

Minutes  
Advisory Council for Teacher Education  
October 13, 2004

In attendance: Karen Bard, Mark Byra, Dave Brinkman, Janet Constantinides, Meredith McLaughlin, Korie Whiteman for CJ Nelson, Deb Parkinson, Kay Persichitte, Nancy Smueles, Joe Stepan, MaryAnn Wurzel (by phone), DJ Yocom.

Deb called the meeting to order at 4:07. The request for a letter of support regarding anticipated changes in the EDST 3000 syllabus regarding a requirement of education students to join a student organization caused a discussion that was generally supportive, but widespread. Joe made a motion (seconded by DJ) to draft such a letter of support, but the motion was withdrawn after discussion. Kay was asked to return to the EDST profs and request a copy of the language that will be included in the syllabus for this topic and to bring that back for Council consideration. The discussion included cost to students, membership vs. participation, community service options, and other.

Deb has a request out to a Laramie CSD#1 PLC faculty person as a potential member to represent the PLCs and the WSUP TITF representative will be identified at the first meeting of this task force on Oct. 14.

The WTEP Assessment Plan that resulted from the May 2004 summer workshop was shared with some description, clarification, and discussion. Decision Point (DP) 2: currently nothing in documentation regarding the Grade of C or higher in the O course. Kay will follow-up on this with other faculty to clarify. DP 3: the current language that we have for the number of credit hours required (and in certain courses or areas) for both elementary and secondary is missing and needs to be added. DP 4: need to add a bullet that says "Successful completion of Phase IIIA." Other general discussion that occurred among Council members: P-12 faculty support of in-field practicum experiences in the WTEP, and especially in methods; possibility of expanding the PLCs to include EDST 3000 placements and participating school sites for those placements; need to continue to accommodate content areas in EDST 3000 placements; importance of continuing to use multiple avenues for input and dissemination of all the issues/changes that are happening in the WTEP. The implementation schedule for changes to the core curriculum (based on approval pending at the Univ Course Committee) will be discussed at a meeting on Oct. 25 with Department Heads, the Dean, and Kay. Information will be shared with the ACTE as issues evolve.

Nancy shared the historical context for the current 2.3 GPA policy for DP 1 (entry to EDST 2000...soon to be EDST 2480). She shared results of conversations with the Center for Advising and Career Services (CACS) and their support for increasing this threshold to 2.5. The Council discussion centered on the importance of minimizing the "distance" between the DP 1 GPA and the DP 2 (admission to the WTEP) GPA. At least two Council members voiced support for raising both the 2.5 and 2.75 thresholds. It was noted that this might be a good goal for our future consideration, but that we need to be cautious of taking too big steps all at once. Council members were overwhelmingly supportive of the CoEd faculty vote to raise the GPA to 2.75. There was unanimous support for revising the agreement with the CACS and documents in the WTEP to reflect a change to 2.5 GPA from the previous 2.3 GPA.

The CACS expressed some concern about the student who would be starting their junior year and sitting at 2.74, not meeting the 2.75 criteria for DP 2. This brought the discussion to the DRAFT Policy Statement (9.24.04) regarding "windows," provisional admits, and continuation in the WTEP. Nancy shared the results on a review of relevant data for the current 138 students who are in Methods. Of these 138, there were 5 elementary and 5 secondary students who did not meet the 2.75 threshold even though their threshold was 2.5. Janet provided an example of the problems that can result when such policies are set with or without strict criteria for decision-making. We were cautioned about putting into place a system that could not be impartially or fairly administered well into the future. It was noted that there is a College policy and procedure in place for a student to appeal an admission decision and that if the gpa policy were strictly stated as "2.75 or higher cumulative GPA," students would have the option to appeal any denial of admission. The policy and procedure we currently have in place seems to have been effective and fair to students and faculty. Meredith made a motion to change the statement to, "2.75 or higher cumulative GPA," for DP 2 and 3. Karen seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

The meeting packet included a document titled, "Mentor Teacher Profile" from 4.28.99. This document was held for the agenda of our next meeting.

We adjourned at 5:20 pm.

Next meeting: October 27, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

Kay