Wednesday.

C. Blum indicated the committee will meet and try to focus in order to have a successful, well-attended event.

Secondly, C. Blum indicated the by-laws have passed out of the rules committee. There is a sticking point at the Executive Committee.

When they first received the by-laws, AP could replace faculty on CTE. That changed to Program Directors/Coordinators. The discussion was that CTE needed to be a faculty majority. The Rules Committee is going to offer some suggestions. The simple solution would be to limit to no AP, only faculty.

There are two options:

1. Faculty – all tenured faculty, probationary tenure-track faculty members and non-tenure-track faculty. Although not technically members of the faculty, coordinators or directors of teacher education programs shall be eligible for membership.

OR

2. Faculty – all tenured faculty, probationary tenure-track faculty members and non-tenure-track faculty. Although not technically members of the faculty, coordinators or directors of teacher education programs shall be eligible for membership only if no other tenured, probationary tenure-track faculty members or non-tenure track faculty are available to serve.

D. Garrahy: CTE reviewed and voted on the by-laws. She asked if the Senate Exec Committee could change the by-laws.

C. Blum: The Executive Committee cannot change the by-laws, but the Academic Senate can insist on by-law changes. He offered two possible versions of changes.

S. Parry: Concerned that in small programs the coordinator is the only teacher education person and is AP. It is insulting to program coordinators who run programs.

S. Otto: There has never been a discussion about membership. She thinks the question needs to be revisited. The CTE Executive Board is primarily administrators and CTE is heavy on administrators. She would like to have a discussion about the membership.

D. Garrahy: CTE members have always been reminded to share CTE information with all stakeholders they represent. If a member cannot be in attendance, the current bylaws call for a replacement.

D. Garrahy stated the format for determining the CTE Exec Board is the same as it has always been for the 12 years she has served on the committee. During the first meeting of the year, each CTE subcommittee meets in a section of the room to determine their Chair. At times, determining the Chair of the subcommittee takes time, as no one has stepped up.

K. Laudner asked about procedures.

C Blum responded by reading the second option again stating it is the most politically viable option for the by-laws.

S. Parry: Is available and willing different?

C. Blum: They could change available to willing.

C. Borders: The coordinators are also teaching in their programs and are AP line. Our secondary programs are being hurt by this language.

M. Noraian: Senate has non-faculty seats who vote.

S. Parry: There is a two-step approval process. COE Dean must approve a representative, then the Senate must approve.

C. Blum: The concern is that coordinators who are AP and administrators take the place of faculty members on CTE.

A. Mustian: Asked about the language – if faculty is limited to teacher education faculty.

M. Noraian: Program coordinators are AP because it was difficult for TT faculty to receive tenure.

K. Laudner: Why hasn't Academic Senate seen this yet?

C. Blum: The Executive Committee could stop this from going to the Senate.

Multiple members asked why the by-laws can't go before the Senate and get their perspective.

C. Blum explained the process of how it would go before the Senate. He said that as an external committee of Senate, the Senate can make this change for CTE.

D. Garrahy: S. Jones-Bock and L. Sutton are the only two people who are still on the CTE subcommittee that developed the revision to the bylaws. These bylaws, currently under review by the Academic Senate were approved by the CTE in Spring 2017 and submitted to the Academic Senate in March 2017.

C. Blum: Can CTE take a poll to see if CTE wants to move forward with by-laws as approved by CTE.

K. Laudner: Why won't the Executive Committee put the by-laws forward?

C. Blum: They want to be able to protect faculty

K. Laudner: Respects that the Executive Committee is protecting faculty but they need to put this forth to the full senate.

C. Blum: Summarized that CTE wants to move this forward.

M. Noraian: Appointed people to CTE are faculty, even if they are AP, and are not actually administrators.

A. Mustian: The majority of members of CTE are faculty who voted on the by-laws.

S. Otto: AP should be the exception and not the rule.

D. Garrahy: The practice is for faculty to be on CTE.

C. Borders asked how CTE needs to proceed during this meeting.

CTE is not interested, at this point. All of this is still in process, and the language could be amended by the Senate.

S. Parry motioned that the CTE document moves forward as is.

Second: T. Davis

Motion that the CTE document moves forward as is approved with one abstention.

D. Vision Committee: D. Garrahy reported that the committee did not meet. However, the NCBC Adhoc Procurement Committee, appointed by the Dean, and the Scoring Committee did. The Scoring Committee housed in the office of the TEC (S. Conner, J. Hobbs, T. Hinkel and D. Garrahy) has reviewed and scored the submitted proposals. A vendor has been invited to campus at the end of February. Two hours will be allowed for the interview. D. Garrahy thanked the scoring committee

E. UTEAC: C. Borders reported that they are currently in AAR review process.

III. Information Items

A. CAEP: D. Garrahy informed members that from now on, the CAEP site visit, April 6 – 9, will be at the bottom of the CTE agenda. She reminded the CTE members of the lengthy conversations that occurred in Spring 2018, in which the CTE and ISU requested an extension with letters of support from Provost Murphy and the Illinois State Board of Education. CAEP turned down the request. D. Garrahy reminded the CTE that only ECE, MLE and World Languages chose to go up for National Recognition with their respective SPAs at the initial level. On 7/10/18, the Self Study Report (SSR) was submitted on behalf of the EPP. CAEP was to have their Formative Feedback Report (FFR) to ISU on December 8th, 2018. The EPP received it on 1/23/19. The report is 35-pages and includes 94 questions. D. Garrahy reminded the CTE that on November 27th, the EPP community, including the CTE, were provided access to review the SSR. To date, 8 faculty/staff have signed up for access with no one opening the document. D. Garrahy discussed preliminary findings related to technology, continuous collaboration with school partners, PEP data, etc. D. Garrahy shared feedback from the FFR such as:

- Where and how are candidates assessed in their use of technology?
 - “What evidence is provided to show that partners gave formal input on curriculum, initiatives and redesigns across the programs of the EPP?”
 - “How is the EPP sharing responsibility for selection, training, and professional development of clinical educators, specifically the K-12 mentor teachers and CTs?”
 - “What are some examples of input from Stakeholders after reviewing data and how has that input been used?”
- D. Garrahy shared that 11 programs have advisory committees, which goes back to NCATE and bringing school partners to campus. CAEP is also interested in our underrepresented students.
- “How does the “Financial Aid office coordinate to follow URM candidates from admission to completion?”

D. Garrahy mentioned that a call went out for CTE members to assist the UTEAC with reviewing AAR. To date, three CTE members (not on UTEAAC) and one Vision Committee (non-CTE member) volunteered. Hand-outs were distributed on CAEP standards and the preliminary findings from the CAEP Site Visit Team. There are 3 standards with stipulations and several Areas For Improvement. EPPS have two years to remediate stipulations.

IV. Discussion Items

V. Action Items:

VI. Announcements and Last Comments:

a. Vice Chair: None

b. Members:

√ M. Noraian informed the members the National Center for Urban Education has a meeting on Friday, February 22, 2019 from 2:30 – 3:30 in DeGarmo 551.

VII. Adjournment:

Motion:

Second:

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

**Illinois State University
Council for Teacher Education
Tuesday, February 19, 2019, 3:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.
DeGarmo Hall, Room 551**

Minutes

Members Present: J. Anderlik, S. Arnett-Hartwick, A. Bates, C. Blum, S. Boesdorfer, C. Borders, M. Brixius, J. Chrismon, T. Davis, M. Ely, S. French, D. Garrahy, V. Graziano, P. Hash, A. Hurd, E. Mikulec, K. Mountjoy, A. Mustian, M. Noraian, S. Osorio, S. Otto, S. Parry, J. Regnier, S. Williams, M. Winsor

Absent: K. Laudner, C. Lawton, S. Jones-Bock, L. Sutton, A. Victor

Guests: B. Jacobsen, T. Hinkel, M. Morris-Davis, H. Olsen, M. Parker

Call to Order by Chair:

S. Parry called meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

Roll Call: Conducted by T. Davis

I. Approval of Minutes from December 4, 2018: Motion to approve the minutes from December 4, 2018:

Motion to approve: P. Hash

Second: S. French

Minutes approved with one abstention.

II. Sub-committee Reports

A. Curriculum Committee: S. Parry reported the committee met and there were two proposals.

Informational:

LAN: Revision of LAN 321, Integrating technology into the foreign language classroom,
Change the prerequisite, from LAN 319 or 320 to TCH 212

[No member called for discussion of the LAN proposal]

For action, a program revision:

S. Parry presented BIO's Revision to Major proposal, noted proposed changes, and stated the proposal did not involve eliminating EAF courses so the Curriculum Subcommittee did not consider the proposed changes to be "controversial." The proposal then was put forward for a full CTE vote.

S. Otto asked if the program revision needed to have a roll call vote for approval. S. Parry said that usually, for noncontroversial proposals, a voice vote or a show of hands was sufficient. However, any CTE member can request a roll call vote or a paper ballot for curricular proposals. C. Blum concurred, saying that the Academic Senate followed the same procedure. S. Otto indicated she did not want to request a roll call vote, but wanted to be clear on procedure for a full CTE vote and when a roll call vote was required. Voting on the BIO proposal then proceeded.

BIO: Revision of Major in Biological Sciences Teacher Education

- Corrected the grade level from 6-12 to 9-12 for Licensure
- Added BSC 220 and BSC 305 as a required course
- Lowered the Biology elective hour requirement to reflect the addition of BSC 220 and BSC 305 to the Biology requirements as well as adding PHY 208 and SED 344
- Removed GEO 100 as a requirement and replaced the course with GEO 102
- Added MQM 100 as an appropriate statistics (quantitative reasoning) course for the major
- Added PHY 208 as a Science requirement
- Added SED 344 as a Professional Education requirement

The curricular revision was approved by a voice vote.

B. Student Interests Committee: S. Otto reported the Student Recognition of Excellence Award notice was sent out yesterday to faculty. Deadline is March 1st. Students will need to submit materials by April 1, 2019.

D. Garrahy asked M. Noraian how many submissions they had last year and if the committee needed assistance to review.

M. Noraian indicated they had 23 and they should be able to review them to make it work.
S. Otto added that students cannot help in the review process.

C. University Liaison and Faculty Interests Committee: C. Blum reported that the Academic Senate is still working on bylaws from last time. There will be more at a later meeting.

D. Vision Committee: D. Garrahy reported that the committee did not meet. S. Williams and S. Parry are part of the National Criminal Background Adhoc Committee and will be joining the scoring committee on Friday to review the product and interview the vendor.

E. UTEAC: S. Williams reported AAR Reviews are ongoing and thanked CTE members.

III. Information Items

A. CAEP: D. Garrahy indicated the CTE members are going to have to block their calendars for the onsite visit. The itinerary is being worked on. C. Borders, D. Garrahy, T. Hinkel and the lead site coordinator had a conference call on Thursday. The lead site coordinator commended the team on how well-organized the Self-Study Report was and commented on the size and scope of our EPP. It was not a surprise to the team members who worked on the report submitted 7/10/18. Those contributing to the writing and documentation of evidence for the SSR were:

- D. Garrahy

- C. Borders
- E. Palmer
- T. Hinkel
- J. Rosenthal
- K. Fansler
- B. Meyer
- C. Kaiden
- K. Harding

An email was sent out on November 27th to CTE members and Program Coordinators across campus sharing access to the Self-Study Report.

Eight people have requested access to date. D. Garrahy will send another email out this week providing access to the Formative Feedback Report (FFR) received from CAEP on January 23rd (original due date from CAEP was 12/8/18). C. Borders, D. Garrahy and T. Hinkel are working on an addendum that is due to CAEP on March 23, 2019. CTE Members must read both reports.

Work is beginning on establishing the Site Visit Itinerary. A draft will be sent to CAEP for their review/approval. Tentatively, CTE members will be meeting with the CAEP site team on Sunday, April 7, 2019 from 4:45 – 5:30 in DeGarmo 551.

A. Mustian commented that she hopes no one is going to AERA.

UTEAC will be meeting with the CAEP site team on Sunday, April 7, 2019 from 3:45 – 4:45.

Program Coordinators will be meeting with the CAEP site team on Sunday, April 7, 2019 from 2:45 – 3:45.

Sunday, April 7, 2019 will be for school partners, alumni and student to meet with the CAEP Site Team.

D. Garrahy will be contacting program coordinators by Thursday, as programs with SPAs will need to identify where the EPP's four key assessments align with specific SPA standards. ECE, LAN and MLE are the only programs who opted to seek National Recognition from CAEP through their SPA.

Congratulations to Sue Hildebrandt for her Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Award.

T. Davis asked what about the programs that don't have a SPA?

D. Garrahy responded to send her an email stating that there is not a SPA. M. Noraian asked if there is a template they could use.

D. Garrahy responded that the template will resemble the one used for the IPTS standards

CAEP will be asking programs how they work with school partners. While several programs identified they have advisory councils and agendas were submitted as evidence, CAEP has asked for the minutes from these meetings. D. Garrahy used Physical Education -Teacher Education as an example of how they work with their advisory council. She mentioned the PETE faculty and S. Williams recently had a journal article published on how they engage their council members in collaborative tasks. A. Bates confirmed that TCH is looking at starting an advisory council. If there are any changes with school partners, D. Garrahy needs to be notified.

CAEP wants to know how technology skills are assessed. Technology may become a key assessment in the future. D. Garrahy mentioned the demonstration Virtual Nest was presented and S. Jones-Bock has taken it across campus.

S. Otto wants to know when the members will receive the itinerary for the CAEP visit. D. Garrahy stated that groups identified by CAEP in the FFR will be notified asap, as to their assigned time with the site visitors. D. Garrahy indicated that the team is responding to the FFR.

C. Borders added that they have access to the SSR and FFR in ReggieNet. The addendum will be available after March 23, 2019.

D. Garrahy stated that we began developing/using an EPP survey used across University getting feedback from cooperating teachers and University supervisors, but as an EPP feedback was not collected across campus.

M. Winsor asked if there will be a bullet list/punch list. D. Garrahy stated that members will need to read the FFR once it is posted to ReggieNet this week. She reminded the committee that the SSR and FFR are in ReggieNet. An EPP is not required to put it on the web.

T. Davis asked if Department Chairs and academic advisors would be part of the site visit. D. Garrahy indicated that CAEP did not request Dept/ Chairs or Directors, but specifically asked for Program Coordinators. If program coordinators wish their Chair-Director to participate the Program Coordinators can ask them to do so. program

D. Garrahy indicated that CAEP provided many questions, for example edDispositions and Alt edDispositions, in relation to who follow up on them. D. Garrahy stated that CAEP will be meeting with administrators, letting them know that this is not NCATE. D. Garrahy shared that the transition moving forward from the CAEP writing team to site visit, will include the CTE's moving forward with CAEP's continuous improvement focus.

B. Submitting Witness Slips for Legislative Items: C. Borders showed members the ILGA site (Illinois General Assembly) where bills can be found based on the number. HB256 – may not require student to be videotaped. ISU will be submitting a witness slip on this one.

HR 10 – witness clips are not always needed.

HB256: The word “may” is in the bill. It could give back local control to the schools. ISU is meeting with the bill sponsor and will not slip until after the bill.

How to file a witness slip:

Go to ILGA Dashboard,
my.ilga.gov

Set up account

Click on House Committee and look for education committees.

Find the committee and look to the right

Click on committee legislation

Click on link

Create witness slip

C. Borders indicated to make sure that you slip as yourself and not the university.

S. Parry commented that C. Borders was using her ISU email.

C. Borders responded that she asked Rob in Ethics and we can use ISU email but cannot represent University.

If anyone has questions, contact C. Borders.

M. Noraian asked if they could be sent the information to share with constituents suggesting doing the witness slips.

C. Borders responded that she will ask D. Garrahy to send out to CTE to encourage completing witness slips.

IV. Discussion Items: None

V. Action Items: None

VI. Announcements and Last Comments:

a. Vice Chair: None

b. Members:

√ A. Mustian indicates NCUE call out - Urban course redesign successful – RFP is out.

√ M. Noraian added the informational meeting is Friday, February 22, 2019 from 2:30 – 3:30. In DeGarmo 551.

VII. Adjournment:

S. Parry motion to adjourn the meeting: P. Hash

Second: C. Blum

Meeting adjourned at 4:04 p.m.

**Illinois State University
Council for Teacher Education
Tuesday,
March 5th, 2019, 3:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.
DeGarmo Hall, Room 551**

Minutes

Members Present: J. Anderlik, S. Arnett-Hartwick, A. Bates, C. Blum, S. Boesdorfer, C. Borders, J. Chrismon, T. Davis, D. Garrahy, V. Graziano, P. Hash, A. Hurd, K. Laudner, C. Lawton, E. Mikulec, K. Mountjoy, M. Noraian, S. Osorio, S. Parry, L. Sutton, A. Victor, S. Williams

Absent: M. Brixius, M. Ely, S. French, S. Jones-Bock, A. Mustian, S. Otto, J. Regnier, M. Winsor.

Guests: B. Jacobsen, H. Goldsmith, T. Hinkel, M. Horst, S. Kalter, J. Lackland, M. Morris-Davis, M. Parker

Call to Order by Chair:

K. Laudner called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Roll Call: Conducted by T. Davis

I. Approval of Minutes from February 19, 2019: Motion to approve the minutes from February 19, 2019:

Motion to approve: S. Parry

Second: E. Mikulec

Minutes approved with no abstentions.

II. Sub-committee Reports

A. Curriculum Committee: S. Parry reported the committee voted unanimously to recommend having paper ballots for major program revisions.

S. Parry moved to have paper ballots for major program revisions.

Second: S. Arnett-Hartwick

Motion carried unanimously to have paper ballots for major program revisions with no abstentions.

There were two Teacher Education program revisions:

1. Business Teacher Education – proposal to approve revision of Business Teacher Education sequence, replacing EAF 228/231/235 with SED 344 and TCH 219 with IT 164. The program provided a matrix showing where the IPTS were met.

S. Parry, on behalf of the Committee, moved to approve

Second: S. Arnett-Hartwick

L. Sutton asked what the first replacement was?.

S. Parry responded: EAF 228/234/235 with SED 344.

D. Garrahy asked in future if a program representative could be invited to the CTE meeting if curriculum revisions are on the agenda due to questions being asked of BTE by CTE members.

S. Parry responded that it would be helpful to invite program representatives and would invite them to the curriculum committee meetings also.

K. Laudner asked members to take out a piece of paper to vote.
Motion to approve the revisions for Business Teacher approved.

Yes – 18

Abstention – 1

Motion carried to approve the revisions for Business Teacher Education.

L. Sutton asked when it will be effective.

K. Laudner indicated this still has to be approved by the UCC. E. Mikulec and A. Hurd indicated that if approved by the UCC quickly this may make it in the 2019-2020 catalogue, but it may not be until the 2020-2021 catalog.

2. Theatre Teacher Education - proposal to replace EAF 228/231/238 with SED 344.

A narrative was part of the revision to show where standards are met with ITPS.

S. Parry, on behalf of the Committee, moved to approve.

Second: S. Arnett-Hartwick

K. Laudner asked for all member to take out another piece of paper to vote.
Motion to approve the revisions for Theatre Teacher Ed approved.

Yes – 18

Abstention – 1

Motion carried to approve the revisions for Theatre Teacher Education

B. Student Interests Committee: M. Noraian reported the committee gathered last submissions of student names for the Student of Recognition of Excellence Award. Nominations are closed. They will start reviewing them shortly.

C. University Liaison and Faculty Interests Committee: K. Laudner indicated this will be reported along with the Information item: Academic Senate Update on CTE Bylaws.

D. Vision Committee: D. Garrahy reported that the committee did not meet. However, the NCBC ad-hoc committee met with a vendor and interviewed the company representatives. It was a two-hour interview process. D. Garrahy would like to thank S. Williams, S. Parry, J. Hobbs, S. Conner, and T. Hinkel who have been involved in this process.

E. UTEAC: C. Borders reported the committee met and reviewing AAR reports. Preparing for CAEP site team and they are reviewing all data. They are moving forward with proposing an edPedagogy Formative Assessment.

III. Information Items

A. Legislative Updates: Annual Assessment Review: K. Laudner introduced J. Lackland, Director of Government Relations who gave legislative updates occurring in Teacher Education and told us about his job.

J. Lackland thanked everyone for inviting him. He gave a brief background of his history: he's been at

ISU for 4 years and was at Board of Higher Education prior to ISU.

ISBE is putting forward many changes without consulting the stakeholders. C. Borders and J. Lackland are working a lot together. They are asking presidents of universities to write a letter asking to be consulted on matters that concern universities.

Developmental Education bill that Senator McGuire is pushing has many consequences. They would like to kill the bill and stop it, but it will not happen.

There are 147 bills relative to Higher Education being considered. March 29th is the deadline to get bills out of committee. Bill 257: Ban the box – restricts institutions of higher education (IHE) from asking about criminal background information on application for admission. Proposal of this bill was not caused by any specific wrong doing across IHEs.

Safe Spaces Bill – mandates metal detectors at every public entrance of every building. This could be problematic.

Capital Funds and Budgets: The governor has proposed a 5% increase for all higher education – \$69.6 million overall and \$3.3 million increase for ISU.

Illinois Veteran's Grant – it is currently unfunded.

Government is being slow to make appointments. ISU has multiple trustees that need to be appointed.

D. Garrahy thanked J. Lackland and C. Borders for keeping us informed and up to date.

B. University Liaison and Faculty Interests with Academic Senate Update on CTE bylaws: C. Blum, Rules Committee Chair, indicated that S. Jones-Bock said how important it is for program coordinators to be on CTE. The issue is that some coordinators are non-faculty.

S. Kalter indicated the Senate Executive Committee values A/P voices, but not in a faculty role. The concern is that the way the bylaws were written could lead to not having a majority of faculty on CTE. S. Horst suggested adding a program coordinator seat as a voting member. Also, she suggested that additional non-voting seats be added.

K. Laudner indicated this is in the informational stage and will need to be moved to the discussion stage.

M. Noraian stated the issue with adding additional seats is it is hard to find qualified members to sit at the table. The proposal does not solve the problem.

S. Kalter asked about the sub-committees that have more members than CTE.

D. Garrahy stated that some sub-committees have additional members who are not CTE members, per the current CTE Bylaws. UTEAC is such a committee.

M. Horst indicated the solution cannot be to flip faculty slots into A/P slots.

S. Parry stated that often the program coordinator may be the only person in teacher education from a program. There are no faculty members available,

The response is that this is why additional non-voting members may be needed.

S. Parry stated that E. Mikulec has been a valuable addition to the Curriculum Committee.

The proposal is that the new seat should be someone who does not already have a faculty seat. S. Parry indicated this is an open meeting and many coordinators or directors come to CTE.

Motion to move to a discussion item: P. Hash

Second: S. Boesdorfer

Motion carried to move adding a new seat to a discussion item.

S. Boesdorfer asked what the original language was.

The proposal was read again:

“One coordinator or director of teacher education programs, voting (1). This seat is chosen annually among three colleges (CAS, CAST, CFA) from among those eligible, preferably with CAS holding the seat every other year due to its larger proportion of programs. It may be occupied by any faculty member or administrative professional who serves as the coordinator or director of a teacher education program in a department/school within one of those colleges. This seat should be occupied by an individual from a program not represented within the faculty seats.”

S. Boesdorfer asked if, for the other language, the proposal would go back to the original wording.

COE seats recommended to stay at 5. The Senate seat has almost always been a COE seat.

C. Borders asked about the proportion of faculty currently.

The response was 52% faculty: 29 tenure; 1 non-tenure; 1 faculty associate.

S. Parry asked if this new seat would be a 1-year term? Normally CTE terms are 3-years.

D. Garrahy stated it would be best if the new seat follows the same 3-year rotation.

K. Laudner asked S. Parry if the 3-year term would work for CAS?

S. Parry indicated it would be best for 3 years as CAS would always have someone.

Motion to move from a discussion item to an action item: S. Parry

Second: P. Hash

Motion carried to move adding a new seat to a discussion item.

S. Williams read the proposed change completely.

S. Williams asked if the Coordinator/Director can be faculty?

S. Kalter responded that is correct.

Motion to move change proposal wording from annual to 3-year term: S. Parry

Second: D. Garrahy

Motion carried to approve adding a new seat with the amendment of changing seat from annual to 3-year term.

D. Garrahy thanked C. Blum, M. Horst, S. Kalter, and S. Jones-Bock for their work on the by-laws.

C. CAEP: D. Garrahy stated that faculty members need to get the message out about CAEP. Access has been given to review the self-study report and associated evidence and the formative feedback reports, prior to our site visit

D. Garrahy stated that Programs are not responding to the formative feedback report. This is the responsibility of the EPP CAEP writing team. Programs need to respond to how their SPA standards align with the EPP's four key assessments.

Program Coordinators are also responding to the Qualtrics survey. These responses will be summarized and added to the addendum due to CAEP by March 23rd.

D. Garrahy reiterated the areas of concern focus on how we consistently/systematically engage our P-12 school partners in curricular decisions, assessment, recruitment, etc. D. Garrahy and team members continue to work on the Addendum and the CAEP Itinerary. She reiterated again that CAEP has identified whom they wish to interview during the April site visit.

IV. Discussion Items: See Above

V. Action Items: See Above

VI. Announcements and Last Comments:

a. Vice Chair: None

b. Members:

√ D. Garrahy reminded the members with spring break next week, the sub-committees and the Executive committee will not meet.

VII. Adjournment:

Motion: S. Parry

Second: P. Hash

Meeting adjourned at 4:09 p.m.

**Illinois State University
Council for Teacher Education
Tuesday, April 2, 2019, 3:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.
DeGarmo Hall, Room 551**

Minutes

Members Present: J. Anderlik, S. Arnett-Hartwick, A. Bates, C. Blum, S. Boesdorfer, C. Borders, M. Brixius, J. Chrismon, T. Davis, M. Ely, S. French, D. Garrahy, V. Graziano, P. Hash, A. Hurd, K. Laudner, C. Lawton, E. Mikulec, K. Mountjoy, M. Noraian, S. Osorio, S. Otto, S. Parry, A. Victor, S. Williams, M. Winsor

Absent: A. Mustian, S. Jones-Bock, J. Regnier, L. Sutton

Guests: M. Morris-Davis, B. Jacobsen, H. Goldsmith, T. Hinkel, H. Olsen, M. Parker, J. Thomas, B. Vietti, K. Wester

Call to Order by Chair:

K. Laudner called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Roll Call: Conducted by T. Davis

- I. Approval of Minutes from March 5, 2019:** Motion to approve the minutes from March 5, 2019:
Motion to approve: D. Garrahy
Second: S. Parry
Minutes approved with no abstentions.

II. Sub-committee Reports

A. Curriculum Committee:

S. Parry moved to have paper ballots for major program revisions.

Second: S. Arnett-Hartwick

Motion carried unanimously to have paper ballots for major program revisions with no abstentions.

There were five proposals:

1. Earth, Space & Science

J. Thomas was present to answer any questions.

Replacing EAF 228/231/235 with SED 344 – The committee looked to see where 10 diverse clinical hours would be met and viewed the alignment of class with the IPTS standards. S. Parry was impressed with proposal given by J. Thomas, who spoke to the stakeholders.

S. Parry moved to approve the revision

Second: S. Arnett-Hartwick

Yes – 23

No – 1

Motion carries to approve replacing EAF 228/231/235 with SED 344.

2. Geography Teacher Education

J. Thomas was present to answer any questions.

Includes ECON 101 replacing ECON 105

Replacing EAF 228/231/235 with SED 344. The committee looked to see where 10 diverse clinical hours would be met and viewed the alignment of class with the IPTS standards.
the 10 diverse clinical hours would be met.

S. Parry moved to approve the revisions.

Second: S. Arnett-Hartwick

Yes – 23

No – 1

Abstention – 1

Motion carries to replace ECON 105 and EAF 228/231/235 with SED 344.

3. History Teacher Education

M. Noraian was present to answer any questions.

Replacing ECON 105 with ECON 101, 102 or 103. Replacing TCH 219 with SED 344. S. Parry indicated R. Hughes gave a good proposal.

S. Parry moved to approve the revisions

Second: S. Arnett-Hartwick

Yes – 25

No – 0

Motion carries to replace revisions to History Teacher Education.

4. Physics Teacher Education

Replacing EAF 228/231/235 with SED 244. K. Wester was present to answer any questions.

Replacing TCH 219 with 200 level Chemistry or Biology course. The committee looked to see where 10 diverse clinical hours would be met and viewed the alignment of class with the IPTS standards.

S. Parry moved to approve the revisions to Physics Teacher Education.

Second: S. Boesdorfer

Yes – 24

No – 1

Motion carries to approve the revisions to Physics Teacher Education.

5. Family & Consumer Sciences

S. Arnett-Hartwick was present to answer any questions.

Replacing EAF 228/231/235 with SED 344. The committee looked to see where 10 diverse clinical hours would be met and viewed the alignment of class with the IPTS standards.

S. Parry moved to approve replacing EAF 228/231/235 with SED 344.

Second: P. Hash

Yes – 23

No – 1

Abstention – 1

Motion carries to approve replacing SED 228/231/235 with SED 344.

S. Parry indicated next UCC meeting is the last one of the semester. If there are any program revisions, they need to be sent this week. The 5 programs approved today will go before UCC. Any others will be deferred until the fall.

A. Hurd stated they are scheduling the 5 program changes. Any others will be in the fall. Any programs wanting to substitute changes before the 2020 official catalog should contact her office for a blanket substitution.

B. Student Interest Committee: No report

C. University Liaison and Faculty Interests Committee: The committee did not meet. However, the by-laws have been moved to an action item. C. Blum expects them to be approved next week at Academic Senate meeting. Once approved, the new by-laws take effect immediately. This means C. Blum's seat on CTE will be terminated.

K. Laudner thanked C. Blum for his time and service.

D. Vision Committee: D. Garrahy indicated the committee did not meet. D. Garrahy has received information about the NCBC vendor. She is very pleased with the company as they are very student focused. Documents should be signed soon. This will be 100% online process. Teacher candidates are required to notify the Lauby Teacher Education Center (TEC) of any changes to their criminal background status after submitting their NCBC. The NCBC will include the vendor checking the Illinois Sex Offender and Illinois Violence Against Youth registry. This will be completed a second time by the was TEC staff the semester prior to student teaching.

S. Parry asked if a student will be pulled from the program of a disposition written if they do not report any criminal activity updates. It is within our purview to administer consequences. The students will still have to do CBCs for every district. D. Garrahy has to meet with teacher candidates that have a "hjt" on their CBC. Out of 3600 teacher candidates, she probably meets with 15 per academic year.

E. UTEAC: S. Williams indicated the committee met and prepped for CAEP visit. They also looked at ISBE completer data. The ISBE completer survey will be brought before CTE at next meeting.

III. Information Items

A. CAEP: D. Garrahy indicated the addendum was due 3/23/19. It was submitted 3/22/19. The 46-page document had over 2000 pages of evidence (59 files). There were 3 key authors. A. Hurd wrote to Standard 3. C. Borders and D. Garrahy wrote all the other standards and questions from the site team. The AAR and PEP Dashboard files were so large, they would not upload to the CAEP system. They were able to send as an attachment.

D. Garrahy thanked C. Borders and A. Hurd for working on the addendum.

D. Garrahy thanked those who opened and read the self-study report and the formative report in ReggieNet. She also thanked those who are attending sessions and providing names for P-12 and alumni.

D. Garrahy indicated we do not need syllabi or evidence. The site team will leave Tuesday at 2:00.

C. Blum asked what time the members need to be here for the CTE session.

D. Garrahy responded 4:45 in STV 401.

B. Legislative Updates: C. Borders stated that there are a lot of legislative reports. IACTE Bill Tracking was forwarded by D. Garrahy.

HB 423: It is a shell bill. Shell bills get gutted and amended. HB 423 has an amendment.

Amendment 1 – strike all licensure testing (i.e. Basic Skills/Content/edTPA/OPI/Braille)
ISU is opposed to this.

Amendment 2 – Retains edTPA but strikes all other testing.

K. Laudner sent out an email asking program coordinators. ISU is split 50/50 on content exams. K. Laudner stated that within one program, it is split 50/50.

Amendment 3 – Retains edTPA. Content is an optional test to be decided by the hiring school district.

This week is appropriations week so no education bills. Next week, all educational bills will be moving forward.

There is a great deal of conversation moving forward. C. Borders suggested members that are not on the IACTE listserv to please get on it as the bills are on there.

HB 256 goes to committee next week. It will remove videotaping. K. Laudner indicated that some are against videotaping due to privacy of minors and some students are putting their videos on social media.

There is a shortage of teachers. D. Garrahy discussed reasons students are not going into teacher education. It is not due to the testing, but due to the low salaries and stability of pensions over a 30 year career.

A. Hurd stated 500 bills impacting Higher Ed are in the works at Springfield currently.

C. Blum talked about the ethical issue to give students consequences such as one and done dispositions if they post their videos.

C. Borders added that Illinois is not the only state facing removing the testing.

C. CTE Bylaws: There was a 40-minute conversation about suggestions for the next version of the by-laws at the Academic Senate. It is possible that the by-laws could be amended on the senate floor. There may be “friendly” changes made. The approval of the by-laws will be an action item on 4/10/19. The bylaws were sent to the Rules Committee two weeks ago. Dr. Horst, Chair of Rules Committee and her committee agree with the proposals. C. Blum will rigorously defend the document CTE approved.

A. Hurd, a member of the UCC, said that the UCC selects their own chair.

C. Blum stated that the CTE chair is appointed by the Provost or COE. CTE has never selected the chair.

IV. Discussion Items: None

V. Action Items: None

VI. Announcements and Last Comments:

a. Vice Chair: None

b. Members:

√ D. Garrahy informed members the program coordinators will receive an email about clinical placements for fall 2019 in Unit 5. There is a new piece: if you plan to take a full class to observe/work in a Unit 5 class you must get permission in advance.

√ D. Garrahy stated the last CTE meeting is April 16th.

VII. Adjournment:

Motion: S. Parry

Second: M. Noraian

Meeting adjourned at 4:04 p.m.

**Illinois State University
Council for Teacher Education**

April 16th, 2019
DeGarmo Hall, Room 551
3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

MINUTES

Members Present: J. Anderlik, S. Arnett-Hartwick, A. Bates, C. Blum, S. Boesdorfer, C. Borders, M. Brixius, J. Chrismon, S. French, D. Garrahy, V. Graziano, P. Hash, S. Jones-Bock, K. Laudner, C. Lawton, E. Mikulec, A. Mustian, M. Norian, S. Osorio, S. Otto, L. Sutton, S. Williams

Members Absent: T. Davis, M. Ely, A. Hurd, K. Mountjoy, S. Parry, J. Regnier, A. Victor, M. Winsor,

Guests: H. Goldsmith, M. Morris-Davis, H. Olson, L. Sexton

Call to Order by K. Laudner at 3:00pm

Roll Call – by J. Hobbs

I. Approval of Minutes from April 2, 2019

1. P. Hash 2. S. French
Minutes approved with no abstentions.

II. Subcommittee Reports

A. Curriculum: (Chair, S. Parry/S. French) – Motion to use paper ballots for voting today by S. French and seconded by S. Otto – no abstentions

SED 344 replaces EAF 228 -

M. Morris-Davis is in attendance from English Education to answer questions.

L. Sutton asks when it is supposed to take place. K. Laudner states it has to go thru UCC – Fall 2020

S. Otto – said Amy Hurd said she would be making overrides until then

C. Borders – advisors can provide overrides before in official catalog –

K. Laudner - still has to go through UCC before overrides can be given

L. Sutton – concerned about waivers – under impression that waivers will take place immediately – need to change wording – wants CTE to consider the EAF faculty.

S. Otto – concerned there are no appeals for such changes, no consideration – went to UCC meeting last week. S. Otto said it was apparent that no one received the EAF letter from last Fall. UCC is not reading. E. Mikulec stated that the EAF

letter was sent to the UCC and that each member received it. She could not guarantee who read it.

A. Mustian –said she could not make April 2nd meeting and was concerned that “move to vote” came quick. SED 344 is a viable course but there is an equity issue here and at what cost and who is going to directly be impacted with the passing of this course –

K. Laudner - stated – spent entire fall 2018 semester meeting with EAF, TCH, and Psych to find resolution, but nothing could be agreed upon. CTE curriculum committee then rejected all proposals and asked each department/school to identify where the content of courses they were omitting from curriculum would be covered. Once they provided that information each proposal came back to CTE as a new item - motion, 2nd, then into discussion. So, there was an opportunity for discussion at our last CTE meeting, but no one had any discussion, which then lead to voting.

M. Norian – if programs are choosing to eliminate an EAF course, that content is being taught in other classes. Programs made their decisions at a program level.

L. Sutton - EAF is trying to pivot and trying to do something new, but this motion moved fast. This body has determined that SED needs to be in the curriculum. Okay with that, but not okay with this moved so fast.

Motion to approve English Ed sequence:

1. P. Hash 2. L. Sutton

Paper Ballots: 15 approved – 2 reject – 2 abstentions

Health Sciences Teacher Ed adding SED 344 to program of study with no Replacements. Adding course with increased major coursework from 59 to 62 credit hours. Financial implication form was approved by the Provost and included in proposal.

S. French moved to approve – S. Arnett-Hartwick 2nd

Paper ballots: 18 approved – 1 abstention

Music – is replacing TCH 219 with SED 344

S. French moved to vote – S. Otto – 2nd

Paper ballots: 18 approved – 1 abstention

Curriculum proposal from Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) to increase KNR 156 from 2 to 3 credit hours, to include more material connected to the discipline. This was treated as information item. No vote necessary.

PETE is removing Psych 215, TCH 212 and TCH 216 and adding SED 244 – looked at clinical hours and disciplinary courses S. Williams is in attendance to answer questions.

S. French moved for program provision. S. Otto 2nd

M. Norian asked about the prerequisite for TCH 219. S. Williams clarified they are keeping TCH219, A. Bates will override the prerequisite.

Paper ballots: 18 approved - 1 abstention

B. Student Interests: (Chair, S. Otto)

S. Otto announced 3 winners of student excellence awards. Students were notified on 4-15-19: Jordan Dulowski – Math, Faith Johnson – ELED and Alyssa Nelson – ECE. She thanked everyone who took the time to review the applicants.

C. University Liaison and Faculty Interests: (Chair, C. Blum)

C. Blum stated that CTE bylaws passed, but with caveat. He reported the Senate was concerned about student selection, specifically with regard to diverse representation, the language “first come first serve” basis was a concern, along with graduate and undergraduate students. Will be changed to (see page that C. Blum handed out)

M. Norian states that each department gets the email about student reps

D. Garrahy expressed concern. This conversation has been going on for some time and this oversight does not seem to happen with other committees. For example, the UCC.

S. Otto – is there a date for response from Departments?

C. Blum – states this does not have to be approved – it will be approved by Senators??

D. Garrahy – has tried to get student representation from all programs across the five colleges each year, by putting a call out. It has been a problem.

C. Blum - he will write what CTE wants him to

S. Otto – is it possible to state “the executive committee strives to seek diverse students from ALL departments”

K. Laudner - asks D. Garrahy when she gets students. Current CTE student members are asked if they are interested in serving the following year. Otherwise, a call goes out to all Program Coordinators across the five colleges. Get names now, but student schedules change by August.

D. Garrahy states Senate affirms CTE faculty positions, not student CTE members.

C. Blum – just need to change wording and send back – general suggestion - as a body to formulate process for this.

D. Garrahy historically this is how it has been done this in the past bylaws. The CTE voted on the proposed bylaws that are now before the senate.

S. Otto motioned to accept friendly amendments

C. Blum plans to move forward.

Second: M. Noraian

Motion was approved.

A. **Vision:** (Chair, D. Garrahy)

No report

B. **UTEAC:** (Co-Chairs, S. Williams/C. Borders)

C. Borders - AAR & Completer survey. Programs will receive institution report – programs will receive their program. Specific report (including comments - uploaded to program folders).

L. Sutton - do we use student engagement and NESSE score here? Is there a sense of how students engage in their instruction. C. Borders stated we do have that data but is not sure it's been looked at. It would be a good idea to start looking at this. Not sure if we can connect by individual student.

S. Jones-Bock – in terms of gifted education - SED could address more.

III. Information Items:

CAEP (D. Garrahy/C. Borders/K. Laudner).

CAEP Site team conducted interview sessions which began on Sunday, April 7th (from 2:45 to 5:30) and Monday, April 8th (from 8 to 5 pm). 25 sessions were scheduled with 229 stake holders participating. The lead site reviewer shared our students are very complimentary of what we do, and it was very clear our grads are sort after.

The CAEP Accreditation Council will not meet until the Fall to review our case, with their final decision sometime during the fall 2019 semester.

K. Laudner stated they were amazed at the size of our education programs and very complimentary.

IV. Legislative Update (C. Borders)

C. Borders – Two bills passed last week in the House. House Bill 423 called for getting rid of all testing. Went to many amendments. Passed on amendment 5, keeping edTPA, keep content. Required that ISBE views content tests: basic skills will be eliminated July 1, 2019 if this passes. Other 2 effective 2021. Sunset clause in 2025 needs to be reviewed – passed house, moves to senate education committee

House Bill 256 - videotaping bill passed the house. Teacher ed assessment conflict. If it passes, edTPA can be completed, but without the video components. Bill's sponsor has "massive" concerns about videotaping. C. Borders is not sure if this will pass.

Part 25 bills will be coming out with public comment on ISBE website - go to ISBE and comment - ISBE does not expect to pass but needs feedback - does not think new Supt. Is in favor but was put forward before she was here.

V. Discussion Items: None

VI. Action Items: None

VII. Announcement and Last Comments:

K. Laudner - thanked everyone this year on sub-committees and students. Deb's last CTE meeting after the last 6 years as Director. Thanked her. C. Borders stated that this was Kevin's last CTE meeting as well.

Adjournment: None

Time: