The third meeting of the Council for Teacher Education for the 2008-2009 academic year was held Monday, November 10, 2008 at 3:15 p.m. in Speight 312. Members present: Rick Barnes, Michael Bossé, Carol Brown, Michael Brown, John Carlson, Joe Ciechalski, Vivian Covington (Chair), Kathy Davis, Lynne Davis, Kay Dotson, David Gabbard, Jennifer Gironda, Linda High, Elizabeth Hodge, Laura King, Tammy Lee, Chris Locklear, Linda Patriarca, LCSN representative Chris Moxley, Betty Peel, Mary Pickard, Robbie Quinn, Marcela Ruiz-Funes, Karli Ruscoe, Christine Shea, Jane Teleki, Laurel Truelove, Sarah Williams and visitor Crystal Jones. Absent were Tom Caron, Meta Downes, Bill Grobe, and Mary Lisa Pories.

Order of Business

Agenda I - Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the October 6, 2008 meeting were accepted.

Agenda II – Announcements

The Dean of the College of Education, Linda Patriarca and new student representatives, Jennifer Gironda, a graduate student in art education, and Laurel Truelove, an undergraduate student in math education, were introduced.

Tuesday, November 18 is School Innovation Day. From 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. you may visit a school and see how public schools are changing in the 21st century. Visit www.ncpublicschools.org/innovate.

The Partnership for 21st Century Skills reported an inherent link between a 21st century education system and economic success. This has interesting implications as we revise curriculum. The complete report may be found at www.21stcenturyskills.org.

Information on the Outreach Scholars Academy was distributed providing information on eligibility and the application process for next year’s selection.

Chris Locklear discussed the ECU Teacher Education Scholarship Matrix which compares the eligibility requirements and service obligations of some of the teacher education specific financial assistance opportunities. When applying for scholarships, students should be aware of payback obligations. The matrix and other scholarship information may be found at http://www.ecu.edu/cs-educ/ and clicking on Become a Teacher.

Please remind advisees that PRAXIS I, PPST, will not be offered on March 14, 2009, June 13, 2009 and July 25, 2009.

Agenda III - Old Business

Program area representatives are still needed for the Latham Clinical Schools Network Advisory Board. This is an excellent connection with public schools. Please let Vivian Covington know if you are interested in attending the meetings, which meet the first Wednesday each month.

Karli Ruscoe reported that the new non-degree applications, Undergraduate Post Baccalaureate Teacher Licensure application for non-degree students seeking their initial teaching license and the Graduate Non-Degree application for master level or above license areas, are up and running. The new Graduate Non-Degree application lists specific fields of study that a student may choose. Post baccalaureate teacher licensure students have been shifted over to Undergraduate Admissions. Online step by step guides have been updated. The Office of Teacher Education has worked closely with the Registrar’s Office, Admissions, Financial Aid and the Graduate School to assist in the identification process and migration.

Lynne Davis, Assessment Coordinator gave an update on teacher education issues. The re-visioning of the undergraduate curriculum process continues. The October meeting focused on evidence for the content/specialty areas and what could be developed. Program area coordinators will meet again on 11/17/08. NCATE summaries are due 12/15/08. The DPI-Teacher Education Advisory Committee met 10/30/08 and will meet again 11/12. Items to be discussed are (1) removing the “M” level license from the MAT and issuing licenses at the “A” level because students
Michael Bossé moved to accept the report which would not allow students who participated in the Teacher Cadet (TC) Program reduction in observation hours (16 to 8) for the “early experience” ____2123 class. David Gabbard seconded. Michael Bossé stated that what a TC is asked to do in a high school course is not the same as observation in all 2123 classes and a reduction of observation hours is unfair. The motion carried 14 to 3 with 2 abstentions. This may be revisited later to consider other ways for TCs to receive credit for the importance of recruitment.

The proposal for the professional core curriculum presented by the Policy Committee at the October 2008 meeting was re-presented for a vote. Michael Bossé stated that the “OR” courses in the proposal were not to take students out of designated courses, but they were there as an option. He motioned to approve the proposal and Kathy Davis seconded. Much discussion followed. Sarah Williams stated that she and the CTE C&I representatives had met and thought we needed to show a common core across the unit. A suggested amendment was distributed. In place of program specific courses as an “OR”, alternative courses with the same prefix could be developed. Kathy Davis stated that K-12 programs have existing courses in many areas that were the same courses in the core and that program areas need flexibility. Jane Teleki suggested that specific program area courses be listed and a percentage of COE core courses could be used. David Gabbard stated that specific program area courses should build upon common, generic course foundations. “OR” courses should protect the integrity of the professional core. Betty Peel felt prefixes should be kept to identify particular courses. Lynne Davis stated that at the last NCATE visit, diversity courses were cited. They were all program specific. There was no consistency. We do not need to duplicate in program areas. She would not recommend approval of this proposal without knowing the criteria for CTE approval. Michael Bossé stated we need to decide so that programs can proceed with their re-visions. We cannot revision without the core curriculum. Who will assess these program specific courses? Lynne Davis stated that by using existing core courses, criteria has to be set if programs want to use their own courses. Linda Patriarca said that all the discussions were substantive and conceptual, but what is knowledge without skills to do something? In two to four years, a critical look may be taken at why there are 15 different courses. Cost will be a factor. A shared responsibility and commitment from deans to offer courses will be needed. Cost analysis will play a part. Rick Barnes stated if we adopt today, we don’t know the criteria and don’t have approval of “CTE approved courses.” There are five non-existent courses listed in the proposal for approval. Marcela Ruiz-Funes stated that she appreciated the courses being in the COE. Michael Bossé called for the question, to approve the original proposal. The motion to approve failed 9 to 4 with 4 abstentions.

Agenda IV – New Business

None

Agenda V – Standing Committees

Curriculum—Carol Brown, chair, reported that the committee met November 3, 2008. Two proposals were submitted from the College of Human Ecology. They were missing documents and a representative from the college was unable to attend. The committee recommended that these proposals be resubmitted at the next curriculum meeting. The committee recommends the following guidelines to CTE representatives. CTE representatives should notify respective departments of guidelines for submitting new courses, revisions, and programs using those provided by the Graduate Curriculum Committee http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/gcc/index.cfm and the University Curriculum Committee http://www.ecu.edu/cs-acad/fsinline/cu/curriculum.cfm. Faculty should note appropriate order of approval beginning with the program area within departments. Proposals from the College of Education must be approved by the COE Curriculum Committee prior to submission to CTE Curriculum Committee. Programs leading to school licensure must be approved by CTE prior to submission to Graduate or University Curriculum Committees. The next meeting will be December 1, 2008.

Evaluation and Planning—Tammy Lee, chair reported the committee met October 28, 2008 and made the following recommendations: (1) the formation of an Ad Hoc committee facilitated by a member of the Evaluation and Planning (EP) committee to work on the transformation of Portfolio A, B, & C into Evidence 3 & Evidence 5 as a Unit Wide product; (2) the separation of Evidence 6 into two parts: Leadership and Collaboration. They recommend the formation of two Ad Hoc committees facilitated by a member of the EP Committee to develop guidelines and rubrics for these two pieces of evidence 6 & 7; (3) the formation of an Ad Hoc committee to be formed to make recommendations regarding evidence 4 for how to implement and integrate the use of the Certification of Teaching Capacity into an Unit Wide evaluation/observation instrument; (4) the recommendation of the adoption of the existing disposition surveys A, B, & C
as evidence 8. If the recommendations are accepted, a suggested timeline would include Vivian Covington contacting teacher education faculty members to serve on the Ad Hoc Committees. EP would meet the first of December to decide on how to begin working with the Ad Hoc Committees. All Ad Hoc Committees should have at least one meeting by January. The EP Committee would reconvene in February and March to check the progress of the Ad Hoc Committees. Draft copies of recommendations from the Ad Hoc Committees should be submitted to the EP Committee by May 8th. A chart of key evidences showing the placement of the recommendations was included. No vote was taken on recommendations as there was no longer a quorum present.

Admission & Retention—Kathy Davis reported that the committee met October 20 and November 3, 2008 and discussed the admission/retention process. The Deans’ Council is still debating whether to still require the 2.5 GPA and Praxis I tests for admission into Upper Division. NCDPI no longer requires these as admissions criteria. The committee decided to develop admission standards that were supportive of the 21st Century Standards, that would have different levels/points in the program that would represent “emerging” and “developing” skills. What is required by the state for accreditation would be considered at the “proficiency” level. In anticipation of the Dean’s Council decision, Plan A and Plan B were developed.

Plan A requires:  
2.5 GPA  
Praxis I – 3 tests

Plan B requires:  
2.5 GPA  
“C or better” in ENGL 1100 & 1200, MATH 1065 (or equivalent)

For both plans for admission, Upper Division Interview application would be revised to include 21st Century Skills; require COMM 2410/2420: Public Speaking in “Foundations Curriculum”; require Dispositions Form A – students would bring it to the Upper Division Interview, and discuss why/how they rated themselves as they did; require a background check – including criminal and child protection services; and determining that “C or better” means a numerical average of 74-76 (letter grade C or better; C- would not be included).

To justify changes, it was decided that the 2.5 GPA was required for graduation and it was needed for Upper Division to avoid getting behind; replacing Praxis I scores with “C or better” in equivalent courses seemed a fair substitution; revising the rubrics for UD and Dispositions to “parallel” the new standards seemed prudent; requiring a Public Speaking course is needed for teacher candidates, but this idea must be shared with the Provost’s Council so the Communications Department will be able to offer enough sections for teacher education students; the committee felt that having the candidates defend their self-ratings on Disposition A was a good way to make them more aware of their behaviors.

For retention, it was decided that teacher candidates in all programs would be required to ask two faculty members in the program area to complete a Form B for them – to be attached to the Internship Application submitted before the Senior I semester; to get into Senior I, the intern would be required to obtain three (3) letters of recommendation – 2 from program area professors, and 1 as an “outside reviewer” (who has knowledge of how the intern works with children); and in 2123, candidates would be required to write an “Observation Statement of Reflection” that includes points of learning from the required 16 observation hours.

To justify changes in retention: It was decided that background checks were vital for anyone who is working in the public schools; the clarification of “C” versus “C-” was necessary; recommendation letters will make candidates more responsible in courses leading up to the Senior I semester and provide another “checkpoint”; a more formal assessment in 2123 may assist in determining the dedication of candidates, and provide a critical thinking assessment.

Policy—no report.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m. The next meeting will be December 8, 2008 in SP 312.

Respectfully submitted,

Sherry S. Tripp