

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

# Teacher Education Committee

November 15, 2005

Approved Minutes (12-13-05)

**Members Present:** Tonya Balch, Brad Balch, Eric Hampton, Molly Hare, Hema Ganapathy-Coleman, Maury Miller, Beth Whitaker, Marilyn Leinenbach, Karen Hamilton, Liz Jones, Deborah Myers, Deb Knaebel, Dan Clark, Bill Wilhelm, Amanda Solesky, Linda Damer

**Members Absent:** Steve Gruenert, Jay Gatrell, Anthony Gilberti, Bob DeFrance

**Ex Officio Members Present:** Susan Powers, Robert Williams, Judy Sheese

**Ex Officio Members Absent:** Jolynn Kuhlman, Tad Foster, Bruce McLaren, Ann Rider, John Ozmun

**Guests:** Brian Coldren

1. Call to Order
2. Meeting with NCATE – Questions were asked by BOE Chairs: 1)What was TEC role with the UAS development? We serve in a guidance role and ensure it is followed, with departments developing individual pieces. 2)How is it reported to TEC and how do we know there is compliance? Course and program changes are approved by TEC. Arts and Sciences now have a TEC governing body. 3)When a student or students have trouble, how is this dealt with at the student or course level? Advisors assist with student issues. Course-level issues are shared at the program level. In larger departments, UAS data is shared collectively by the respective departments. 4)Are there examples of TEC considering a data-driven change? The undergraduate media program had data that supported the elimination of the program (i.e., low enrollment numbers). 5)Are there examples of adding or removing a class from a program that was data driven? In special education at the undergraduate level, student and faculty feedback (e.g., annual reviews, evaluation feedback from students) prompted SPED faculty to make a course change. 6)Explain the evolution of the Conceptual Framework (asked by TEC for the BOE Chairs)? Clearly it has evolved, but dates that support this are missing. In other words, a clear timeline is not apparent. Dating materials college-wide would be helpful to future teams. BOE Chairs noted that fully understanding “our” system is a challenge, but essential to the process. 7)TEC member question – What’s next? A preliminary report of approximately 80 pages will be tendered tonight and shared with the Dean’s Ofc. and the Provost. The remaining steps were explained.
3. Approval of Minutes (October 18, 2005)  
Motion - Molly Hare, 2<sup>nd</sup> - Liz Jones, Approval – Unanimous (15-0)
4. Old Business
  - A. Change TEP language to BCP 1, 2, 3  
Motion - Eric Hampton, 2<sup>nd</sup> - Dan Clark, Approval – Unanimous (15-0)
  - B. Application process for BCP  
Discussion of the gatekeeping nature of this process. Denials come too far in advance. The process is currently cumbersome and lack clarity. Students should be admitted to professional education once. With student teaching, students fill out paperwork a year before and then are denied. Doesn’t make sense. If tracked on the DARS report, it could be shared with instructors and students would more clearly understand what is expected.

Explanation about BCP 1, 2, and 3 was explained by Brian Coldren. Consensus was formed that this could be streamlined. It was suggested that a sub-committee be formed to address this. Brian Coldren, Karen Hamilton and Beth Whitaker agreed to serve on the committee.

5. New Business - None
6. Dean's Report—Bob Williams – A thanks was extended to all who assisted with the NCATE visit. The exit interview will occur on 11/16 in late morning. Also on 11/16 at 4:00, a celebration of the BOE visit will occur on the COE 11<sup>th</sup> floor. All are welcome.
7. Acting Associate Dean's Report—Susan Powers – No report
8. ESS Report—Judy Sheese – Additions to existing Rules 46-47 licensure is subject to change through the Dept. of Education. Judy will keep TEC posted.
9. Adjourn  
Motion - Beth Whitaker, 2<sup>nd</sup> – Brad Balch, Approved by acclamation.

Respectfully submitted by,  
*Brad Balch, TEC Secretary*