

Illinois State University
Council for Teacher Education
Tuesday, September 16, 2014, 3:00 p.m.-4:30 p.m.
DeGarmo Hall, Room 551

Minutes

Members Present: A. Adkins, E. Baker, M. Coleman, T. Davis, S. Doering, L. Eckrich, B. Edmonson, S. French, D. Garrahy, K. Hamann, B. Hatt, S. Jones Bock, C. Kahl, M. Lin, K. Lopez, T. Lorsbach, J. Manfredo, T. Martin, K. Mountjoy, M. Noraian, S. Parry, J. Rosenthal, R. Seglem, S. Semonis, L. Sutton, M. Temple, A. Wright

Members Absent: J. Brown, L. Kendall, P. Schoon, O. Landa-Vialard

Guests: K. Appel, C. Herald, B. Jacobsen, G. Higham, E. Palmer, M. Parker, C. Rutherford, L. Steffen, Y. Visser

- I. **Call to Order by Vice-Chair:** S. Parry called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m. All members of the CTE introduced themselves.
- II. **Approval of Minutes from May 6, 2014:** Correction to the minutes from May 6, 2014: In section *III. Committee Reports, Curriculum Committee*, the date as to when the Middle Level endorsement to teach grades 5-9 will require a stand-alone endorsement should be *January 31, 2018*. The date of August, 2018 was incorrect in the minutes. Motion to approve minutes (as amended): J. Rosenthal, A. Adkins seconded. Minutes were approved unanimously with no abstentions.
- III. **Subcommittee Reports:** Subcommittee members shared the duties of each committee.
 - A. **Curriculum (TBD):** Curriculum proposals by all Teacher Education programs on campus are reviewed by this committee prior to moving on.
 - B. **Student Interests (TBD):** This committee works on anything related to students in teacher education, especially facilitating dialog between programs and students.
 - C. **University Liaison and Faculty Interest (TBD):** This committee organized the *fall* and/or *spring* colloquia on campus and this year will be reviewing CTE By-laws also.
 - D. **Vision (TBD):** This year the Vision Committee will be working on facilitating Unit 5 clinical experiences.
 - E. **UTE Assessment:** This committee deals with stakeholder data such as edTPA, CAEP structure and internal reviews for ISBE. They will no longer be doing the internal reviews for ISBE reports.
- IV. **Information Items:**
 - A. **CTE Subcommittee Assignments/Chair Selections/Secretary:**
 1. Curriculum Committee Chair: S. Parry
 2. Student Interests Committee Co-Chairs: M. Noraian and B. Edmonson
 3. University Liaison and Faculty Interests Committee Chair: J. Manfredo
 4. Vision Committee Co-Chairs: P. Schoon and D. Garrahy

5. UTE Assessment Committee Chair: A. Adkins

6. Elections for Vice-Chair and Recorder:

Motion to elect S. Parry as Vice-Chair of CTE (A. Adkins), Second: D. Garrahy
Motion passed unanimously

Motion to elect M. Coleman as CTE Recorder (A. Adkins), Second: D. Garrahy
Motion passed unanimously

B. Talking About Teacher Education at ISU (P. Schoon): Tabled

C. edTPA Update (E. Palmer): Overview of edTPA began with reminder that as of September 1, 2015, it becomes consequential (must be passed to get teacher licensure).

- ISU went to full implementation last semester with 950 portfolios completed and 630 being sent in for scoring as funded by the Provosts' office and vouchers. Most programs were able to send at least 65% of their candidates' portfolios in for scoring. The breakdown by College was as follows:

CAST: 51	CAS: 180
COB: 6	COE: 342
CFA: 51	

- This year 725 portfolios will be officially scored.
- The spring 2014 pass rate was 86% with an average score of 43.
- There is a sliding score for pass rates over the next few years:
 - 35 for 2015-2016
 - 37 for 2017-2018
 - 39 for 2018-2019
 - 41 for 2019-2020
- Data from scoring was used for: Program improvement, Targeting of resources, and Retake support predictions and policy recommendations.
- An overview of proficiency data relative to the 15 rubrics showed that assessment is our weakest area (rubrics 11-15) as they are under 70% proficiency.
- Point of pride: approximately 140 schools nationwide are using edTPA materials developed by ISU.
- Goals for this year:
 1. Establish a system to support candidates re-taking edTPA
 2. Provide targeted professional development for faculty and staff
 3. Continue outreach to school partners
 4. Minimize stress that edTPA places on teacher candidates; and
 5. Develop a resource data base for use by faculty and staff

- A. Adkins distributed a hand-out: "The 31 flavors of student learning."

D. Provost's edTPA Task Force (S. Parry): The Provost identified this group to discuss policy issues (such as non-passers) and report to the CTE. The committee is small and meets regularly to make sure we are doing what is best for the students. It is

recognized that edTPA is an addition to the faculty workload. Committee is comprised of: P. Schoon, S. Parry, A. Adkins, J. Rosenthal, D. Garrahy and E. Palmer.

E. How do we celebrate our edTPA work? (A. Adkins): At the next meeting, A. Adkins will present information on how, after working hard on edTPA, we can celebrate our work.

F. Secondary PDS (D. Garrahy): Tabled until next meeting.

G. Unit 5 and Clinical Experiences (D. Garrahy): On July 25, 2014, D. Garrahy and B. Meyer met with Unit 5 regarding clinical experience issues, specifically:

Component I:

- Unit 5 must know the ISU teacher candidates in their schools on any given day, time and location. This is a safety issue for both Unit 5 and Illinois State University Teacher Education.
- Accurate documentation on the schools and teachers our teacher candidates are placed with, so that ISU can collaborate with as many schools and teachers within Unit 5.
- The size and scope of clinical experiences across university teacher education:

Spring 2014: 500 teacher candidates from 25 ISU Teacher Education programs in 17 Unit 5 schools.

Fall 2014: 220 teacher candidates from 21 ISU Teacher Education programs in 17 schools in Unit 5 schools.

Component II:

- Spring Semester –
 - Professors *will not* be able to contact their Unit 5 colleagues, after the fall, 2014 semester, to make their clinical placements.
 - Unit 5 wants ISU to provide a list of all courses requesting clinicals in their district for spring 2014.
 - This information will be shared with Principals.
 - Principals will let Unit 5 administrators know if they will be able to accommodate us.
 - ISU and Unit 5 will need to collaborate on a mutually agreed timeline. Professors will need to have a response from Unit 5 to plan other clinical options if Unit 5 does not accept a placement.
- A concern is that if Unit 5 turns down a placement, this must be communicated quickly to ISU, so we can arrange alternate placements. Discussion ensued. The Vision Committee will be working on this.

V. Discussion Items: None

VI. Action Items:

A. Initial and Final Reflective Essay (S. Parry): This conversation began last spring semester. Since edTPA also has a reflection aspect, we can now afford to delete the Initial and Final Reflective Essay requirement from Teacher Education programs.

Motion: Eliminate the Initial and Final Reflective Essay requirement, effective immediately (A. Adkins). Second: T. Martin

Discussion: Programs can certainly keep this requirement if they'd like. L. Steffen was asked about removing it from Gateways 1 and 3 and she will look into disestablishing it.

Vote: Unanimously passed, with no abstentions.

VII. Announcements and Last Comments:

A. Vice Chair: S. Parry thanked everyone for participating in CTE

B Members: None

VIII. Adjournment: Motion to adjourn by J. Rosenthal, seconded by A. Adkins. S. Parry adjourned the meeting at 4:35.

**Illinois State University
Council for Teacher Education
Tuesday, October 7, 2014, 3:00 p.m.-4:30 p.m.
DeGarmo Hall, Room 551**

Minutes

Members Present: A. Adkins, E. Baker, J. Brown, M. Coleman, T. Davis, S. Doering, L. Eckrich, B. Edmonson, D. Garrahy, K. Hamann, S. Hildebrandt, S. Jones Bock, C. Kahl, L. Kendall, M. Lin, K. Lopez, T. Lorschach, J. Manfredo, T. Martin, K. Mountjoy, M. Noraian, S. Parry, J. Rosenthal, R. Seglem, S. Semonis, P. Schoon, M. Temple

Members Absent: S. French, B. Hatt, O. Landa-Vialard, L. Sutton

Guests: A. Jarvis, G. Higham, G. Hoffman, E. Palmer, M. Parker, A. Raver, C. Rutherford, L. Steffen, L. Thetard, J. Webster, Y. Visser

- I. **Call to Order by Vice-Chair:** S. Parry called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m. P. Schoon introduced G. Hoffman, principal of the Regional Alternative School and A. Jarvis, assistant principal. M. Temple and A. Jarvis are participating in the Principal-Professor Partnership, as well as M. Noraian and G. Hoffman. They have been job shadowing each other. The goal is to open dialogue between the two professionals as they learn about each other's positions in education. P. Schoon thanked them for attending the CTE meeting and shared the Principal-Professor Partnership flyer.

- II. **Approval of Minutes from September 16, 2014:**
Motion to approve: A. Adkins
Second: S. Parry
Minutes were approved with no abstentions.

- III. **Subcommittee Reports:** Subcommittee members shared the duties of each committee.
 - A. **Curriculum:** S. Parry reported the committee has not yet met, but will be meeting next week. The committee will be considering approximately a half dozen proposals.
 - B. **Student Interests:** M. Noraian reported the committee has not yet met, but will be meeting next week and looking at issues to discuss.
 - C. **University Liaison and Faculty Interest:** L. Kendall reported that the committee has not yet met, but will be meeting next week.
 - D. **Vision:** D. Garrahy reported the committee met last week and discussed clinical experience protocols with S. Wilson who attended from Unit 5. They are developing a template to be used to identify clinicals and will be piloting that with selected programs.
 - E. **UTE Assessment:** A. Adkins reported the committee met two weeks ago and discussed Evaluation of Teacher Prep Programs which they will use as a guide this year. The committee will begin looking at CAEP and State Reports to the State Board of Ed and the implications of these on edTPA and dispositions.

IV. Information Items:

A. Talking about teacher education at ISU: P. Schoon addressed the current perception of society that teacher education is somehow “broken”. He reported that there is an abundance of evidence to show the good things that we do and we rarely get a chance to look back at our accomplishments. Several examples were cited and the Dean indicated he would share this information via email with the Council. Some of the highlights:

- According to student exit surveys, scores of 5.22 out of 7 indicate our overall effectiveness.
- Seven of 14 factors rate our quality and instruction.
- Greatest strength is student teaching experience, 5.97 out of 7.
- 87% of Illinois school districts have people who have earned at least one degree from ISU.
- Co-teaching, 90% of teacher educators satisfied with their student teaching experience.
- When we have reached out to alumni, 95% satisfied with quality of education programs.
- edTPA – tool is aligned with our assessment practices, our portfolios exceed the national average portfolio.
- Fine Arts pass rate was 100%.
- Proficient in 3rd party reviews.
- Students choose ISU – quality of graduates produced.

P. Schoon thanked CTE for all they do.

B. How do we celebrate our edTPA work: A. Adkins reported that we are celebrating the work that we’ve done, not edTPA itself. The edTPA assessment is really difficult to administer. A great deal of hard work went into the implementation of edTPA and we currently are a national model for large programs. The University Liaison and Faculty Interests sub-committee is looking at ways to celebrate this campus-wide.

B. Edmonson requested that the CTE acronym list be sent.

C. What are we trying to accomplish in student teaching: P. Schoon provided some context to these remarks: Last year, CTE went to the Provost to make her aware of recommendations regarding re-takes of edTPA, legal issues, etc. The Provost responded by forming a task force to make recommendations. The task force is comprised of: P. Schoon, S. Parry, A. Adkins, D. Garrahy, E. Palmer and J. Rosenthal. They will raise the implications and bring forth to the executive committee. J. Rosenthal presented information on student teaching. The perception is that grades in student teaching are high which is leading to explorations of making it a Credit/No Credit course. The last 2 semesters of data indicate that 84% of students earn an “A” and another 12% earn a “B”. However, it is entirely possible that not everyone out of this 96% will pass their edTPA. Additional points to consider:

1. What are our benchmark schools doing? Eight out of fourteen are currently using Credit/No Credit.

2. Superintendents reported that GPA, Content Knowledge matter more to them than the student teaching grade since their perception is that “everyone gets an A”.
3. CAEP’s silent on the subject.
4. Student’s perspective: most go into student teaching at approximately 112 credit hours. Getting an “A” means .09 of a point increase in their GPA if they are going in with a 3.0.
5. A GPA in a student’s major is not affected by their student teaching grade.

Thus, we may want to look at the Credit/No Credit option at ISU. The Curriculum Committee will discuss and make recommendations regarding this as well as the variety in credit hours and length of student teaching experiences across campus since there is currently considerable variability. The Student Interest Committee may also be involved in this. Discussion ensued. S. Parry requested programs send her concerns they may have.

D. Bylaws revision update: D. Garrahy reported that there are many new members on the University Liaison and Faculty Interests Committee which is charged to revise the Bylaws. In April 2014, former Academic Senate Chair, Dan Holland indicated the most recent Bylaws were from 2008. Currently, the student appeals process is in the Bylaws. If a student receives 3 dispositions, their progress in a teacher education program is stopped. They can appeal to the executive board. D. Garrahy informed the committee that she has a note from a student that is going to appeal. The appeal will go under the current appeal process. D. Garrahy also stated that this semester has been very difficult to find faculty to be on the CTE. S. Parry stated that many are A/P and not eligible to serve on CTE.

E. Secondary PDS update: D. Garrahy reported that currently there is no designated coordinator for this year. They are holding off for a year as D. Garrahy wanted to learn about PDS. All PDS applications are out to the principals at PDS sites. D. Garrahy would like to grow the secondary programs. Some programs opt out of PDS. Dr. Seglem, Dr. Lycke and Dr. Garrahy have discussed creating a PDS brochure. Discussion ensued.

VI. Discussion Items: None

VII. Action Items: None

A. Vice Chair: S. Parry thanked everyone for participating in CTE

B Members: None

VIII. Announcements and Last Comments:

A. Vice Chair: None

B. Chair: None

VIII. Adjournment: P. Schoon motioned to adjourn. J. Rosenthal moved the motion, S. Parry seconded. P. Schoon adjourned the meeting at 4:05.

Illinois State University
Council for Teacher Education
Tuesday, October 21, 2014, 3:00 p.m.-4:30 p.m.
DeGarmo Hall, Room 551

Minutes

Members Present: A. Adkins, E. Baker, J. Brown, M. Coleman, T. Davis, S. Doering, L. Eckrich, B. Edmonson, S. French, D. Garrahy, B. Hatt, S. Hildebrandt, S. Jones Bock, L. Kendall, M. Lin, K. Lopez, T. Lorschach, J. Manfredo, T. Martin, K. Mountjoy, S. Parry, J. Rosenthal, S. Semonis, P. Schoon, L. Sutton, M. Temple

Members Absent: K. Hamann, C. Kahl, M. Noraian, O. Landa-Vialard

Guests: G. Higham, B. Jacobsen, E. Palmer, A. Raver, C. Rutherford, L. Steffen, L. Thetard, Y. Visser, J. Webster

I. Call to Order by Vice-Chair: P. Schoon called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes from October 7, 2014:

Motion to approve: A. Adkins

Second: S. Parry

Minutes were approved unanimously with no abstentions.

III. Subcommittee Reports

A. Curriculum: S. Parry reported the committee approved program revisions:

- **Art:** Teacher Ed sequence revised to add new course, ART 212, Teaching Art in the Digital Studio, and reducing the elective hours from 6 to 3.
- **Physics:** Teacher Ed sequence revised to add new 1 hour course, PHY 307, Seminar in Physics, and reduce PHY 107 from 2 hours to 1 hour
- **Family & Consumer Sciences:** Teacher Ed sequence changed core from FCS 101/103 to 100, 200 and 300, and removed the professional practice requirement
- **Chemistry:** changed major GPA requirement for Teacher Ed from 2.25 to 2.5
- **Business:** New elective BTE 365; Programming for mobile apps

None of the revisions affected total credit hours for these programs. The committee also discussed the Credit/No Credit option for student teaching. S. Parry strongly requested anyone with questions/concerns on this issue to contact her via email.

B. Student Interests: B. Edmonson reported the committee has been working on student teaching awards. Direction is needed from CTE as a whole since the essay (or performance) is based on the theoretical framework of Realizing the Democratic Ideal (RDI). The Initial and Final Reflective Essays are not requirements, but they are still part of ISU's standards. D. Garrahy noted that while CAEP is apparently not using RDI for assessment of our programs, the theoretical framework is still in place at ISU. A. Adkins

clarified that this essay/performance is an award and not a scholarship. The award can be postponed until the spring if the subcommittee wants to revisit the guidelines.

P. Schoon indicated that the subcommittee can examine the guidelines, make recommendations to CTE, and was urged to take that up in future meetings.

C. University Liaison and Faculty Interest: J. Manfredo reported the committee met and established a timeline for completion of reviewing the By-laws. They have both a 2008 and 2012 version from ISU and collected By-law examples from NIU, EIU, Ball State, and other peer institutions. The committee also began working on a timeline for the Spring Colloquium: where and when to have it and guest speakers.

D. Vision: D. Garrahy reported the committee will meet next Tuesday and examine the final version of the ISU/Unit 5 survey for clinical experiences to be sent out to all programs. Unit 5 is very pleased with it.

E. UTE Assessment: A. Adkins reported the committee met and has been reviewing the content and APT test scores from different programs. They identified some programs in need of assistance to present their data and guidelines for programs as they prepare ISBE reports due in December. Math TE documents were drafted earlier. Based on the response, the committee came up with language to share with other teacher education programs. ISBE will review reports internally.

IV. Information Items:

A. edTPA Update: E. Palmer provided a PowerPoint presentation highlighting several edTPA points pertaining to developing retake policies:

1. Roles of SCALE and PEARSON
2. Who the edTPA Scorers are
3. Scorer Training
4. Official Score Processing
5. Scaling up in Illinois
6. How to Begin with the edTPA Rubrics
7. Determining how many tasks a candidate must retake
8. Samples of edTPA score profiles
9. Flowcharts on different scenarios
10. Results

E. Palmer also provided an update as to where we currently are in assessing portfolios and provided retake strategies that will be put in place. Discussion centered primarily on retake options and when a student would need to do a one task retake versus a full retake. Several criteria have been developed to help make this determination and whether or not a teacher candidate may need a second student teaching placement. If the issue is with their video, students may go back to their video footage and use a portion they have not already submitted and redo that part of edTPA.

Another point of discussion was on how much scaffolding is being put into place in teacher education programs so that teacher candidates are better prepared for

completing their portfolio. Programs are encouraged to embed edTPA assignments and elements into the coursework so that student teaching is not the first time teacher candidates are aware of edTPA requirements. Discussion ensued. The edTPA PowerPoint presentation will be sent out to CTE members and teacher education faculty, coordinators, and advisors across campus.

B. edTPA Process Update: S. Parry reported that she and E. Palmer will be speaking with CAS teacher education faculty regarding edTPA on November 13. J. Rosenthal indicated he will be facilitating the meetings with the other teacher education programs. P. Schoon indicated that the Executive Committee determined to start from the ground up and see how each program views and receives feedback – shared governance at its best.

C. CAEP Update: What are we trying to accomplish in student teaching: A. Adkins reported that she attended the licensure board session by Stevie Chepko of CAEP. Main highlights of the session included:

1. A consistent message has been that any upcoming CAEP accreditation will be very different from prior NCATE type methods;
2. The agreement is not yet finalized but CAEP will likely give schools an option of individual program review (SPAs), along with university review or, a type of program review using data we have collected with feedback from CAEP; and
3. CAEP is looking at many fewer data points for review purposes. Previously, over 60 data points were collected and currently that number is looking to be closer to 8 points.
4. **Teacher Graduate Assessment Survey (TGA)** - D. Garrahy noted that her staff will be making reminder phone calls to Illinois State teacher education graduates, regarding the TGA. One of the data uses of TGA is for the CAEP Annual Report required of all member institutions.

D. CTE – Academic Senate Collaboration: P. Schoon reported that there has been interest from the Academic Senate on edTPA and its implementation. L. Eckrich is the Academic Senate liaison to the CTE. P. Schoon and A. Adkins have not been able to meet with the Academic Senate due to conflicts in schedules. An invitation has been extended to the Academic Senate Academic Affairs committee for the two bodies, CTE and Academic Senate, to meet to discuss history, context and future steps for edTPA implementation. To date, a response has not been received. CTE is generating an edTPA report, so that the Academic Senate is informed regarding this state licensure requirement. A draft of this report will be sent to CTE members. L. Eckrich will then deliver the report to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, prior to sending it to the entire Academic Senate.

VI. Discussion Items: None

VII. Action Items: None

VIII. Announcements and Last Comments:

A. Vice Chair: None

B. Chair: None

VIII. Adjournment: Motion to adjourn by A. Adkins
Second by S. Parry
CTE adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

Illinois State University
Council for Teacher Education
Tuesday, December 2, 2014, 2014, 3:00 p.m.-4:30 p.m.
DeGarmo Hall, Room 551

Minutes

Members Present: A. Adkins, M. Coleman, T. Davis, S. Doering, L. Eckrich, D. Garrahy, S. Hildebrandt, S. Jones-Bock, L. Kendall, M. Lin, J. Manfredo, T. Martin, M. Noraian, S. Parry, J. Rosenthal, P. Schoon, S. Semonis, L. Sutton, N. Uphold

Members Absent: E. Baker, A. Beaman, J. Brown, B. Edmonson, S. French, K. Hamann, B. Hatt, O. Landa-Vialard, K. Lopez, T. Lorsbach, K. Mountjoy, R. Seglem, M. Temple

Guests: K. Appel, J. Cheville, G. Higham, S. Hochstelter, N. Latham, L. Lienhart, E. Palmer, M. Parker, L. Steffen, L. Thetard, Y. Visser, J. Webster

I. Call to Order by Chair: P. Schoon called the meeting to order at 3:06 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes from November 18, 2014:

Prior to approval of the November 4, 2014 minutes, J. Cheville, L. Eckrich, and T. Martin had friendly amendments to the minutes:

J. Cheville noted on page 4, under Discussion response to edTPA: CAS had deliberations on edTPA for 7 months.

L. Eckrich indicated there needs to be a correction made to page 4, last paragraph, 5th line: "L. Eckrich suggested the minutes be sent to the secretary of the Academic Senate committee." Senate needs to be changed to Affairs.

L. Eckrich noted an amendment needs to be made to page 4, last paragraph, 6th line: "P. Schoon reiterated that he extended an invitation to the Senate executive committee to meet with the CTE executive board but the invitation was declined. L. Eckrich indicated it should read, "P. Schoon reiterated that he extended the invitation to the Academic Affairs secretary for the chair and the invitation was declined."

The minutes should read: L. Eckrich, Senate-at-Large representative to CTE, concurred with D. Garrahy that the report on edTPA at Academic Senate was very effective. L. Eckrich urged regular communication between CTE and Academic Senate's Academic Affairs committee to which CTE is supposed to report as an external committee of Academic Senate. D. Garrahy noted that Academic Affairs committee meetings are open meetings and she will attend them to help keep everyone informed. L. Eckrich suggested CTE minutes always be sent to the chairperson of the Academic Affairs committee. P. Schoon reiterated that he extended an invitation to the Chairperson of Academic Senate to meet with the CTE executive board but the invitation was declined (she teaches at that time).

T. Martin had an amendment to the Vision Committee report: The last couple of sentences are, "T. Martin had concerns from the Math Department. Discussion ensued."

T. Martin requested her specific question to the Vision Committee be recorded in the minutes, which was not intended to be limited to any mathematics department concern.

Suggested revision: "T. Martin raised the question of whether any feedback would be sought from ISU faculty regarding the effect of the revised Unit 5 clinical placement process on ISU courses with clinical components."

T. Martin raised the same question again at today's CTE meeting. She understands that D. Garrahy and her staff may not be ready to respond to the question because of the work involved in getting the survey up and running. But she would like to have the question recorded in the minutes, so that it may be revisited at an appropriate time.

P. Schoon stated the friendly amendments should be made to the minutes for accuracy. Motion to approve the minutes with the friendly amendments from November 18, 2014:
J. Rosenthal
Second: S. Parry

Amended minutes were approved unanimously with no abstentions.

P. Schoon requested any announcements be shared before the subcommittee reports.

Members:

1. M. Noraian:

- a) The committee has sent a request to programs asking for names for scholarships.
- b) ISU History department is co-sponsoring with Normal West Community High School Social Studies Career Night. This will take place on Tuesday, December 2, 2014 from 5:30-7:30 p.m. at Normal West High School.

2. D. Garrahy:

- a) The Lauby Center will be checking students who do not have a current Criminal Background Check, hopefully, next week or the week after. D. Garrahy is hoping that the numbers are much smaller. In fall 2014, there were 141 students who did not have a current Criminal Background Check and there were 40 in the spring.
- b) Pleased to share with CTE that Lynn Steffen has won the Distinguished Service Award. Congratulations Lynn! Your work on behalf of our programs and teacher candidates is outstanding and so glad that it is being acknowledged by our University!

III. Subcommittee Reports

A. Curriculum: No report. S. Parry indicated the committee will report by the 20th on its charge and the two curriculum proposals.

B. Student Interests: No report.

C. University Liaison and Faculty Interest: J. Manfredo reported the committee is working on the final revision on the CTE bylaws and today is the deadline. They hope to get the final document out this week.

D. Vision: D. Garrahy reported that they did not meet. However, Y. Visser and D. Garrahy have been working on the Unit 5 survey. Unit 5 is ecstatic about the survey with the data being reader friendly. December 11, 2015 is the date we should receive information back from Unit 5 with regard to the ISU courses accepted for spring 2015. The original date was December 9, 2015. Y. Visser, A. Jain, and D. Garrahy have been diligently looking at changes for the next survey. T. Martin asked if the survey would be going to the faculty. D. Garrahy replied that there have been no discussions yet. Y. Visser has been tracking data from the survey from a technical standpoint. D. Garrahy stated that it is a process to outline revisions. There will be a subsequent survey down the road. It has been beta-tested. P. Schoon added that not only have Y. Visser and D. Garrahy been working on the survey, but that it is a mammoth of a task. Dr. Daniel expressed interest in working with ISU and other partners to diversify the teacher pipeline. He is extremely interested in very early recruitment – before high school. A group of individuals will be brought together in the spring to talk about possible ideas.

E. UTE Assessment: No report.

IV. Information Items:

A. Induction and Mentoring Steering Committee: New Teacher Conference – K. Appel and N. Latham did a presentation of the Induction and Mentoring Steering Committee. The committee consists of: K. Appel, N. Latham, J. Donnel, M. Henninger, E. Palmer, A. Mustian, S. Mertens, J. Meadows, G. Jamison, D. Karraker, R. Shifflet, D. Yong-Park, K. Hamann, B. Weldy, and D. Wolf. The Committee has created Pinterest boards, Facebook page, and blogs. The new teacher conference was held 6/20/14 and the purpose is to strengthen connections with recent graduates. They provide support to beginning teachers to enhance effective practice. Ninety College of Education graduates who completed their 1st or 2nd year as teachers attended the conference. The graduates requested they extend the invitation for 3rd year teachers. There were over 25 faculty and staff that participated. They had session presenters and the graduates loved receiving bags of supplies. The conference also included lunchtime panel discussions and resource sharing. The keynote speaker was Esme Raji-Codell, author of *Educating Esme*. Comments from participants were very positive.

The New Teacher Conference this year will be held June 19, 2015. The conference this year was funded by the College of Education and a grant. There is no cost to participants and they are requesting financial support from other colleges. They also need committee members to join from K-12 and secondary programs. To encourage attendance, they also are requesting assistance in advertising. Online announcements and registration will be available in February. D. Schoon suggested the CTE members approach their deans and advocate for the students. D. Schoon also wanted to give a

big thank you to D. Layzell for her work in preparation for the conference. D. Layzell is no longer with the College of Education at Illinois State University.

B. Response to English Education Letter to the Academic Senate: Visit Update:

D. Garrahy reported that on November 5, 2014, she, L. Steffen, and E. Palmer represented CTE at the Academic Senate meeting. Senator Kalter received a letter from colleagues in the English Department. It was a 5 page letter. Some of the contents of the letter outlining English Education's issues with edTPA were shared. After reviewing the full letter, it was determined that CTE would draft a response letter. Since English Education's letter was the property of the English department, it was not appropriate to send to CTE members. When the minutes from the Senate were posted, there was hope of the English letter being attached. The CTE draft response addressed concerns raised by the English department, especially with regard to Pearson, the Race to the Top grant, and edTPA implementation. The draft of the CTE response used the same headings found in English Education's letter to the Senate and Academic Affairs. A. Adkins suggested that any concerns or issues related to edTPA be referred to E Palmer. D. Garrahy reminded CTE that the appendix in the draft of the CTE response letter, which was sent to CTE members, included a response by Superintendent C. Koch to a request by Chicago Area Deans and the Illinois Association of Deans of Public Colleges to postpone the implementation of edTPA. The response letter will be sent to the Academic Senate prior to its December 10, 2015 meeting.

Discussion: T. Martin noted that the Race to the Top portion of the letter also affected the Mathematics department since it involved a difficult timeline and considerable work.

J. Cheville, English department, stated that the intent of their letter was that it be shared with the public and urged D. Garrahy to send the letter out to the CTE committee members. Their submission of the letter, at the Senate's request, reflected programmatic concerns and they knew that these were beyond the scope of the Academic Senate and CTE and was the spirit with which she responded to it. She was under the impression that all teacher education programs were to respond with a letter regarding edTPA.

J. Rosenthal indicated that CTE and UCC are external committees and that the information discussed in both committees is well circulated. D. Garrahy reiterated that in the prior 17 months she has been Director, there have been no questions raised from Academic Senate regarding edTPA.

D. Garrahy noted that while several English Education faculty names were read at the 11/5/14 Senate meeting, with regard to their letter, the names did not appear in the approved Academic Senate minutes from 11/5/14. D. Garrahy's concern is that other teacher education programs were not solicited for comments and that is troublesome.

A. Adkins made a correction to the draft response letter. The letter says portfolio materials are kept confidentially for 2 years but it should read 4 years.

D. Garrahy will send the English department letter to CTE and asked members to review the letter and CTE's response letter. D. Garrahy requested any feedback be sent to her by Friday, December 5th at 2 p.m. The CTE response will then be sent to the Senate by

2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, December 9, 2014. Again, D. Garrahy reiterated some of the strengths of ISU with regard to edTPA:

- 1) Teacher Education has requested \$450,000 each year to fund portfolio review;
- 2) ISU is currently the only school in the state with a full time edTPA coordinator;
- 3) Other schools are not nearly as well prepared for implementation as ISU;
- 4) D. Layzell was the initial person providing edTPA support; E. Palmer's position as edTPA coordinator was a new position created.

L. Eckrich posed a question to the entire CTE committee regarding whether or not anyone is doing any research on edTPA. There were multiple responses indicating a great deal of research is on-going. For example, as a result of a research project, K. Appel and L. Sexton are now considered national experts in edTPA implementation. S. Hildebrandt has an article forthcoming.

T. Martin asked whether or not COE is considering offering a special education course since the number of students with disabilities seem to be more prevalent. D. Garrahy responded that currently there are no plans to add a course and M. Noraian added that it would pose an undue burden on Special Education to offer this. J. Rosenthal stated that most education students do not have many electives or open hours in their programs. J. Rosenthal mentioned that S. Jones-Bock has been very generous in accommodating requests. S. Jones-Bock indicated another option for SED 101 is online course modules available to departments. The modules are highly effective and state of the art. N. Latham responded that while it is a state requirement, many programs do not offer a dedicated course but instead infuse knowledge and concepts into their other courses.

A final discussion question was asked regarding the availability of somewhere on campus to have conversations about Secondary Education issues (such as infusing Special Education into existing programs). D. Garrahy intends to investigate this during the spring semester and that past COE conclaves were a result of trying to have secondary education programs meet to discuss their needs.

C. APT Update: A. Adkins reported that several emails have been circulating regarding the APT. ISBE will be meeting on December 2, 2014 and December 3, 2014 to approve recommendations for new cut scores for the APT. ISBE anticipates the cut scores to be delivered on December 12, 2014. Commencement is on December 13, 2014 and actual graduation is January 16, 2015. If on December 12, 2014, a student has not passed the APT test (and took it prior to October 28, 2014), she or he can take it again on December 28, 2014. The scores would be received on January 9, 2015 and the student could still graduate on January 16, 2015. There is a 60 day window from the first time to the 2nd time a student can take the test. The spring timeline will be similar to this. Students should check with their academic advisors for these dates when they are available from the testing center. The difference for spring is the cut scores will already be in place so that will not be an issue. Pearson has indicated that not all questions on the tests are scorable. They are constantly cycling in field test questions to explore reliability.

VI. Discussion Items: None

VII. Action Items: None

VIII. Announcements and Last Comments:

A. Vice Chair: None

B. Chair: None

C. Members:

1. D. Garrahy:

a) D. Garrahy and L. Steffen will be sending out Disposition Concerns Forms to all students who do not have a current Criminal Background Check and TB test on file during clinical experiences.

D. Garrahy also announced that L. Steffen has been awarded the Distinguished Service Award and will be celebrated on Founders Day. L. Steffen is very deserving of the award.

VIII. Adjournment: Motion to adjourn by A. Adkins
Second by S. Parry
CTE adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

**Illinois State University
Council for Teacher Education
Tuesday, January 20, 2015, 3:00 p.m.-4:30 p.m.
DeGarmo Hall, Room 551**

Minutes

Members Present: K. Austin, M. Coleman, C. Cullen, T. Davis, S. Doering, L. Eckrich, S. French, D. Garrahy, S. Hildebrandt, S. Jones-Bock, L. Kendall, O. Landa-Vialard, M. Lin, K. Lopez, J. Manfreda, K. Mountjoy, M. Noraian, S. Otto, S. Parry, P. Schoon, R. Seglem, S. Semonis, N. Uphold

Members Absent: A. Adkins, A. Beaman, J. Brown, K. Hamann, T. Lorsbach, J. Rosenthal, L. Sutton, M. Temple

Guests: A. Fritson-Coffman, C. Herald, P. Finnegan, G. Higham, B. Jacobsen, E. Palmer, M. Parker, J. Percell, L. Steffen, L. Thetard, Y. Visser, K. Walker-Smith, J. Webster

I. Call to Order by Chair: P. Schoon called the meeting to order at 3:06 p.m. He welcomed back all colleagues and stated there were a few new people to the Council for Teacher Education. He introduced Kristina Austin, a student representative from the English Department, who is a Bone Scholar nominee.

II. Approval of Minutes from December 2, 2014:

Motion to approve: S. Parry

Second: O. Landa-Vialard

Minutes were approved unanimously with one abstention.

III. Subcommittee Reports

A. Curriculum: S. Parry reported the approval of two courses:

1. IDS 274 Preparing the edTPA
2. Revision of Geology Major, Earth and Space Science sequence

The courses were approved by the CTE subcommittee.

S. Parry distributed a hand-out that included the response to a change to investigate whether student teaching should move from a graded experience to a credit/no credit experience. The committee met or received responses from several departments including English, Mathematics, and Kinesiology and Recreation, plus received informal responses from a wide variety of teachers, supervisors, and a principal. The majority of the people were not comfortable with making this change. The hand-out included the considerations (most of the information courtesy of Jon Rosenthal) and feedback. A question was raised regarding graduating with distinction in teacher education. Currently, that is not an option but students can be part of the Honors program and graduate with honors. Due to the outcome, the committee cannot bring a recommendation for a change to CTE. Individual programs may make their own choice. S. Parry noted that the comments and discussion points have been sent to S. Conner to be included with the minutes.

B. Student Interests: S. Doering reported students are still submitting their work and waiting on a couple of departments to nominate students for the Student Recognition of Excellence Award. L. Eckrich urged departments to submit the nominees to the committee as they do not have that many thus far.

C. University Liaison and Faculty Interest: J. Manfredo reported the committee completed the revisions on the CTE bylaws. They will be sent to the CTE executive committee next week. The Spring Colloquium will be held March 19, 2015 from 3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. at the Alumni Center in room 118. The committee’s meeting next week will be determining the refreshments, music, etc. They would like to have as many people there as possible and are asking CTE members to help publicize it.

D. Vision: D. Garrahy deferred it until later in the meeting.

E. UTE Assessment: No report.

IV. Information Items:

A. Mindful Reflections: Metcalf Teacher leaders share about PLCs that connect the Danielson Framework, edTPA, and National Board Architecture of Accomplished Teachers to reflect on their practice (Metcalf Colleagues): A. Fritson-Coffman, Principal at Metcalf introduced K. Walker-Smith, P. Finnegan, and G. Barke who presented their work on Mindful Reflection. A hand-out was distributed on the Metcalf Minutes Newsletter. The Newsletter contained National Board Core Propositions and edTPA rubrics. The focus was Planning and Preparation. When ISU clinical students come to Metcalf for observations, the newsletter is posted on their bulletin board and the students have access to it when they sign in. The documents and resources are the work of Deb Kasperski, Director, National Board Resource Center. L. Kendall is the administrator who designed the bulletin board.

K. Walker-Smith, a National Board Certified Teacher, did a presentation on National Board Development and enhanced Architecture of Accomplished Teaching (hand-out was distributed). K. Walker-Smith went to the State Board to learn the process to get more teachers on board. We have a local support system. There are currently 10 teachers from Metcalf and U-High working towards NBCT. L. Kendall is also a National Board Certified Teacher and Aggie Hatch is the National Board cohort/liason. Together they are helping teachers with their NBCT. There are 400 teachers in the State of Illinois working towards NBCT.

A. Fritson-Coffman and K. Walker-Smith noted they are using tools to create a mindful environment for both Metcalf and U-High teacher education candidates.

- School Improvement Plan – access teaching students (Danielson, NBCT, edTPA)
- Faculty late start – occurs once a month
- Good teaching practices
- Architecture of accomplished teaching – Danielson added in
- 9-month late start
 - Main focus – Differentiation Instruction
 - Sub-focus – NB Core Propositions
 - Pre-questions – forms to start reflective process

- Come to meeting with answers and share/learn from others with guided activities by a NB Team Leader
- Individuals, small groups, and whole faculty activities
- Collect data from forms and exit slips

A. Fritson-Coffman stated it is great to see what they are doing from their work.

P. Schoon added this is another example of great things in the lab schools.

B. Professional Development Hours and Cooperating Teachers: L. Steffen reported that until the summer of 2014, teachers were able to earn Continuing Professional Development hours (previously CPDUs and units) for supervising student teachers and pre-student teachers needed for renewal of their teaching licenses. ISBE has revised their requirements at that time for licensure renewal.

At a meeting of the State Educator Preparation and Licensure Board, it was stated that since institutions of higher education with an approved teacher education program are “approved providers” of Professional Development, we could award hours for supervision. Dr. Adkins made a very convincing argument that mentoring a pre-student teacher or student teacher can, in fact, enhance a teacher’s professional practice.

The Illinois Association of Colleges for Teacher Education unanimously passed a resolution at their Friday, October 17, 2014 meeting calling for the membership to award up to:

- 30 professional development hours for the supervision of a student teacher
- 12 professional development hours for the supervision of a pre-student teacher

This is to have consistency in awarding the PD hours and avoiding institutions getting into a “bidding war” for student teaching placements.

This will now be handled by the Teacher Education Center. This was previously handled by Conferencing Services, where 40 people signed off. Only D. Garrahy will be signing the Evidence of Completion forms (Form 77-21B). L. Steffen stated once they complete the activity, they only have 60 days to enter it in ELIS. For implementation at ISU, it is imperative to obtain guidance from CTE. L. Steffen also indicated there is specific paperwork we have to retain. She encouraged colleagues to email her and she will send the 1st form and identify what needs to be done. Discussion ensued.

P. Schoon indicated parameters will need to be sent by the Vision Committee. Any objections or concerns send to Vision Committee.

C. ISU & Unit 5 Clinical Experiences Survey Update: D. Garrahy reported on November 23, 2014, Unit 5 received ISU Teacher Education survey data analysis. Dr. Wilson sent our data to principals asking them to select and submit their ISU course preference to her. On December 10, 2014, Dr. Wilson compiled the Unit 5 requests and sent it to Dr. Garrahy on December 10, 2014.

- Dr. Wilson identified the Unit 5 schools/teachers who volunteered to work with ISU for the spring semester. Principals had access to all survey information including historical relationships and clinical descriptions submitted by ISU faculty via survey.
- Dr. Wilson assigned an ISU course/clinical to every Unit 5 teacher who requested one.
No Unit 5 teacher was denied a clinical student if they requested to participate.
- Dr. Wilson identified the number of ISU students the specific teacher would be able to accommodate.

Dr. Garrahy began notifying professors on December 11, 2014. She also provided the Unit 5 school, teacher, and number of spots assigned to that clinical.

- Dr. Garrahy responded to any professor who had a question/concern (email or phone).
- Any questions that needed to be forwarded to Dr. Wilson were sent.
- Dr. Garrahy sent any questions from principals and Dr. Wilson to the appropriate source.

On December 16, 2014, Dr. Garrahy in phone conversation with Dr. Wilson requested more clinical opportunities for ISU, specifically for TCH (the largest program on campus). Dr. Wilson sent out a second call to principals seeking additional Unit 5 teachers. Her second request was sent out prior to the holiday break.

For whatever reason, not as many Unit 5 teachers/schools signed up in December. Unit 5 and ISU offices closed on December 23, 2014 and re-opened on January 5, 2015. Dr. Garrahy met with Dr. Wilson on January 7, 2015 at Unit 5 offices to review data and seek additional opportunities for ISU Teacher Education. On January 12, 2015, Dr. Wilson has added more Unit 5 teachers as a result of the second call. Dr. Garrahy informed appropriate faculty. Many ISU courses have clinicals where the entire class goes on site as a class. This is difficult for Unit 5 schools to accommodate. There are many changes going on in schools that would prevent this type of accommodation.

The Vision Committee will be working on the survey for fall and summer 2015. The Executive Board meeting is on February 2, 2015 and they will come up with a priority list. R. Seglem asked if they can loosen diversity hours as they would obtain their 20 diversity hours in Unit 5. M. Noraian stated they use Peoria/Springfield for History. Discussion ensued. This will be a topic for the Vision Committee.

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

J. Rosenthal, E. Palmer, and S. Parry worked on worst case possible scenarios. The options are or could be:

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

A. Adkins emailed Jason Helfner regarding program completion.

edTPA policy course was approved by the CTE Curriculum Committee and is being piloted in Business Teacher Education where it has been very successful. T. Davis and E. Palmer indicated it has been going well. They will be working with Y. Visser to create on-line modules. S. Parry strongly suggested to the CTE to discuss this information with their colleagues and relay questions or concerns.

VI. Discussion Items: None

VII. Action Items: None

VIII. Announcements and Last Comments:

A. Vice Chair: None

B. Chair: P. Schoon welcomed the new committee members:

- Stacy Otto, EAF faculty member
- Kristina Austin, ENG

C. Members: None

IX. Adjournment: Motion to adjourn by S. Parry
Second by M. Coleman
CTE adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

**Illinois State University
Council for Teacher Education
Tuesday, February 3, 2015, 3:00 p.m.-4:30 p.m.
DeGarmo Hall, Room 551**

Minutes

Members Present: A. Adkins, K. Austin, A. Beaman, M. Coleman, T. Davis, S. Doering, L. Eckrich, S. French, K. Hamann, S. Hildebrandt, L. Kendall, O. Landa-Vialard, M. Lin, K. Lopez, T. Lorschach, K. Mountjoy, M. Noraian, S. Otto, S. Parry, J. Rosenthal, R. Seglem, S. Semonis, L. Sutton, N. Uphold

Members Absent: J. Brown, C. Cullen, D. Garrahy, S. Jones-Bock, J. Manfredo, P. Schoon, M. Temple

Guests: B. Jacobsen, E. Palmer, M. Parker, L. Steffen, L. Thetard, J. Webster

I. Call to Order by Vice Chair: S. Parry called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes from January 20, 2015:

Motion to approve: A. Adkins

Second: J. Rosenthal

Minutes were approved unanimously with no abstentions.

III. Subcommittee Reports

A. Curriculum: S. Parry reported the approval of five curriculum proposals that do not require a CTE vote:

1. *History/Social Sciences Ed Student Teaching & Licensure Lab – Course 391*; change in requirement for sequence; adding 1 hour course – edTPA part of topics.
2. *Topics in German Language, Literature, and Culture*; new course added to obtain a larger mass of students.
3. Introduction to English Education – Course 194; revision program proposal titled *English Education Sequence*. Courses were deleted that are no longer in the catalogue; reduction of hours from 9 hours to 6 hours.
4. *History 100 – Introduction to History*; change in requirements for sequence.
5. *Revision of History Teacher Education*; program to include HIS 100 and 391.

Completion of other proposals was tabled until more information is gathered.

B. Student Interests: M. Noraian reported the committee is still working on student awards. They have received nineteen applications that include essays and lesson plans on environment, in addition to Realizing the Democratic Ideal. There are eight faculty members delegated to review the applications. The award will not be given at Founders Day this year. The President's Office has been notified.

C. University Liaison and Faculty Interest: S. Hildebrandt reported the committee had two orders to complete:

- 1) CTE Bylaws
- 2) Spring 2015 Colloquium

The committee has finished their work on the Bylaws and sent them to the Executive Committee.

Celebration of edTPA is the theme for the Colloquium. “Save the Dates” were distributed to the members of CTE. An evite will be up and coming so please look at it. Due to an outside company address, the evite may go into “junk” mail. The date is Thursday, March 19, 2015 from 3:30 – 5:00 in Room 118 at the Alumni Center. Finger foods/cash bar will be provided. J. Manfredo will have a jazz/combo for background music. A guest speaker and skyping with colleagues from Stanford on edTPA will be featured. They would like to start publicity now with an RSVP by 3/4/15. The committee is working on a title for the Spring Colloquium and welcomes any suggestions.

D. Vision: M. Coleman reported that the Vision committee met last week with S. Wilson from Unit 5 to discuss her perspective on use of the survey for placing clinical placements. It was a learning experience and very helpful. It was determined that it is very difficult to accommodate full classes. The challenges occur when courses such as TCH 219 are trying to accommodate multiple student majors and having dates spanning the entire semester. Y. Visser was present from a technology standpoint. She is building the survey and committed to making it work. The meeting was very collaborative and it was helpful to hear perspectives from both ISU and Unit 5.

E. UTE Assessment: A. Adkins reported the UTEAC has changed their meetings to Tuesday mornings so D. Garrahy can attend as CAEP accreditation is coming up. They are resurrecting the disposition concerns issue that was temporarily put on hold.

IV. Information Items:

A. Catalog Changes: S. Parry reported that an Academic Senator has suggested changes to the catalog regarding COE Gateways and edTPA information. The Executive Board will refer this information to the Curriculum Committee.

V. Discussion Items:

A. edTPA

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

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

Communication with ISBE's Jason Helfner **approves** the following:

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

Therefore, departments will determine options for candidates:

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

S. Parry stated that creating a new sequence/major will be up to individual programs, and not for CTE to determine. A. Adkins strongly suggested that college representatives from CTE take the message to their respective programs. Some programs have separate majors, others do not. J. Rosenthal stated that it is highly recommended to create a sequence and not a new major. Creating a sequence is handled on campus and takes less time. T. Lorschbach added that it is perfect timing for them to create an International degree.

L. Eckrich asked how the implication would affect statewide stipulations, specifically could a student get a non-licensure degree here and then go to another state and become licensed. J. Rosenthal stated they would work closely with the Registrar's Office and ISBE on this to not have unintended consequences and that there could be unforeseen circumstances.

L. Steffen added if the candidate demonstrates coursework and has the stipulations in support, this allows the candidate's degree to be more transportable.

J. Webster will not entitle them before they have completed their undergraduate program.

After completing a first degree, a student could return for entitlement only. L. Steffen gets a form sent to her on occasion for master's programs to see if the student has completed an approved program.

2) Guidelines for Re-take Support: A. Adkins referred to the handout already distributed which includes information from a previous presentation by E. Palmer on guidelines for re-takes of edTPA.

- **3.B.1** – Task Analysis
 - Fails more than one task = complete retake, most likely requires new placement
- **3.B.2** – Unless within 3 points of passing
 - 2ndary analysis to identify a task for resubmission
- **5** – Mentoring for retake

- Resources yet to be determined
- Most likely, full cost recovery from IDS 274: Preparing for the edTPA
- **More** than one retake?
 - Pending department approval

Item **3.B.2** indicates a student should find a task to re-submit since they are very close to passing. Hopefully, this is a task that does not require a placement because they should have oversampled on their data collection. In addressing **Item 5**, A. Adkins noted that the revenue from the edTPA preparation course may be able to pay for mentorship. The procedure to deal with the situation of more than one re-take needed is still being discussed. The University is committed to assisting with one re-take and will consult with departments/schools on a second re-take. E. Palmer stated that the procedure may be similar to when a student wants to re-take a course for a third time which requires department/school approval. R. Seglem asked about a situation where the video is good but the write up is bad. The response is that they must use new video that has not already been submitted. L. Eckrich asked about the timeline for re-takes. A. Adkins stated there is an approximate four-month window available in order to make the next graduation cycle. K. Hamann asked about the difficulty for a student in identifying “good” video for re-submission. A. Adkins replied the video simply has to be “good enough” in terms of showing student engagement. E. Palmer noted that last fall ISU had an 83% pass rate and all of the non-passers were just 1 task re-takes. A question was posed as to how Pearson handles re-takes. E. Palmer stated there is a re-take submission process in place. Guidelines exist as to what has to be re-submitted and the cost is \$100.00 per task. Scoring schedules exist for re-takes also and these are coordinated by E. Palmer’s office. Scorers do not know they are scoring a re-take.

A. Adkins advised that these two items (Program Completion and Re-Take Guidelines) will be action items at the next CTE meeting. Information on these items was sent with the agenda. S. Parry reminded everyone that any questions should be directed to the edTPA working group (D. Schoon, S. Parry, A. Adkins, J. Rosenthal, D. Garrahy and E. Palmer). College representatives were strongly urged to help engage and educate their constituents about this process. L. Eckrich asked about graduation for non-passers. J. Rosenthal responded that a non-passer cannot graduate until they pass but they can walk. A window exists between commencement and graduation and a non-passer could potentially finish in time to make that cycle.

B. CTE Bylaws: S. Hildebrandt stated the committee revising the bylaws used the 2008 Bylaws and the 2012 Bylaw document that never was fully implemented. The revisions included:

- Two new sub-committees were added – Vision and UTEAC
- Objectives and membership of all committees were updated
- Vocabulary reflecting CAEP language was implemented and consistently applied
- CTE Review Board (TERB) procedures were eliminated in the new Bylaws

A student appeal is usually due to student progress being stopped because of three unresolved dispositions. The process has been that a student appeals, and then meets with D. Garrahy who explains the process. Next, the Teacher Review

Board (TERB) looks at the materials from the student and the department's response and then rules for either the student or to uphold the stoppage of progress. If a student disagrees with this decision he or she can then appeal to the entire CTE. This is often an emotional appeal which can sway CTE. University Legal Counsel has recommended that the appeal process be taken out of the Bylaws because the entire process is too cumbersome and litigious. In 2012, Legal Counsel recommended that the student meet with TERB instead. Once a decision is made, a student can only appeal to the full CTE on procedural grounds. It should be noted that this change to the student appeals process was included in the 2012 version of the Bylaws but due to oversight, was not fully approved and implemented. This change to the Bylaws will separate the Bylaws from the appeal process. S. Parry thanked the University Liaison and Faculty Interest sub-committee for all of their hard work on this.

VII. Action Items: None

VIII. Announcements and Last Comments:

A. Vice Chair: S. Parry reminded the CTE that their next meeting would be a closed session due to an appeal by a student. A closed session means the meeting is restricted to voting members only. Materials regarding the appeal will be sent distributed to CTE members.

There are several possible action items for the next meeting as well (see minutes regarding edTPA Program Completion and Re-takes). These are time-sensitive due to a desire to get them passed and on to the Academic Senate during this school year.

Lastly, the Bylaws would be sent to members so they can be voted upon.

B. Members: E. Palmer announced that the edTPA preparation course has been approved and will be offered this summer as a 6-week course.

IX. Adjournment: Motion to adjourn by A. Adkins
Second by S. Otto
CTE adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

**Illinois State University
Council for Teacher Education
Tuesday, March 3, 2015, 3:00 p.m.-4:30 p.m.
DeGarmo Hall, Room 551**

Minutes

Members Present: A. Adkins, K. Austin, M. Coleman, C. Cullen, T. Davis, S. Doering, L. Eckrich, S. French, D. Garrahy, S. Jones-Bock, M. Lin, T. Lorsbach, J. Manfredo, K. Mountjoy, M. Noraian, S. Otto, J. Rosenthal, P. Schoon, S. Semonis, N. Uphold

Members Absent: A. Beaman, J. Brown, C. Cullen, D. Garrahy, K. Hamann, S. Hildebrandt, S. Jones-Bock, L. Kendall, O. Landa-Vialard, K. Lopez, S. Parry, R. Seglem, L. Sutton, M. Temple, D. Wilson

Guests: G. Higham, B. Jacobsen, E. Palmer, A. Raver, C. Rutherford, L. Steffen, Y. Visser, J. Webster

I. Call to Order by Vice Chair: P. Schoon called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes from February 3, 2015:

Motion to approve: A. Adkins

Second: J. Rosenthal

Minutes were approved unanimously with one abstention.

III. Subcommittee Reports

A. Curriculum: No report

B. Student Interests: M. Noraian reported the committee continued reviewing the scholarship award applications. They had two rounds of review of the lesson plan/essay for each applicant. They are meeting after spring break and hope to have three winners confirmed and will bring to CTE. M. Noraian added they had 19 good applications.

C. University Liaison and Faculty Interest: J. Manfredo reported the committee has completed the logistics for the CTE Spring Colloquium. It will be held March 19, 2015 from 3:30 – 5:00 p.m. at the Alumni Center 118. They will have catering from 3:30 – 4:15 (finger foods, coffee, iced tea, water and a cash bar). Speakers will be from 4:15 – 5:00 and include the Executive Director of SCALE and Chelsea Pruitt – an ISU alum who will discuss the positive impact that edTPA has had on her career. Evites have been sent out to everyone and the committee is asking people to help promote the event.

D. Vision: D. Garrahy reported that the Vision committee met last week. By the end of this week, faculty and Directors who completed the initial Unit 5 survey will receive an open ended survey requesting their feedback. A new survey is being developed to be sent out in the summer and spring. The committee is also working on criteria regarding professional development hours for cooperating teachers who host clinical students. We are allowing up to 30 hours for student teaching and up to 12 hours for clinicals. The Vision Committee will be establishing a policy for determining the number of hours to grant for each clinical experience.

E. UTE Assessment: A. Adkins reported the UTEAC met last week. They are reviewing the Professional Education Disposition Assessments (PEDA) which will complement the

current Student Disposition Concerns system. They are building descriptors for each professional disposition, drawing from Charlotte Danielson's framework. The committee is hoping to make a recommendation to CTE and to pilot next year with select programs.

IV. Information Items: None

V. Discussion Items:

A. CTE Bylaws – Review of proposed revisions: J. Manfredo stated that the committee reviewed the 2008 and 2012 versions of the Bylaws. Most of the changes were formatting and consistency of language throughout. The Bylaws from 2008 showed there were 3 sub-committees. This was changed to five sub-committees. The proposed edits and a chart summarizing the changes were sent to all CTE members. The three-column Bylaw chart shows the 2008 “official” version, the 2012 membership changes and the proposed updates. D. Garrahy reiterated that former Dean D. Curtis sent a letter to Academic Senate on February 17, 2011. Chairs of EAF, SED and TCH became ex-officios. P. Schoon and D. Garrahy met with the chair of Academic Senate, Dan Holland and shared that the 2012 version was approved by the Academic Senate on 10/24/12, but never appeared in an amended document.

J. Manfredo proposed that the CTE go through the chart, page by page, to go over the changes and ask questions or voice concerns.

- **Page 1, Article 1:** *no questions/concerns*
- **Page 2, Article III:** clarification of total number of members, representation, voting and overall eligibility - *no questions/concerns*
- **Page 3, Article III:** *no questions/concerns*
- **Page 4, Article IV:** *no questions/concerns*
- **Pages 5 – 8, Article V:** reflect the change from 3 to 5 subcommittees, adding Vision and UTEAC. A. Adkins noted that the committee realignment was done to prepare for NCATE Accreditation. D. Garrahy noted that the “Student Concerns” subcommittee was changed to “Student Interests” subcommittee to better reflect the purpose of the committee. Also, CECP (Clinical Experiences and Certification Processes) was changed to CELP (Clinical Experiences and Licensure Processes) to reflect the change from “certification” to “licensure”. *No questions/concerns*
- **Page 9, Article V:** *no questions/concerns*
- **Page 10-14, Article VI/VII/VIII:** removes TERB information from the Bylaws since TERB is a separate document and not a part of the Bylaws. Y. Visser asked if some kind of annual report should be generated. D. Garrahy responded that we actually do an annual report that has been in place for years and it is posted on the Provost's website. The Dean presents the annual report at Budget meetings. J. Manfredo noted that Article II, Section 3 already addresses the notion of annual reports, also. P. Schoon reminded CTE that nothing has changed from the TERB process; instead it just

goes into a separate document. D. Garrahy added that this was shared with Dan Holland, then Chair of Academic Senate and recommended by University Legal Counsel. J. Rosenthal suggested preparing a summary of changes with a cover letter, including committee membership, before the document goes to the Senate to help expedite the process. M. Noraian asked if the TERB document and Bylaw changes could be presented at the same time to the Senate.
No questions/concerns

- **Page 14, Article VIII:** states that the proposed review process has changed from every 2 years to every 5 years to correspond with Senate reviews. D. Garrahy commented on the make-up of the Executive Board. Specifically, on page 4, the Executive Board now includes the Lauby Center director and she chairs the Vision subcommittee. M. Noraian asked about the membership and was referred to page 2.

P. Schoon thanked J. Manfredo, his committee and D. Garrahy for all their hard work on this document. He suggested that this will likely come to a vote at one of the next two CTE meetings.

B. CAEP

1. Pathways: D. Garrahy and A. Adkins have set up meetings with various faculty groups (both graduate and undergraduate) on March 4th, March 18th, and March 20th to discuss CAEP pathway options. The link for the Pathways is:

<http://caepnet.org/accreditation/quick-guides-to-the-pathways/>

A hand-out was distributed outlining the options. The three options are:

- i. Selected Improvement Pathway** - formerly Continuous Improvement Pathway, changed by CAEP on 2/3/15. This pathway allows the provider (ISU Teacher Ed) to focus on its own improvement. The Provider selects a standard(s) on which we want to focus on for our next accreditation visit (p.1)
- ii. Inquiry Brief** - includes a research project, in addition to how we meet each standard
- iii. Transformational Initiative** – rigorous research investigation similar to format of dissertation in addition to how we meet each standard.

This will be a decision that CTE makes on behalf of the university (the unit). *Regardless of the chosen pathway, ISU must provide evidence that it meets all CAEP standards.*

P. Schoon reiterated that no matter which pathway we choose, the outcome is the same. ISU will get accredited; however, it does not get any additional types of recognition. M. Noraian asked if individual programs can pursue other pathways and the response was “no”. D. Garrahy recommended the Selected Improvement Pathway as the most viable for the type of university that we are. P. Schoon asked the members if anyone felt we should go to a different option than Selected Improvement Pathway and there were no comments.

2. Program Review with Feedback: D. Garrahy distributed a hand-out outlining the three CAEP Program Review Options. Programs will have the option to choose the one that best fits their program (retrieved 3/1/15, pp. 31-32: https://caepnet.files.wordpress.com/2015/03/caep_accreditation_manual.pdf).

- ***Program Review with Feedback:*** The process by which CAEP assesses the quality of programs offered by an educator preparation provider (EPP). Specialty program areas are reviewed individually in clusters) cross-grade programs, secondary programs, and other school professionals) against state-selected standards. This review results in feedback for stated, EPPS, and site visitors as the accreditation visit is conducted.
- ***Program Review with National Recognition:*** The process by which CAEP, in collaboration with its specialized professional associations (SPAs), assesses the quality of programs offered by educator preparation providers (EPPs). EPPs that select this program review option are required to submit their programs for review by SPAs as part of the accreditation process unless otherwise specified by the state partnership agreement with CAEP.
- ***State Program Review:*** The process by which a state governmental agency reviews a professional education program to determine if it meets the state's standards for the preparation *of* school personnel.

The options provide each program with some flexibility. Programs that have SPAs and want national recognition might opt for **#2 – Program Review with National Recognition**.

A. Adkins indicated that a State Program Review is like National Recognition, but with the State using state programs and a state agency conducting the review. P. Schoon noted that CAEP is ever evolving. Programs will need to decide if national recognition is needed by them or not. S. Otto stated OK is a SPA state and feels some programs use national recognition in terms of helping graduates get jobs. L. Steffen added most employers will not know the difference if they have national recognition or not, nor do most students know whether or not their program is accredited. CAEP allows this flexibility of deciding what level of program review is used whereas NCATE did not. B. Jacobsen asked if having national recognition helps with the recruitment of students. D. Garrahy indicated it is supposed to with licensure reciprocity across state lines. L. Steffen added that our transcripts indicate “NCATE approved program”, not “National Recognition”. K. Austin explained from a student’s perspective that the terminology is new to her but would definitely pay attention since moving out of state could pose implications. J. Rosenthal informed the committee that U of I does not do accreditation and it has not hurt their recruitment of students. D. Garrahy indicated CAEP is looking at annual reports from institutions and incorporating their feedback. ISU’s last accreditation used the Program Review with National Recognition model so we are actually familiar with that format. L. Steffen said we previously did National Recognition and State somewhat simultaneously.

3. Program Review with National Recognition: See Discussion in B. 2.

VI. Action Items

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

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

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

Motion made by A. Adkins: CTE acknowledges three options available to programs for candidates who do not fulfill licensure requirements:

- 1) IDS option (Human and Educational Services sequence);
- 2) non-teacher education sequence/major;
- 3) create a new sequence in their major (for example: French: pedagogy emphasis).

Friendly amendment (J. Rosenthal): it would be an “appropriate non-teacher education major”. Accepted by A. Adkins.

Second: M. Noraian

Sara Semonis raised the question if any of these options include student teaching? A. Adkins indicated it is up to individual programs to structure their sequence.

Motion passed unanimously 19-0.

B. edTPA: Guidelines for Retake (A. Adkins): Tabled due to time constraints

VII. Announcements and Last Comments:

A. Vice Chair: None

B. Members: None

VIII. Adjournment: Motion to adjourn by A. Adkins
Second by D. Garrahy
CTE adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

**Illinois State University
Council for Teacher Education
Tuesday, March 17, 2015, 3:00 p.m.-4:30 p.m.
DeGarmo Hall, Room 551**

Minutes

Members Present: A. Adkins, C. Cullen, S. Doering, L. Eckrich, S. French, D. Garrahy, S. Hildebrandt, S. Jones-Bock, L. Kendall, M. Lin, K. Lopez, T. Lorsbach, J. Manfredo, K. Mountjoy, S. Otto, S. Parry, J. Rosenthal, P. Schoon, R. Seglem, S. Semonis, L. Sutton, N. Uphold

Members Absent: K. Austin, A. Beaman, M. Coleman, T. Davis, K. Hamann, M. Henninger, O. Landa-Vialard, M. Noraian, D. Wilson

Guests: C. DeSantis, K. Grimes, G. Higham, E. Palmer, M. Parker, C. Rutherford, L. Steffen, L. Thetard

I. Call to Order by Chair: P. Schoon called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes from February 3, 2015:

Motion to approve: A. Adkins

Second: S. Parry

Minutes were approved unanimously with no abstentions.

III. Subcommittee Reports

A. Curriculum: No report

B. Student Interests: No report

C. University Liaison and Faculty Interest: J. Manfredo reported the Spring Colloquium is Thursday, March 19, 2015 at the Alumni Center 118 from 3:30 – 5:00. Program begins at 4:15 with several guest speakers. S. Hildebrandt sent out Evites and catering has been ordered.

D. Vision: D. Garrahy reported that the Vision committee did not meet last week. They have received feedback from the coordinators who completed the Unit 5 clinical survey. The deadline for feedback closes tomorrow at 4:30 p.m. The committee will be reviewing the proposed survey in the next couple of days so that it can be sent out for fall/summer 2015.

E. UTE Assessment: No report

IV. Information Items: D. Garrahy reported that D. Garrahy and A. Adkins have met with the first half of the teacher education programs regarding the options for the CAEP pathways which best fit their program. They are meeting with the other half of the teacher education programs tomorrow. The three options are:

a. Selected Improvement Pathway - formerly Continuous Improvement Pathway, changed by CAEP on 2/3/15. This pathway allows the provider (ISU Teacher Ed) to focus on its

own improvement. The Provider selects a standard(s) on which to focus for the next accreditation visit (p.1)

- b. **Inquiry Brief** - includes a research project, in addition to how we meet each standard
- c. **Transformational Initiative** – rigorous research investigation similar to format of a dissertation in addition to showing how we meet each standard.

We are waiting on the state to sign a partnership with CAEP. ISBE has informed us that it is on the Assistant Superintendent's desk. Before we can move forward, we have to wait to hear from ISBE. D. Garrahy reiterated that regardless of the chosen pathway, ISU *must* provide evidence that it meets all CAEP standards.

V. Discussion Items: None

VI. Action Items

A. edTPA guidelines for retake: A. Adkins reminded everyone that a hand-out was distributed at the last CTE meeting for edTPA retakes. The procedures for re-takes have been determined. The initial edTPA portfolio analysis criteria:

- a. Candidate must have at least three “3”s or higher within each task.
- b. There can only be one “1” within a task.
- c. The composite score for a task must be a 12 or higher.

If a task fails any of these 3 criteria, the candidate must retake that task. If the candidate fails more than one task, he or she must redo the entire edTPA portfolio; unless he or she is within 3 points of passing.

If a candidate who is determined to be a full retake based on the initial analysis is within 3 points of passing, a second portfolio analysis will be performed. The criteria for a secondary portfolio is:

- a. Is there a task in which the candidate has no “3”s?
 - 1. One task meets this criterion: Single retake of this task
 - 2. More than one task meets this criterion: Move to “b”
 - 3. No task meets this criterion: Move to “b”
- b. Is there a task that scored lower than the other tasks?
 - 1. One task meets this criterion; Single retake of this task
 - 2. More than one task meets this criterion: Move to “c”
 - 2. No task meets this criterion: Move to “c”
- c. Is there a task that the candidate could complete without an additional student teaching placement?
 - 1. One task meets this criterion: Single retake of this task
 - 2. More than one task meets this criterion: Move to “d”
 - 3. No task meets this criterion: Move to “d”
- d. Candidate can choose what task to retake.

A. Adkins motioned to pass final documentation on edTPA retake.

Discussion: N. Uphold asked unless it specifically states a mentor, can we assume it is up to the department to choose a mentor? A. Adkins indicated she was hesitant to answer.

A. Adkins assured the committee that mentors will be determined in a manner fair to all

programs and departments.

Motion passed: 19 yes, 0 no

Motion to approve final documentation on edTPA retake – approved unanimously.

A. Adkins	Yes
C. Cullen	Yes
S. Doering	Yes
L. Eckrich	Yes
S. French	Yes
D. Garrahy	Yes
S. Hildebrandt	Yes
L. Kendall	Yes
M. Lin	Yes
K. Lopez	Yes
J. Manfredo	Yes
K. Mountjoy	Yes
S. Otto	Yes
S. Parry	Yes
J. Rosenthal	Yes
P. Schoon	Yes
R. Seglem	Yes
S. Semonis	Yes
N. Uphold	Yes

B. CAEP Accreditation Pathway selection: D. Garrahy reminded that at the last meeting there were three options for the CAEP Accreditation Pathway selection. Regardless of the pathway, each option submits evidence on each of the CAEP standards:

1. Selected Improvement Pathway – this pathway allows ISU Teacher Ed to focus on its own improvement. ISU would select a standard on which we want to focus our next accreditation visit
2. Inquiry Brief – major research, research monograph; report in same format as dissertation or manuscript to refereed publication
3. Transformational Initiative – rigorous research similar to a dissertation; research adds significantly to the field

D. Garrahy motioned to pass Selected Improvement Pathway.

Second: A. Adkins

Motion passed: 19 yes, 0 no

Motion to approve Selected Improvement Pathway for CAEP - approved unanimously.

A. Adkins	Yes
C. Cullen	Yes
S. Doering	Yes
L. Eckrich	Yes
S. French	Yes
D. Garrahy	Yes
S. Hildebrandt	Yes
L. Kendall	Yes
M. Lin	Yes
K. Lopez	Yes

J. Manfredo	Yes
K. Mountjoy	Yes
S. Otto	Yes
S. Parry	Yes
J. Rosenthal	Yes
P. Schoon	Yes
R. Seglem	Yes
S. Semonis	Yes
N. Uphold	Yes

C. CTE Bylaws revision: J. Manfredo motioned to approve CTE Bylaws revision.

Second: S. Bock-Jones

Discussion: L. Eckrich asked for clarification of the process of the next step for the CTE Bylaws. The answer was the Bylaws go to the rules committee /Senate Executive Committee.

Motion passed: 18 yes, 1 no

Motion to approve CTE Bylaws revision - approved unanimously

A. Adkins	Yes
C. Cullen	Yes
S. Doering	Yes
S. French	Yes
D. Garrahy	Yes
S. Hildebrandt	Yes
L. Kendall	Yes
M. Lin	Yes
K. Lopez	Yes
J. Manfredo	Yes
K. Mountjoy	Yes
S. Otto	Yes
S. Parry	Yes
J. Rosenthal	Yes
P. Schoon	Yes
R. Seglem	Yes
S. Semonis	Yes
N. Uphold	Yes

L. Eckrich	No
------------	----

VII. Announcements and Last Comments:

A. Vice Chair: None

B. Members:

1. D. Garrahy wanted to remind everyone that CTE scholarships deadline is soon.

D. Garrahy indicated that in the past, University Liaison and Faculty Interests and Vision committee members have assisted in reviewing the applications. Last year, in addition to

the two committees, D. Garrahy invited any CTE member to assist in the review. She made the same request for 2015. CTE faculty members able to assist in the review process would be greatly appreciated. The applications are submitted online. A. Adkins mentioned it was not a cumbersome process.

N. Uphold asked what the approximate time frame is? D. Garrahy indicated the review of the materials will begin after the March 31st submission deadline date. A. Adkins added it will then go for CTE review and then down to the individual departments.

VIII. Adjournment: Motion to adjourn by A. Adkins

Second by S. Parry

CTE adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

**Illinois State University
Council for Teacher Education
Tuesday, April 7, 2015, 3:00 p.m.-4:30 p.m.
DeGarmo Hall, Room 551**

Minutes

Members Present: A. Adkins, K. Austin, M. Coleman, C. Cullen, S. Doering, L. Eckrich, S. French, D. Garrahy, K. Hamann, M. Henninger, S. Hildebrandt, L. Kendall, M. Lin, T. Lorsbach, J. Manfredo, K. Mountjoy, M. Noraian, S. Parry, J. Rosenthal, P. Schoon, R. Seglem, S. Semonis, L. Sutton

Members Absent: A. Beaman, T. Davis, S. Jones-Bock, O. Landa-Vialard, K. Lopez, S. Otto, M. Temple, N. Uphold, D. Wilson

Guests: K. Harding, G. Higham, B. Jacobsen, E. Palmer, M. Parker, C. Rutherford, L. Steffen, L. Thetard, Y. Visser

I. Call to Order by Chair: P. Schoon called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m. and announced M. Henninger from KNR (CAST) is replacing J. Brown and welcomed her to CTE.

II. Approval of Minutes from March 17, 2015:

Motion to approve: A. Adkins

Second: S. Parry

Minutes were approved unanimously with no abstentions.

III. Subcommittee Reports

A. Curriculum: S. Parry reported the CTE Curriculum Committee met on Tuesday, March 24, as requested by the CTE, to discuss suggested changes to the catalog copy for 2015 and 2016-18. After much discussion, the committee decided to reject the suggested changes and to keep graduation and licensure coupled as it currently is in the catalog. Because the assessment (edTPA) is to be completed as part of Gateway 3, it should be tied to graduation.

The Lauby Center should make sure that the list of approved programs is up to date.

S. Parry reiterated the departments currently have three options for students to consider which have been approved by the full CTE:

- 1) retake all or part of it, depending on the score;
- 2) switch to a non-teaching major (this really applies mostly to secondary); or
- 3) switch to a major in Interdisciplinary Studies, Education and Human Services sequence.

Secondary programs could also consider creating an Education focus sequence for students who don't want to take more time to complete extra requirements for a nonteaching major. However, this would be up to each program.

B. Student Interests: M. Noraian reported the Student Interests committee has been meeting regularly and reviewing students' submissions for the student essay contest. The committee

brought a new look to CTE focusing on English Language Learners on Ecology and Environment, that includes a lesson plan. Most programs submitted nominations. The committee gave awards to one student from the Math department, one student from the School of Theatre department, and one student from the English department. One of the students happens to be on CTE. M. Noraian stated the committee appreciates the support of faculty. The students and their respective programs were notified. The committee felt it was extremely important to notify the programs as this was not the procedure in the past. The committee received positive feedback on the new process.

C. University Liaison and Faculty Interest: J. Manfredo reported the committee finalized the CTE Bylaws and passed them onto the CTE Executive Committee for final review (e.g. proof reading of the document).

For the scholarship review, there will be a members training session the latter part of today for non-students. K. Grimes will be conducting the training session. The committee would appreciate any volunteers. D. Garrahy indicated last year, both the University Liaison and Faculty Interests committee and the Vision committee were the ones that reviewed the scholarships and it made the process go a little quicker. J. Rosenthal inquired about the timeline of the review process. J. Manfredo stated the reviewing would take about 1 week.

D. Vision: D. Garrahy reported that the Vision committee met on the summer/fall survey for Unit 5 clinicals. Y. Visser and D. Garrahy have been compiling the feedback from Vision Committee members. The feedback from faculty members who took the survey in fall 2014 were shared and reviewed by Vision Committee members.

The Vision Committee is developing a process for awarding Professional Development Hours for cooperating teachers hosting clinical students. The meeting was very productive and the committee will be submitting its recommendation for awarding Professional Development Hours based on the state's requirement for substantial experience.

E. UTE Assessment: A. Adkins will discuss when she reports on the Professional Education Disposition Assessment under the Information items.

IV. Information Items:

A. College of Education's "New Student Communication Plan": P. Schoon introduced our guest, K. Harding. She previously worked in the Admissions office and now is in the College of Education. K. Harding distributed a hand-out (from the Admissions office) on a draft for the New Student Communication Plan. The College of Education Marketing team that consists of T. Navickas, K. Grimes, and K. Harding will be working on the plan outlining programming for incoming students. The goal is to create a series of effective communication/ events throughout the year for various targeted audiences. The goal is effective communication to the students. The marketing team is collaborating with Admissions to see what is effective. K. Harding informed the committee the need to do this is due to the high competition for our students. Other institutions are already using this tool. There is a cover letter from the Dean already in place that is sent to the students. K. Harding encouraged printed material as this is important to parents. Postcards would be something to consider doing. We want to create a personal touch from the University to the student.

Y. Visser indicated at her previous University an effective tool was telephone calls. Faculty members made calls to students and/or parents for recruitment. This was very much

appreciated by students and parents. K. Harding stated that they are moving in the direction of private schools even though ISU is a public university. P. Schoon added that this is a nationwide event. ISU has a couple of programs where enrollment is down. P. Schoon encouraged members to take this information to their Deans. It was noted that Fine Arts does a tremendous job for recruitment and that we all may need to do a little more.

L. Eckrich asked what is meant by high achievers. The response was 27 ACTs or higher and transfer students at 3.5 and above for cumulative GPA. Parameters can be communicated. J. Rosenthal added that these are good numbers for the Provost. P. Schoon stated that as of now there is no central funding and it was not requested in the budget proposal. J. Rosenthal also added that print is very effective with parents and that the cost is in the postage. A. Adkins stated the telethon efforts for COE are very fun to watch and that M. Smith tracked the yield at 30%.

P. Schoon mentioned that we are very lucky to have K. Harding aboard as she is an expert and that the College appreciates everything she has done for us.

B. Professional Education Disposition Assessment: A. Adkins indicated they have continued engaging with programs and piloting the new Professional Educator Disposition Assessment developed by UTEAC. A PowerPoint presentation was shared to outline the committee's work. They have completed the second meeting and have met with 10 programs. There are 8-10 more programs coming to the next meeting. The disposition assessment has been based on Realizing the Democratic Ideal. The new assessment is derived from the Charlotte Danielson framework and is a formative assessment, evidence based, and positioning on attributes. L. Steffen added that programs have to show alignment with the standards. The assessment is based on a 4 pt. scale and is aligned with RDI: Unacceptable, Acceptable, Proficient, and Exemplary. Collaboration looks like:

- 1) cooperates and maintains positive relationship with others
- 2) embodies honesty and integrity
- 3) maintains confidentiality

For the pilot process, they will invite programs to implement 2015-2016 and the departments will determine which course is appropriate. We should implement early to provide critical feedback. To implement the departments should:

- 1) review expectations
- 2) scaffold with intentional opportunities (spread out over a semester of over a program)
- 3) maintain a running record of evidence
- 4) provide feedback

A. Adkins and B. Jacobsen have run scenarios in LiveText and feel the infrastructure can be engineered. J. Manfredo had asked if they foresaw any changes to the disposition concerns forms. A. Adkins stated that they would not be changing at this time but the number of disposition forms should go down. There are more faculty on board than expected. J. Rosenthal urged A. Adkins to copyright the form. TCH has been piloting for the semester and has had great success. A. Adkins would like the PEDDA (Professional Educator Disposition Assessment) to be in national mode – CAEP accreditation. SCALE has been very valuable for ISU to use for validity/reliability and to see how our candidates perform.

C. CTE Scholarship & CTE Faculty Volunteers: A. Adkins stated the COE scholarships are available to any COE member. The scholarships have gone from being in the hundreds to the thousands. Last year, the review went to two committees: University Liaison and Faculty Interests and the Vision Committee to review. The review process is not extensive and there are 130 scholarships total. D. Garrahy added that the reviewers will scan and make a quick assessment. K. Grimes made it criteria based and added extra- curricular and service opportunities. The essays are 300-500 words with 5-6 questions that each faculty member will ask themselves. A. Adkins gave an example. First question is, “Does it respond to the essay? If the answer is “no”, it will not go to any further questions and prompts you to go to the next essay. K. Grimes worked hard to prompt and streamline the process. K. Grimes will orient on the layout to the format. The Greenebaum fund is very generous. P. Schoon added she was never a student at ISU but wanted to give the funding to an institution to make a better impact on teachers. She chose ISU. She wanted to come to ISU but worked at the family business, Illinois State Bank. D. Garrahy added it is a phenomenal award. Additional information about the Greenebaum family is displayed in a case in the hallway outside the Lauby Teacher Education Center. P. Schoon indicated the awards are recurring as long as the endowment is there. P. Schoon added the endowment fund is close to \$5 million.

D. Professional Educator Licensure Requirements for new ISU Grads: Dates and **Deadlines:** L. Steffen distributed a hand out that was sent to all student teachers on March 27, 2015. D. Garrahy reiterated that the letter went out to students and will be included in the CTE minutes. Any way that other departments can get the information out to students would be helpful. ELIS’ phone number hotline is 217-557-6763. ELIS can help any students and assist them in collapsing 2 accounts. The five items listed on the letter are:

1. Student teachers must establish an Educator Licensure Information System (ELIS) account if they have not already done so. To set up an account please go to the following website: https://sec3.isbe.net/IWASNET/sign_upo.aspx?logintype=elis and follow the directions given. After setting up an ELIS account, everyone should check that ELIS has a record of the Basic Skills requirement having been met by having a record for one of the following: Basic Skills Test (96 or 300) is passed, the Test of Academic Proficiency (400) is passed, or have a record of the ACT or SAT being used to meet this requirement. ISBE must also have a record of passing all appropriate content test(s) and the Assessment of Professional Teaching. If planning on using the ACT/SAT to meet this requirement, but it does not appear in account, it means that ISBE never received the actual scores from the testing company. This needs to be taken care of as soon as possible.

Last day to take APT is 5/17/15. Scores come in on 5/29/15. Students that do not pass have to wait 60 days in between each test.

2. The final date that all requirements must be met for spring 2015 graduations is June 6, 2015. If ISU does not have a passing score on the APT licensure exam by that date, you will not be able to graduate from your teacher preparation program or be licensed to teach in Illinois. The next opportunity to graduate would be summer 2015, which would be August 15, 2015, at the earliest.

Last day to take APT for summer graduation is 8/23/15. Test scores come in 9/4/15 and summer graduation is 9/5/15.

Students that do not pass have to wait 60 days in between each test.

3. You must notify the Office of the Registrar immediately if you see any errors on the notification of what endorsements the Registrar's Office believes you will be entitled to at the time of graduation. If an endorsement is omitted when ISU officially informs ISBE of the endorsements you have earned, you will need to submit a separate application to ELIS to add that endorsement. This will require an additional \$50 fee.
4. When you apply for your Professional Educator License after ISU has notified you to do so, the Professional Educator License is usually issued at the end of the application process. If you try to apply for your license before ISU has notified ISBE of your program completion, ISBE will treat it as an application for ISBE review. It will then be subject to the current ISBE review timelines for evaluation (which could be up to six months). You must not apply for your license before you get notification from the Office of the Registrar. You do not want to wait 4 to 6 months to get your license. In some cases a student may get notifications from ISBE that ISU has notified them of program completion, and you may now apply for the license. This is acceptable.
5. Those students completing secondary education programs will see an endorsement "SECA Secondary Education (6-12)" in addition to their 9-12 content area endorsement when they apply for their license. This will continue to occur through December 2017. The Secondary Education (6-12) endorsement is necessary if the student is to be able to add a middle school endorsement. Remember no middle school endorsements will be added to a license after February 1, 2018, unless the individual has completed an approved middle school program.

T. Lorschbach added that course TCH 233.01 and Psych 302 can be taken through fall 2017 and that students can apply for middle school endorsement and be awarded by January 31, 2018.

E. Student Teacher Physical Exam Requirement: Illinois General Assembly: D. Garrahy distributed a hand out from the Illinois General Assembly mandating all school district employees must have a physical exam. Employees include student teachers. The rule was effective last summer but it was not in effect until fall 2014. The responsibility is on the school districts and not the university (ISU) to carry out this requirement. Per the handout from the General Assembly "...and the cost of such examination shall rest with the employee." The Lauby Teacher Education Center has still not been officially notified by ISBE.

M. Parker wanted to know if the TB test was still required. L. Steffen stated even though it is crossed out in the law there are still individual health departments that may require it and some Early Childhood classes that still require it.

S. French inquired about HIPAA privacy in place. A. Adkins stated that the protocols would be in place.

L. Steffen added that Health Services is aware of the new law and B. Stevens from Health Services is looking into the 90 days prior to student teaching.

K. Shelton wanted to know if we wait for the districts to notify the students or do we share this information? C. Rutherford stated she informs the students what the districts require.

A copy of the rule is attached to the minutes.

M. Norian raised two issues:

- 1) the new APT test is resulting in many more students not passing the test. L. Steffen stated that the question was asked to Kellee Sullivan from ISBE and they plan to remove the APT exam once edTPA goes into effect. A. Adkins added the strategy is to include information that all teachers should know – focus on pedagogy, not the content.
- 2) a student in a TCH class who is no longer a teacher education major but wants to continue in the class is this something we should address? Consensus was that this issue will be an ongoing discussion.

V. Discussion Items: None

VI. Action Items: None

VII. Announcements and Last Comments:

A. Vice Chair: None

B. Member:

D. Garrahy indicated program coordinators were notified that effective July 1, 2015, G. Higham will be the Coordinator for the Secondary Professional Development Schools. G. Higham has been a PDS mentor teacher and previously taught at LeRoy High School.

D. Garrahy indicated program coordinators were notified effective August 1, 2015, A. Lyde will be the Liaison to Secondary Teacher Education Programs. She is an Assistant Professor in Health Education, is the Program Coordinator, and previously worked in the Lauby Teacher Education Center.

L. Steffen will be retiring July 1, 2015. The Lauby Center has received presidential approval to search for the Associate Director position. The position has been posted on the Human Resources website and it is a national search. Please share with your colleagues and anyone who may be interested. The search committee consists of L. Steffen, J. Rosenthal, A. Lyde, R. Clemmons, A. Adkins, and D. Garrahy, who will chair the committee.

J. Rosenthal informed the committee the new Campus Solutions Registration system has been launched and they are leaping through it. Currently, there are 1200 students registered. They have discovered issues as the prerequisites are not being accommodated very well and they are working very hard to fix the issue. This is labor intensive and a little bit cumbersome.

VIII. Adjournment: Motion to adjourn by J. Rosenthal
Second by M. Norian
CTE adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

**Illinois State University
Council for Teacher Education
Tuesday, April 21, 2015, 3:00 p.m.-4:30 p.m.
DeGarmo Hall, Room 551**

Minutes

Members Present: K. Austin, M. Coleman, C. Cullen, T. Davis, S. Doering, L. Eckrich, D. Garrahy, K. Hamann, M. Henninger, S. Hildebrandt, S. Jones-Bock, L. Kendall, M. Lin, K. Lopez, T. Lorsbach, J. Manfreda, K. Mountjoy, S. Otto, S. Parry, J. Rosenthal, P. Schoon, R. Seglem, S. Semonis, L. Sutton, N. Uphold

Members Absent: A. Adkins, A. Beaman, S. French, O. Landa-Vialard, M. Noraian, M. Temple, D. Wilson

Guests: K. Appel, J. Donnel, C. Herald, B. Jacobsen, M. Parker, L. Thetard

I. Call to Order by Chair: P. Schoon called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes from March 17, 2015:

C. Cullen noted on page 4, under Professional Educator Licensure Requirement for new ISU Grads, last paragraph: Last day to take it (APT) for summer graduation is September 5, 2015. Scores come in on 8/23/15. He does not think this is correct. We will check with L. Steffen and amend the minutes. *Amended Minutes should read:* Last day to take APT test for summer graduation is 8/23/15. Test scores come in on 9/4/15. Last day to graduate for summer is 9/5/15.

P. Schoon stated the friendly amendments should be made to the minutes for accuracy.

Motion to approve the amended minutes from March 17, 2015:

J. Rosenthal

Second: S. Parry

Minutes were approved unanimously with one abstention.

III. Subcommittee Reports

A. Curriculum: S. Parry reported the CTE Curriculum Committee met and looked at four proposals:

1. New Course: TCH 272 Biliteracy Development in K-12 Classroom
2. Revision in Art Teacher Education Sequence
3. New Minor in Bilingual Education
4. Revision of Bilingual/Bicultural Education Sequence

The committee requested more information on the Bilangual/Bicultural Sequence before approving. The new program, Minor in Bilingual Education requires a vote. S. Parry indicated it is an 18 hour endorsement, similar to the TESOL endorsement and for all Teacher Education candidates. TCH 272 is part of this minor.

S. Hildebrandt had a concern about teacher candidates' language proficiency. S. Hildebrandt indicated that the Bilingual endorsement has no assessment beyond the content. T. Lorsbach asked about languages not taught here. S. Parry noted that she reaches out to faculty members

with language proficiency to do the testing. S. Bock-Jones added if students can't meet the proficiency, they would have to take additional courses.

L. Eckrich raised the question as to what level of target the Language test is for?

S. Hildebrandt responded with advanced low proficiency for teacher education majors. S. Parry said that we follow the standards the state has set for the minor.

Motion to approve Bilingual Education Course

J. Rosenthal asked if it was a minor or endorsement as they try to keep minors separate from endorsements. In this case, it is both. J. Rosenthal stated this may be a topic to discuss in the fall on the University Curriculum Committee.

Second: J. Rosenthal

Course was approved with one opposed.

B. Student Interests: No report

C. University Liaison and Faculty Interest: J. Manfredo thanked everyone for their help with the student scholarships applications. D. Garrahy added that it was a laborious process with each volunteer reading 215 applications (there were 1500 applications). Even with a streamlined process, it is a significant time commitment of 7-8 hours. P. Schoon noted the Executive Committee will be looking at ways to lighten the workload. The process is highly streamlined, thanks to A. Adkins. D. Garrahy reiterated that the review process is not going to get any easier as there will be more scholarships in the future. D. Garrahy thanked all staff that assisted.

L. Eckrich asked if these scholarships are for Teacher Education majors or College of Education only. P. Schoon said there is one application for all the scholarships of both kinds. His staff worked on 1900 applications before the various scholarships were disbursed across campus, with COE ending up with 1500 scholarships.

D. Vision: D. Garrahy reported that the Vision committee met on the Professional Development Hours Process for Clinical Experiences. A hand-out and a copy of the blue doc form were distributed. The Vision Committee established a process for the Lauby Teacher Education Center to document pre-student teaching professional development hours for cooperating teachers. This process needed to be established because the ISBE no longer will be doing this verification of PDH. The parameters set by the Vision Committee for a Cooperating Teacher to earn 12 Professional Development Hours are as follows:

- Must have a minimum of 25 contact hours with ISU candidate
- Clinical Hours must fall within the "experience type" indicated on the teacher candidate's blue documentation form of one or more of the following:
 - #2 Tutoring one on one contact
 - #3 Non-Instructional assisting
 - #4 Small group instruction
 - #5 Whole class instruction
 - #7 Graduate practicum

In order for a cooperating teacher to receive 12 professional development hours verification for working with an ISU teacher candidate, it is the **Professor's responsibility** to submit the blue documentation forms for their course within two weeks of completion of the pre-student teaching clinical experience (not the end of the semester, **but the end of the clinical experience**).

- √ ISBE now requires the **cooperating teacher to submit verification of Professional Development Hours within 60 days** of completing the clinical experience on the ELIS system.
- √ Delay in submitting the blue doc form by the professor and/or incorrect information provided by the teacher candidate will prevent the cooperating teacher from earning the 12 professional development hours for that specific experience/course.
- √ Once the blue doc form has been submitted and processed, the Lauby Center will generate a professional development hours verification letter and send it to the cooperating teacher.

D. Garrahy stated that the process has to be a substantial process according to the state document in case we were ever audited. After running some scenarios, it was found that if they used 40 professional development hours, they would lose 250 cooperating teachers. They also looked at 25 professional development hours and they would lose 125 cooperating teachers. D. Garrahy indicated C. Herald was present and she handles the blue documentation forms. PDHs are tied to completion of blue documentation forms and need to be submitted in a timely manner. If the blue documentation forms are not submitted at the end of the completion of the clinical experience, it could be very problematic.

M. Lin is an instructor for ECE. Her clinical students are with their infant/toddler experience for only 20 hours. Therefore, she is concerned that none of her cooperating teachers will receive Professional Development Hours.

M. Coleman added that the ROE reiterated it had to be a substantial experience.

D. Garrahy stated it is imperative that the professor does not wait until the end of the semester of the cooperating teacher will not get their 12 PDHs. This is a huge administration burden on the Lauby Center. Last fall there were 184,000 clinical hours.

C. Herald informed the Council that some of the common errors on a blue doc form that are time consuming are:

- Incorrect University ID
- Incorrect Clock Hours
- No Teacher Name or Building
- Completion Status

The steps in identifying incorrect information are time consuming. C. Herald includes a Clinical Experience tip sheet, etc. with pertinent information. K. Hamann requested this be on the TEC website. C. Herald stated it was on the website. It will be pertinent to colleagues across campus to not set aside the blue doc packet when they receive it.

J. Manfredo asked if the clinical experience was the end of March, why can't the blue docs be submitted at the end of the semester?

L. Kendall stated that at Metcalf all their teachers are well aware that they only have 60 days from the end of the experience to submit verification in order to obtain their PDHs.

Discussion ensued as there is no date on the blue doc. D. Garrahy apologized and indicated there used to be a date of the blue doc form and the Lauby Center will have to change that. S. Bock-Jones' understanding is they finish their experience and submit their blue doc and the letter is generated from the blue doc. Is the submission into ELIS 60 days from the date of the verification letter?

The Lauby Center is working with Campus Solutions to get the blue documentation form online. P. Schoon stated they tried to have the blue docs online a couple of years ago and we are getting closer.

S. Semonis indicated there is potential for unintentional mistakes since so many professors are in a semester frame of mind or may have classes that have multiple sites and multiple ending dates. In response to a question regarding what the clinical teacher fills out, L. Kendall pulled up the ELIS account and said a cooperating teacher would need to enter:

1. Clinical Name
2. Provider Name
3. How many hours
4. Begin Date
5. End Date

A question was raised to see if the dates as a unit could be the end date of semester. L. Kendall stated they put in the beginning and end date of the semester. P. Schoon stated we need to clarify with ISBE if they would allow us to put in the dates as the beginning and end of the semester and reiterated we must follow rules of ISBE since students and/or teachers get hours because of us. We cannot be misleading as that is unethical.

L. Eckrich asked if the cooperating teachers get tuition waivers in addition to the PDHs? Response was that PDHs are for license renewal. Tuition waivers are separate and issued when they host one of our students. C. Herald indicated previously logs were kept and sent to ISBE, but they have gone away with that process. ISBE discovered there was a lot of cooperating teachers who were getting hours when they should not have.

M. Parker asked if the policy is in effect. D. Garrahy stated it is not yet in effect as there have been too many questions raised. Before a final decision will be made, the Vision Committee will contact teachers from Metcalf for their input. B. Jacobsen added LiveText may help. D. Garrahy thanked her but noted that Campus Solutions is finalizing the process.

L. Thetard indicated the English Methods clinical experience is only 15 hours, so none of the 52 cooperating teachers would obtain PDHs. However, they combine that experience with J. Percell's TCH 219 in order to qualify.

J. Donnel stated their cooperating teachers will not be able to get PDHs this semester and asked if there be a process in the fall to assure the cooperating teachers that they will obtain them then. L. Eckrich why hours can't be aggregated as many clinical experiences are not 25 hours.

C. Herald stated the majority of clinical experiences are 20 hours or below. Also, when an entire class is present, there may not be an individual form with 25 hours so the Lauby Center would not be generating a letter. It would be logistically very challenging to try and add class hours up.

T. Davis indicated that as a professor, she makes contact with all the cooperating teachers before the beginning of a semester and gives them the exact dates of the experience.

P. Schoon added that ELIS may have an option to combine experiences. L. Kendall stated at Metcalf there one teacher for 20 students in the course for a two week period.

T. Lorschbach stated in TCH they have whole class experiences for 25 hours.

M. Parker asked how two people in the Lauby Center will handle all this. C. Herald stated there will be a discussion.

P. Schoon informed the committee that this will need to go back to the Vision Committee and will contact L. Kendall and teachers at Metcalf for input.

C. Cullen asked if there was a maximum number of PDHs a teacher can collect? D. Garrahy answered Unit 5 has a limit within a 5 year period.

E. UTE Assessment: None.

IV. Information Items:

A. New Teacher Conference: K. Appel and N. Latham informed CTE last fall on the New Teacher Conference. They have sent out flyers for 1st and 2nd year teachers electronically. J. Donnel added proposal requests were sent out on campus. There are many presenters for K12 and also presenters that target all audiences. They have 140 attendees confirmed but they can take more. Michael Vetere III, Associate Professor of Creative Drama and Puppetry, and Greg Michie, Urban Education, are two of the presenters and have interesting topics. K. Appel stated they will take more attendees for the next two months and will probably cap at 175. The cost is free to the students. They will hand out supplies, books, ISU Gear, etc.) Lunch is provided. Teachers love it! There has been tremendous support from COE and Grants.

V. Discussion Items:

1) edTPA full retake: S. Parry reiterated that A. Adkins presented guidelines for edTPA retakes and the Deans were provided the information to make a decision for their respective programs.

If students do not pass and do not want to retake edTPA, they have 2-3 options:

- 1) Graduate from IDS
- 2) Non TED in their major (applies primarily to secondary programs)
- 3) Some programs may create a new sequence

If the students want to retake, E. Palmer has asked programs for their input.

E. Palmer needs the following information prior to submitting in September:

- 1) What degree options for each program
- 2) Main Contact Person that the edTPA will work with on the department level
- 3) Who within their program will mentor retakes

P. Schoon added that a full task retake must be handled at the program level and individualized for the student since there are so many components in place. Programs will get suggestions for best practices and programs will need to devise a process. As of the fall semester there would have been 14 students in this situation. It is anticipated that this number will be lower when it becomes consequential and students may put more effort into it.

The edTPA course is being offered this summer. It is an FCR course and open to any majors.

- 2) **edPR Student Teaching Performance Assessment:** S. Parry indicated that this is connected to Realizing the Democratic Ideal. Once edTPA becomes consequential in September, this assessment will duplicate what students are doing in edTPA. Discussion ensued and it will come to a vote at the last CTE meeting.

C. Cullen asked if edPR was not going to be needed for CAEP. D. Garrahy stated edPR is not in the CAEP standards. We still have RDI and adhere to it. P. Schoon advocates removing edPR out of the teacher education requirements. J. Donnel added that they align the Danielson framework with edTPA. Removal of edPR will be added as an Action item for the May 5th, 2015 meeting. CTE will do a roll call vote.

VI. Action Items: None

VII. Announcements and Last Comments:

A. Vice Chair: None

B. Member:

- √ D. Garrahy: A flyer for Lynn Steffen's retirement reception will be sent out electronically. The reception will be held May 20, 2015 from 3-5 in the Circus Room at the Bone Student Center. She encouraged staff/colleagues to write their favorite memory of Lynn and there will be a basket at the reception to put them in. L. Steffen does large quantities of work for people across campus.
- √ D. Garrahy: Program Directors will be sent an email tomorrow indicating the Unit 5 survey will soon be launched. Faculty will have one week to submit the survey.
- √ D. Garrahy: The Lauby Teacher Education Center has been totally remodeled. She encouraged the members to stop in the Lauby Center to see the improvements. She is very appreciative to Dean Schoon.
- √ J. Rosenthal stated 10,000 students have registered. He encouraged members to hug an advisor as a lot of overrides had to be given. T. Lorsbach added they TCH gave 1100 overrides this semester so far.

VIII. Adjournment: Motion to adjourn by S. Parry
Second by T. Lorsbach
CTE adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

**Illinois State University
Council for Teacher Education
Tuesday, May 5th, 2015, 3:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.
DeGarmo Hall, Room 551**

Minutes

Members Present: A. Adkins, M. Coleman, C. Cullen, T. Davis, S. Doering, L. Eckrich, S. French, D. Garrahy, K. Hamann, M. Henninger, S. Jones-Bock, L. Kendall, J. Manfredo, S. Otto, S. Parry, J. Rosenthal, P. Schoon, R. Seglem, N. Uphold

Members Absent: K. Austin, A. Beaman, S. Hildebrandt, M. Lin, O. Landa-Vialard, K. Lopez, T. Lorschach, K. Mountjoy, S. Semonis, L. Sutton, M. Temple, D. Wilson

Guests: P. Boyes, S. Burt, C. De Santis, G. Higham, B. Jacobsen, M. Monts, E. Palmer, M. Parker, A. Raver, C. Rutherford, L. Seloni, L. Steffen, L. Thetard

I. Call to Order by Chair: P. Schoon called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.
Announcements by P. Schoon:

- 1) L. Steffen was recognized at her LAST CTE meeting. P. Schoon thanked L. Steffen for her service and dedication to ISU and CTE. Her leadership in all aspects of teacher education and across the state is unparalleled and it will be very difficult in finding her replacement.
- 2) Student committee members were thanked for their service on CTE. S. Doering will be coming back next year to serve on the CTE.
- 3) Committee Chairs were thanked for their service as it was a very busy year and the chairs took on many roles and did a great job.

II. Approval of Minutes from March 17, 2015: Motion to approve the minutes from April 21, 2015:
A. Adkins
Second: S. Parry
Minutes were approved unanimously with no abstentions.

III. Subcommittee Reports

A. Curriculum: S. Parry reported the CTE Curriculum Committee met and had a proposal for Theatre Teacher Education sequence revision. Theatre performance changed student teaching to 12 hours to provide more hours in the classroom. This enables the teacher candidates to have more time on site. They eliminated DAN 398 with no extra hours. This proposal does not require a vote.

There were three new EAF graduate proposals. Due to more information needed, they will be discussed further next year.

Bilingual/Bicultural sequence revision will be delayed until fall as there were some concerns.

B. Student Interests: M. Noraian reported the committee debriefed about the student essay contest. They were pleased with the revision and liked the new timeline and change to infuse a content piece. They urged next year's committee to also include this aspect. The content piece this year was the environmental and ecology with the student exceptionality ELL. The students were not recognized at Founders Day and instead were honored at the COE awards ceremony.

C. University Liaison and Faculty Interest: J. Manfredo reported the committee reviewed the scholarship process and had three recommendations for next year:

1. Get more people involved in the process;
2. Increase the evaluation period for review of applications by changing the time allowed for applications; and
3. Adjust the rubrics to a 3 pt. scale to better differentiate among students.

D. Vision: P. Schoon and D. Garrahy reported there were several concerns at the last CTE meeting regarding Professional Development Hours. Several departments/programs made commitments under the previous protocols to schools and cooperating teachers for professional development hours for this semester. It was felt that these commitments needed to be honored. The decision of the Vision Committee was to allow an interim policy for PDH's. For the interim policy, the departments/school chairs will decide if the clinical experience was a substantial experience and will notify the Lauby Teacher Education Center. This will be effective immediately through the end of summer. There was a long discussion regarding the number of hours required (25 was the recommendation). The Vision Committee determined that the 25 hour requirement would stand. T. Lorschbach, TCH chair stated the program/faculty was on board with the recommendation.

P. Schoon added that since there is currently no time stamp on the blue doc form, it was recommended that a time stamp be included on new forms. The final discussion point was whether experiences could be combined to reach the 25 hour limit. The issue is whether that would be true to the intent of ISBE. L. Steffen sent an email after the Vision Committee meeting but has not received a reply from ISBE. P. Schoon stated we will go under the assumption that ISBE would state experiences could not be combined. If they would indicate that the hours could be combined, CTE would revisit this issue.

Questions:

M. Noraian asked if the diversity hours/waivers would change? L. Steffen clarified that diversity hours and professional development hours are different. Professional development hours relate to teacher licensure renewal.

C. Cullen asked if this process is only for clinical experiences and not student teaching.

D. Garrahy stated that yes this is only for clinical experiences due to the changes with ISBE who turned the responsibility over to the universities.

P. Schoon added that it may be possible to create a best practices form for departments to use in documenting forms.

L. Eckrich asked if this only pertains to placements in public schools? L. Steffen replied it pertains to anyone who is licensed and needs to maintain licensure.

D. Garrahy reiterated that faculty must pay attention to the 60 day window since she only has one staff member processing the forms. Last year there were 184,000 clinical hours processed by the Lauby Center. They must do this quickly so that clinical teachers can document their hours for their licensure.

E. UTE Assessment: A. Adkins reported the committee reviewed the results of the LiveText audit and thanked B. Jacobsen for her assistance. LiveText has some features that we do not currently use but may want to in the future (i.e. demographic data, institutionalization). The audit is helpful for CAEP purposes. The committee also discussed reinstating program reports. Currently they used to go to the state but maybe there may be a change to do the reports internally.

The purpose of the reports is to make the best case for oversight of programs. The discussion will be continued next year.

IV. Information Items:

A. LiveText Fundamentals Workshop Proposal: P. Boyes distributed a hand out on an online version of the LiveText Fundamental Workshop. The LiveText Fundamentals workshop is a part of the Gateway 1 requirements for Teacher Education. Currently, this workshop is administered in-person by student workers and graduate assistants on the College of Education Technology Team. The workshop takes approximately 60 minutes and covers the following topics:

1. Registration for LiveText
2. Where to get help
3. Where to find course content
4. How to use the file manager
5. How to interact with instructors
 - a. Grading, comments, withdrawing submissions and redoing work
6. Three practice assignments:
 - a. Submitting a word doc and supporting files
 - b. Submitting work with a template
 - c. A workshop completion assignment*
7. Downloading and using a portfolio

* Students are guided through all parts of the workshop, except the workshop completion assignment. They are expected to prove their knowledge by completing the work alone.

P. Boyes proposed an on-line delivery of the LiveText Fundamentals workshop in response to several requests by students. A preliminary version of the workshop has been created and tested with COE LiveText support staff. In summer 2015, the staff would like to do a small-scale pilot with students who wish to complete the workshop. Students would still come to DeGarmo to complete the workshop, but the COE staff would not do the instruction. Instead, COE staff would simply help the students access the course and be available to provide support if necessary.

In fall of 2015, the staff would like to begin offering the choice between an online and in-person version of the workshop. All workshop content will remain the same for both choices. The number of scheduled in-person workshops would be reduced by 50%, but can also be scheduled if needed. Support will continue to be available in Studio Teach and through the Technology

Support Center (in a limited capacity).

A few advantages to online delivery include:

- Students can go at their own pace
- Students can review materials and refresh their memories
- The workshop will always be delivered uniformly
- The workshop can be completed at any time of the day (or night)
- Off-campus students can complete the workshop from any location
- Changes to LiveText can be easily communicated

M. Noraian urged consistency for TCH 212 instructors. This course had some variations in content as to how the workshop was done. D. Garrahy asked student CTE representative, S. Doering to be part of the pilot study since she has already completed the workshop and would have good perspective. S. Doering agreed to participate.

P. Boyes reported that 780 students completed the workshop this fall and 560 students this spring.

B. Program Decision - Graduate options for edTPA: A. Adkins indicated three items need to be discussed and decided upon by programs. She will be following up with programs to get their decisions on each item.

1. **Graduate options for edTPA:** E. Palmer will meet with programs to get their information.
2. **Strand for CAEP: SPA or No SPA:** Programs need to decide and inform CTE.
3. **Piloting PEDA in fall 2015/spring 2016:** A. Adkins is finalizing the list of teacher education programs that are going to pilot this new system.

C. Deadlines for spring and summer graduation: L. Steffen distributed a hand-out with important dates and deadlines.

Spring 2015 Semester

- June 6, 2015 last date to meet all requirements for Spring 2015 graduation
 - Complete all student teaching requirements
 - Complete all Gateway III requirements
 - Be sure that ISBE has records of all testing requirement being met
- May 17, 2015 last date to take and pass the APT for Spring 2015 graduation
 - These scores come in on May 29, 2015

Summer 2015 Semester

- September 4, 2015 last date to meet all requirements for Summer 2015 graduation
- August 23, 2015 last date to take and pass the APT for Summer 2015 graduation
 - Test scores come in on September 4
 - Judith Webster confirmed that she will look for passing scores on that date

Fall 2015 Student Teaching

- All Gateway II requirements must be met by July 15, 2015

V. Discussion Items: None

VI. Action Items:

A. edPR: A. Adkins indicated that CTE must take action to delete the edPR requirement from Student Teaching requirements.

A. Adkins motioned to remove the edPR requirement from Gateway 3 and Student Teaching, effective July 1, 2015.

Second: D. Garrahy

Motion passed: 18 yes, 1 abstention, 0 no

Motion to remove the removal of edPR requirement from Gateway 3 and Student Teaching – approved unanimously.

Point of clarification: M. Noraian asked if LiveText portfolios will need to be revised.

B. Jacobsen replied that the revision will be done by her and may have one page instructions for the students.

A. Adkins	Yes
M. Coleman	Yes
C. Cullen	Yes
S. Doering	Yes
T. Davis	Yes
S. French	Yes
D. Garrahy	Yes
K. Hamann	Yes
M. Henninger	Yes
L. Kendall	Yes
J. Manfredo	Yes
M. Noraian	Yes
S. Otto	Yes
S. Parry	Yes
J. Rosenthal	Yes
P. Schoon	Yes
R. Seglem	Yes
N. Uphold	Yes
L. Eckrich	Abstain

VII. Announcements and Last Comments:

A. Vice Chair: None

B. Member:

- √ D. Garrahy: Announced a retirement reception for L. Steffen on May 20th, 2015, in the Circus room from 3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

- √ D. Garrahy: Announced a retirement reception for C. Herald on May 14th, 2015, in the lobby of the Teacher Education Center from 3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m. She invited everyone to visit the newly remodeled lobby of the Teacher Education Center.
- √ S. French: Requested a list of acronyms used by COE. A. Adkins noted one exists and it will be updated and distributed.
- √ P. Schoon: Urged everyone to have a productive and/or relaxing summer

VIII. Adjournment: Motion to adjourn by J. Rosenthal
Second by P. Schoon
CTE adjourned at 3:40 p.m.