MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
COUNCIL ON TEACHER EDUCATION
August 31, 2005
3:10 p.m. – 4:45 p.m.
Conference Room B, 505 E. Green, Ste. 203

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bonnie Armbruster, Cheri Carlson, John Grashel, Eve Harwood, Jennifer Heinhorst-Busby, Bob Hughes, Kristi Kuntz, Christine Jenkins, Marilyn Johnston-Parsons, James Leach, Brenda Lindsey, Ann Mester, Chris Roegge, Kristi Townsend, Chet Zych

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ave Alvarado, Jennifer Anderson, Jillian Forestiere, Susan Fowler, Marge Jerich, Linda Sloat

1. Approval of Minutes and Announcements:

a. The meeting was called to order by Roegge at 3:10 p.m. Roegge introduced the new members of the committee and asked continuing members to introduce themselves. He noted that the committee should have another student representative, preferably a graduate student, and asked members to send him names of students who might be interested in serving.

Roegge asked if there were any additions or corrections to the minutes of June 15, 2005. Mester, seconded by Grashel, move approval of the minutes as presented. Unanimously approved.

b. Announcements: None

c. Additions to the agenda: Public University Coordinator State-Wide Meeting was added to the agenda as item 4.g.

d. Executive Director Report: Roegge reported that the Council on Teacher web site is being upgraded. He passed around a mock up of the new site and asked for comments from committee members.

Roegge also reported that a school district has asked that we amend our contract with them to include language verifying that all students placed in that school have cleared a criminal background check. He has developed a form letter to send to the school verifying the criminal background check and that appears to be a satisfactory solution for now.

Roegge has a meeting scheduled with the Provost on September 28th. He plans to discuss the role of the Council and teacher education on this campus in general.


3. Matters for Discussion/Action:

a. Priorities for the 05-06 academic year: Roegge reported that he sees the priorities for the coming year as resolution of governance issues (Area of Specialization Committee structure), accreditation (seek NCATE or not), revision of the Tuition & Fee Waiver policy, revisions to the Conceptual Framework, and initiating preparations for the next accreditation review..

b. Area of Specialization Committee Appointments for 2005-06: Roegge reported that his scheduled meeting with the Deans to present the proposal to revise the area committee structure was postponed as it fell on the same day as the memorial service for Sheryl Benson. He hopes to meet with them in September. Consequently, area committees will be formulated under the existing structure for one more year. Roegge
stated, however, that the structure did not need to be tightly maintained. Council staff will be forming student and P-12 advisory committees, so it is not necessary for area committees to include students and public school teachers in their membership, unless they wish to. It is also permissible to use already established departmental committees as the area committee if they are already performing the functions assigned to area committees.

So far, we have only been informed of the membership of four committees. Roegge stressed that we need the rest of the committees appointed as soon as possible. Membership lists should be forwarded to Zych.

c. CAP Compliance Procedures: Zych presented a document that spells out the procedures for monitoring program compliance with the Common Assessment Plans. The document, CAP Compliance Procedures, was developed by CTE staff, based on the discussion at the April meeting. Upon approval, the procedures will be disseminated to clinical experience program coordinators.

Leach suggested clarifying wording be added throughout the document to make it clear that CTE would only be dropping candidates from certification program, not degree programs. Armbruster, seconded by Grashel, moved approval of the CAP Compliance Procedure with the suggested changes in wording. Unanimously approved.

d. Conceptual Framework survey results/recommendations: Roegge presented an overview of the survey results from faculty, candidates, and P-12 personnel. The responses indicate that the Conceptual Framework does not provide and adequate foundation for specific assessments, the pillars overlap and do not carry equivalent weight, and important elements such as classroom management are not addressed at all. The survey respondents indicated that the Conceptual Framework is a compliance document, not a conceptual framework that says who we are and what we expect our candidates to be when they complete our programs.

Roegge suggested that two options are available. Option one would be to make adjustments to improve the assessment indicators and state them in ways that allow them to be measured in meaningful ways. The indicators should clearly express our expectations of our candidates and be measurable. Option two would be to redo the entire document, turning into a vision statement and developing new assessments from there.

Roegge suggested that option two could produce a shorter, direct, document that speaks directly to what makes us different. Everything necessary to comply with accreditation standards would flow out of the document.

Leach asked how different a new document would be. Heinhorst-Busby commented that the conceptual framework does not address what an effective teacher looks like. Because of that, the Department of Curriculum and Instruction has expanded the unit common assessments to include items that address such areas as classroom management and professional behaviors. She suggested that some areas of the Conceptual Framework should be expanded, while others should be reduced in emphasis and stated that she would welcome a complete re-write that would directly link to what a teacher should be and include indicators that are measurable.

Harwood commented that the Conceptual Framework that we currently have reflects the necessity of agreement by many different constituencies on this campus. Mester suggested that a re-write begin by asking individual programs, through the Area of Specialization Committees, to define their goals and values. These could be brought together to determine which of goals and values are shared by all programs, and form the basis for the conceptual framework, indicators, and assessments.
Johnston-Parsons questioned the relationship of the conceptual framework to the current strategic planning going on throughout the campus and suggested that this may not be the appropriate time for significant change.

The discussion returned to the issue of current problems with assessing outcomes related to the pillars and indicators of our current conceptual framework. A clear linkage between what we say we value and what we assess does not exist. Townsend asked if individual program assessments can be shown to link to the pillars.

It was suggested that a complete re-write of the conceptual framework could result in a visionary document that, while it would reflect our values, would also necessarily focus on our decentralized structure. Committee members questioned whether the Illinois State Board of Education would see value in this, given the lack of flexibility exhibited during our last accreditation review. The committee, as a whole, did not support the development of a new conceptual framework.

4. Updates/Reports:

a. Status of ASC proposal: See item 3.b. for this discussion.

b. Preliminary report of statewide follow-up survey data: Roegge high lighted some of the information presented in a handout that was provided to committee members at the table. There was no discussion.

c. Report of T & F Waiver study committee: Roegge reported that the subcommittee has met and determined that additional information is required before any recommendations for changes in the current policy can be made. Questions to be answered include: 1) what is the real cost of the waivers to the University?; 2) who uses the waivers?; and 3) how much tuition money gets to the colleges? Roegge will be meeting with Bill Adams next week to find out answers to these questions. This item will be brought back for discussion at a later date.

d. CAP Report: Spring 2005: Zych reported that eleven candidates received letters dropping them from their programs, and 15 candidates received warning letters. Based on further review of candidate grade point averages it was discovered that there was an error in reporting and two of the individuals dropped have been reinstated and one warning letter has been rescinded. Zych noted that drop and warning letters are going out to candidates in a number of different programs and to both graduate and undergraduate candidates.

e. Online certification: Zych reported that the certification staff has made the transition to processing certification applications online. This change eliminates a great deal of paper usage, postage costs, the need for staff to handle money, and person hours devoted to the processing of applications. At the same time, it benefits the candidates by shortening the processing time by several weeks and permitting immediate verification to potential employers that they are certified and can sign teaching contracts.

f. Teacher Education Minors: Zych referred to a handout showing the approved teacher education minors that are currently listed as available to students on this campus. He reiterated his earlier statements at previous meetings that he is concerned because these minors do not lead to certification to teach those subjects because of Illinois State Board of Education rule changes that became effective July 1, 2004. He stated that the minors must be either revised to meet new standards or eliminated so that students will no be
misled into believing that they are completing requirements for a teaching endorsement by completing the minor.

g. Public University Coordinator Meeting: Heinhorst-Busby announced that she and Cheryll Douglas will be hosting this state-wide meeting on our campus. This is a relatively new group that meets to share information, especially regarding clinical experiences. Heinhorst-Busby expressed her hope that the clinical experiences program coordinators for all of our programs would attend and that she would like assistance from the Council on Teacher Education to support the meeting. Roegge said that CTE would provide support. The date is yet to be determined but will most likely be in early November.

5. Information Items: Committee members were provided with revised copies of the CAP for Undergraduate Professional Education Programs Leading to Initial Certification and the CAP for Graduate Professional Education Programs Leading to Initial Certification. There was no discussion of these items.

6. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Future meetings: All meetings are scheduled for 3-5 p.m. in Ste. 203-B, 505 E. Green Street unless otherwise noted.

Date:
September 21, 2005 (subsequently cancelled) March 15, 2006
October 19, 2005 April 19, 2006
November 16, 2005 May 17, 2006
December 14, 2005 June 21, 2006
February 22, 2006 August 30, 2006