

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY
TEACHER EDUCATION COMMITTEE
February 20, 2007

APPROVED MINUTES
(3-20-07)

Members present: T. Balch, D. Ballard, D. Clark, H. Ganapathy-Coleman, S. Gruenert, E. Hampton, M. Hare, K. Miller, M. Miller, D. Quatroche, A. Solesky, W. Wilhelm.

Members absent: L. Calvin, R. DeFrance, W. Flurkey, A. Gilberti, F. Lai, M. Leinenbach, D. Rueckert, A. Stafford.

Ex Officio Members present: R. Libler, J. Sheese.

Others present: M. Sacopulos.

1. Meeting called to order at 3:35 by Chair S. Gruenert.
2. Approval of minutes: D. Quatroche moved approval of the January 16, 2007 minutes. D. Clark seconded. Minutes were approved (11-0-0).
3. Old Business
 - A. Assessment Day – Fall 2007

A two-page handout including overarching questions was distributed for discussion. D. Quatroche asked if new UAS subcommittees were set up yet. S. Gruenert replied that there were as of yet insufficient membership.
 - B. Establishment of new UAS Committees

There is a need for a number of individuals to fill the new UAS committees. Four individuals are needed for the initial committee, one being from TEC, two from content areas. One more individual from TEC is needed on the advanced committee. S. Gruenert will communicate these needs to chairs and program coordinators and have them forward names. The work of the subcommittees and the direction needing to be pursued was discussed. TEC members feel it is acceptable for the Executive committee of TEC to vote on the slate of names once they are filled.
4. New Business
 - A. Legal issues related to policies – M. Sacopulos

M. Sacopulos spoke about legal issues related to policies passed by one body while another body hears appeals to policies. The question has arisen around certain requirements for students on whether a committee has the authority to make exception to policy that the committee had not enacted. Policies are generally something that the Board of Trustees has moved on to make university policy. When dealing with local governance, there is not always clear understanding of

whether things rise to the level of policy. As a legal matter, if something is a policy moved upon by the Board of Trustees, then we do not have authority to make exceptions unless language exists within the policy granting this. If something is, rather, a procedure or a rule, then this is different. Strict interpretive bodies of information do not exist on this. Different colleges apply rules in different ways. As we review rules and policies, we should figure out what we need discretion in regard to and what we do not. If we create policy and then eat away at it with exceptions, then we have created a problem. This can lead to legal ramifications. We should think up front (not when dealing with a particular student's issue) programmatically on why the rule is in place. If we are going to make exceptions, then we need to outline criteria articulating the exceptions and procedures for these. A platform on which to base these decisions is necessary.

J. Sheese reported that this question arose from committees that hear appeals, stemming from decision on allowing students into CIMT 301/302 without criteria in place.

D. Clark spoke about the committee that rewrote TEC bylaws. TEC is setting policies but we do not have an established way of dealing with appeals. We are leaving it to groups that did not create the policies. There was not a feeling that TEC needed a group to hear appeals.

M. Sacopulos stated that if one committee is in charge of something, then it does not make sense to have other bodies hearing appeals. It is important that decisions are made consistently. There is always an overriding concern of due process. In this case the property interest at stake is the student contract with the university. Due process in this case means notice and adhering. Students need an opportunity to tell someone why they disagree. We need to go back and decide if there is latitude to grant appeals. If we have this, then what are the criteria for granting appeals? If they do not exist, then they must be developed. If we do not have documented parameters that serve as a buttress for our decisions, this is problematic. If a discrimination argument is made, we will be pressed to have the burden of proof. We need substantive bases for our decisions. A question is whether TEC has implicitly given the right to departments to make decisions about TEC approved policies or rules. We need a framework so everyone understands the rules.

Discussion of whether we should be more involved in exceptions ensued. S. Gruenert asks whether it would be beneficial for TEC to provide all departments parameters by which they hear appeals, or whether TEC should hear appeals. This will be on the March TEC agenda.

B. Programs providing data for Assessment Day

S. Gruenert asks legal counsel about possible ramifications for programs not providing data or reporting information to UAS committees for Assessment Day. The question is, if programs or departments do not cooperate, what do we do, how

far can we go? Members described situations and various potential reasons for not responding. M. Sacopulos suggests working through the Provost's office and back through the Dean of the College from which you are trying to collect information.

C. COE Climate Assessment

Results from the survey administered during assessment day were distributed. The provided data had items circled that do not reflect well on climate. The question of how seriously the survey was taken was discussed. Climate is the attitude of the building. Attitudes are based on environment. S. Gruenert concluded that there are a few items that need help, but that a toxic environment is not evident. It does not indicate that professors are really having run here. E. Hampton suggested doing this survey online with a larger sample prior to Assessment Day and discussing results at the next Assessment Day.

D. Executive Committee for 2007-2008

As TEC goes evolves and becomes more robust, do we want to keep the executive committee as it now stands for another year or do we want to change it. M. Miller moved that we maintain the current executive committee for another year. D. Clark seconded. The bylaws were referenced to check on this. The bylaw language removed the need for consideration of this issue as executive committee members serve for two years. M. Miller withdrew the motion.

E. Criminal History Checks – J. Sheese

Vigo County has adopted new criminal history check procedures. We are developing a procedure similar to what we are now doing. Information will be sent out on these new procedures. Checks will be conducted for everyone who goes into schools. This will start next fall.

5. Reports

A. Dean's Report

R. Libler: A white paper is circulating discussing office hours and how many should be held. As we increase use of distance technology we have seen a decrease in the number of people present in the building. Enrollment planning has been discussed. It is hoped that this will impact this.

An event is being planned for prospective students in April. Invitations will go out to people having made inquiries or identified any areas of education as an interest. This even will contain mini-teaching units and focus on curriculum specific to education majors. Information about this event will be forthcoming. April 11th is the expected date at this time.

Five searches are going on and none have failed to date. Two offers have been extended and one has been accepted. Three searches are winding down.

The Dean's office will be absent to AACTE from February 24 – 27.

B. Associate Dean's Report

R. Libler: Project PRE has been active in supporting initiatives. EESE had a retreat last week and are moving forward on development of the professional semester. Four different workshops supported by Project PRE will be offered this summer. There is still room for more workshops.

Information was handed out on a center of pedagogy. A task force on this issue has submitted a report. This document is a draft of a proposal for a center for pedagogy at ISU. This has been reviewed by the Deans of Education and Arts and Sciences. They have provided input into this. TEAC in Arts and Sciences is reviewing this. The PDS steering committee has reviewed this. TEC should now review the information. Comments and feedback are appreciated and should be sent to R. Libler or brought to the next TEC meeting.

C. ESS Report – J. Sheese

Copies of the most recent Title two data, listing grades for Praxis II for the last five years, including the most recent was distributed. If you have fewer than ten in a subgroup, that is not reported.

6. Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 4:55. The next TEC meeting will be on March 20th at 3:30.

Respectfully submitted by:

Eric Hampton
TEC Secretary