

**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 20<sup>th</sup> deadline meant inevitably led to rushed deliberations at the department level.
- I understood that by Apr 20<sup>th</sup>, 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 11<sup>th</sup>, 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 16<sup>th</sup>) a clarification on the meaning of the April 20<sup>th</sup> 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 27<sup>th</sup>.
- 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 27<sup>th</sup>: 23 in favor; 11 against.
- My concern: had we understood what was meant by the April 20<sup>th</sup> 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 are 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.