Teacher Education Council Executive Committee

Meeting Minutes
November 15, 2004

The Teacher Education Council Executive Committee (TECXC) met on Monday, November 15, 2004 at 1:30 p.m. The meeting was held in Beering Hall Conference Room 6115.

Secretary: B. Jensen

I. Welcome - S. Moon
S. Moon welcomed all members present.

II. Approval of Minutes 09-14-04
The minutes stand approved.

III. Review of Agenda for December 3, 2004 - Committee Members
TEC and TECXC Agenda, Minutes, and Format
S. Moon started the conversation by addressing the format of the meeting minutes and asked if the minutes were adequate. P. VanFossen stated that since the Teacher Education Council Executive Committee (TECXC) was an advisory group, the minutes should be extensive in regards to the discussions or proposals that took place. C. Knoeller stated that an advantage to the extended or dictated format is, if an issue rises to the surface it may be easier to follow up on that particular issue or question. It was agreed upon that the minutes for the TECXC should be more detailed; and the minutes for the Teacher Education Council (TEC) should be more summarized.

S. Moon presented the draft TEC agenda and its new format. She noted to members to pay close attention to the action items to ensure they are ready to go before the Council, as well as, ensure that the visioning topic stays on track. The discussion then moved to the previous Professional Development Forum. It was noted that the activity went well and there are expectations that the upcoming forum also will be good. Members then discussed the items on the next TEC agenda. The members questioned if there were set guidelines as to how programs made their way to the Teacher Education Council. T. Oakes stated that there was a flow chart, but no specific guidelines for submitting programs. S. Moon stated that the TECXC serves as a gatekeeper and a leadership team for the TEC. She also stated that nothing should pass through without examination. Members discussed the idea of the TECXC serving in this capacity and the possible time saved for the TEC as well as to ensure the readiness of proposals. G. Hynd added that if the TECXC could serve this function it also would help move the Teacher Education Program forward in a more broad sense.

TEC Operational Guidelines
It was decided that in the future the TECXC should receive proposal materials prior to the TECXC meeting, which would ensure the readiness of the item to be brought before the TEC. T. Oakes asked if the faculty would be ready to back up the process that far. It was asked how the committee would verify the fact that the program had obtained the appropriate approval documentation. G. Hynd stated a procedural checklist would make the process more efficient and ensure the credibility of proposals. T. Oakes stated that there used to be a signature form; however, faculty did not care to use it.
G. Hynd then reviewed the Operational Guidelines. The Teacher Education Council Executive Committee (TECXC) shall:

1. Receive communications directed to the TEC and make proper disposition of them by either placing them on the TEC agenda or acting for the TEC if the matter is routine;

2. Prepare the agenda for the TEC meetings;

3. Assist the chair in making effective the formal actions of the TEC; and

4. Facilitate cooperation among campuses, academic schools, departments, and programs on new policies and changes in policy.

After review of the guidelines members discussed the need for distinction between conceptual approval and final approval and that all action items need to go before the TEC. G. Hynd stated the TECXC would review the item and recommend that the TEC give final approval. Discussion followed about how to keep the TECXC from disenfranchising itself from the TEC. It was noted that this process could be done by giving an executive committee report at the TEC meetings; however, the TECXC needed to be careful not to allow proposals to pass through with insufficient information or without going through a checklist. S. Moon noted this was not entirely the fault of the TECXC since in the past there was no signal given regarding insufficient information. G. Hynd did note that there was no requirement for a Program Convener’s signature. T. Oakes also noted that there was a need for information regarding the program’s alignment with institutional, state, and national standards.

**College of Education**

G. Hynd commented on the School of Education name change to College of Education, effective January 2005. He informed members that the change would be celebrated in April.

**Reports**

**Unit Assessment System (UAS) Decision - Support System**

Discussion began with the flow of data and how it will be complied and acted upon as well as the assessment coordinator role. The weaknesses cited from the accreditation visit also were discussed. S. Moon informed members that C. Mattix would be responsible for technology needs and R. Frisbie would create a report based on all six National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standards. P. VanFossen stated the decision support nomenclature was not clear. S. Moon replied that the Assessment Coordinator role is to internally review the Teacher Education Program in regards to the six NCATE standards. P. VanFossen asked for a definition of the role that the TEC/TECXC would play in the UAS. S. Moon stated that the focus of the UAS has been the candidate assessment system including methods and student teaching. She then stated that the UAS encompasses more than candidate assessment. It also needs to address the diversity of the candidates and faculty as well as other NCATE standards. The Assessment Coordinator report will address all six standards and will compile information for the next accreditation visit. Members then discussed a possible title for this area. It was agreed that the area could be called Unit Assessment System Accountability and Reporting Office with the primary function to produce the UAS Annual Report.
Year End Report

T. Oakes noted the Year-End Report is a link and was already provided to administrators and program conveners. Each program has an opportunity to add program specific questions.

Credit Hour Comparison
T. Oakes stated that the Office of Professional Preparation and Licensure surveyed various institutions and found Purdue did not require as much Professional Education course work as other institutions.

Branding
S. Moon reported that B. Watson would be retrieving stakeholder information for future branding tasks.

Programs
It was noted that Early Adolescence Generalist: Science and Mathematics had no report for the upcoming TEC meeting. T. Oakes stated that the reason this program was staying on the agenda was to keep track of the programs as previously requested by the TECXC. G. Hynd stated he believed the reason there continued to be no report was due to an insufficient number of faculty to offer the program.

Visioning
G. Hynd stated the last TEC conversation regarding visioning was proceeding. It also was noted that the Council should be held accountable for conversation to help move the productivity of the TEC and Teacher Education forward.

TEC Engagement and Professional Development Forum
G. Hynd asked how we (TEXC/TEC) engage the programs in the TEC. It was stated that an intersection needed to be made since there were issues related to assessment and accreditation. If the connection is not made and people or programs do not feel engaged, then the TEC becomes the only vehicle for Teacher Education. Members deliberated ways to help this process. One way is to have a small secondary committee consisting of program conveners. Another way is to configure the Council in a manner such as a House of Representatives and Senate.

G. Hynd noted his enthusiasm regarding the Indiana Mentoring and Assessment Program (IMAP) Professional Development Activity. S. Moon stated IMAP was relevant to the Unit Assessment System Task Force. D. Gunstra stated that elementary education had already started implementing a similar system.

IV. Other
G. Hynd updated the group regarding the IPSB meeting on November 16th. He stated that the public institution deans have signed and sent a letter to the IPSB indicating endorsement of the option of Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs) or state program review. Members affirmed that some type of SPA review was inevitable and that the review will require more work prior to the accreditation visit.

V. Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m. The next Teacher Education Council Executive Committee meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, February 1, 2005 at 1:30 p.m. in Beering 6115.