ATTENDANCE

Present:

Sheila Benson (English), Elizabeth Zwanziger (Modern Language/TESOL), Mary Doyle (Clinical Experiences), Ron Reinhart (Alt for Nicki Skaar) Professional Sequence), Samantha Goss (Art), David Hernandez-Seca (Special Education), Kyle Gray (Science), Jennifer Anderson (Business), Kevin Droe (Music), Elizabeth Hughes (Mathematics), Catherine Miller (EPP Faculty chair), JD Cryer (Coordinator of Teacher Education)

Absent:

Dominick Manusos (Technology and Engineering), Kyle Rudick (Speech and Theatre), Barb Bakker (P.E./Health)

I. Welcome

JD welcomed everyone and introduced Samantha Goss, representing art education.

Cathy noted that next semester concludes her first term as EPP faculty chair and that she plans to run again when elections are held in March/April; however, she invited all others in the program to feel free to run for the position if interested.

II. Approval of November meeting minutes

Done.

III. Reports

A. General Education Revision Committee Update

No report

Old Business

IV. TE Diversity Committee was charged to “have the diversity committee to do an assessment of the program to see where EL is already in our program in order to support our faculty and think about next steps.”

A. Question of “who chairs this committee?” was discussed

1. Should this be a faculty member?
2. Should we follow the example of the Faculty Senate for subcommittee leadership?
3. Until a decision is made, JD offered to continue chairing this subcommittee. No one objected to JD serving as chair of this committee next semester. However, continued discussion and bylaw revisions will be necessary.

V. Current Motions:

A. To recommend a position be created in the Teacher Education Office to do the day-to-day work involved with both elementary and secondary teacher education programs. (Refer to job description to inform or delay vote.)
   1. Cathy spoke about these as a listing of tasks needing to be completed by the Teacher Education Program and not job descriptions, as it is a bit premature.
   2. Senators were asked to read these lists and be prepared to discuss in January in order to get back to the motion.

B. Secondary senate’s motion for completing the Preservice Substitute Authorization Verification for “exemplary classroom readiness” as listed in the new law:
   1. The Teacher Education Program will base verification of “exemplary classroom readiness” on the student’s completion of Level II, Level III, or Level IV rubrics with competency in each category of the given rubric, GPA of at least 3.0, and no NOC’s at the time of request, with the addition of a due process policy included for students to challenge being denied the recommendation. The due process would have a student’s program faculty and field experience coordinator consulted when student’s readiness is questioned by JD using the newly developed checklist. (For example if one of the GPAs is 2.98.)
   2. JD reviewed the process he has been using based upon the suggestions of the senates during this first semester.
   3. David said first generation students and students of color may not be aware of how to be self-advocates to do this.
   4. Cathy shared that her concern is the workload for the Coordinator position.
   5. JD said there have been about 75 requests for verification, and only about 10% of the students do not have 3.0 GPAs, so the workload may not be an issue. His concern is about consistency across all cases.
   6. Samantha wondered if program advisors could help students with the appeal.
   7. JD shared that some students at other institutions have been caught cutting class to substitute teach. This would be something to keep an eye on as we move forward.

C. Vote was taken on the motion. Vote to accept motion was passed.
VI. Who completes strategic/visionary work of EPP? Who is the leader or head of unit for EPP?

A. At the November Secondary Senate meeting a suggestion was made that leadership might not need to be one person; instead, the Leadership Team can make these decisions and do this. The Provost would be involved if money is involved or if the Leadership Team is not able to reach consensus. Included in the conversation was that the Provost can serve as a figurehead, head of unit when needed. No motion was made regarding this.

B. JD reviewed the options we have explored thus far.

C. Cathy shared the elementary senate gave cautious support of the Leadership Team to lead the vision/strategic work.

D. Discussion took place:

1. What if the Leadership team does not reach consensus -- who makes the decision when decision is needed? What if the senates and Leadership team disagree? Who makes the decision?

2. Kevin asked for membership of Leadership team. CM listed members: COE Dean or her representative (maybe Assoc. Dean), TE elementary coordinator (now JD), TE secondary coordinator (currently a vacant position), EPP Faculty chair (now Cathy), director of assessment (currently a vacant position) and if the EPP faculty chair is not from a secondary program, a secondary representative will be added to the team.

New Business

VII. State Follow up visit update

A. Literacy instruction as required by state--Sheila TABLED to next time

B. JD described what was submitted for the state’s follow up visit in fall 2019 about reading in content area. Highlighted parts of syllabi where we stated what we did to meet this concern was presented. When the BOEE people returned to UNI last week, they said they could see by the syllabus what was being listed as being done to meet the concern for reading in the content area. However, they wanted to see evidence of what is being done. The BOEE people shared the table where they are also asking about what reading strategies are taught and how are we assessing the reading lessons. At some schools, the data system (Watermark for example) have rubrics uploaded to document what students learned about literacy instruction.

C. Discussion took place:

1. Sheila indicated that reducing literacy in content areas to little boxes does not represent the complexity of literacy instruction.
2. Cathy shared that two things are needed 1) Complete the work required by the IDOE team, and 2) Continue to improve so we know we are preparing future teachers to be good teachers.

3. David agreed that making it work in our curricula for various content areas is complex.

4. Samantha asked what do they [IDOE] specifically require for literacy instruction?

5. David wondered if FERPA comes to play when sharing rubrics.

6. JD said no, FERPA shouldn’t be a concern. He believes that the goal of the code is for us to provide evidence that students learn about reading strategies and how to implement these in each specific content area.

7. David believes that this is more than literacy, but has social justice and special education components too.

8. Ron asked if we have a working knowledge of what literacy means. He explained how science literacy is different from reading/writing literacy. He wonders if IDOE has a definition of literacy we are supposed to comply with.

9. Kyle said that in Washington State, all teachers need to take a reading course.

10. Cathy said for now we need to complete the form JD sent out in response to IDOE’s program follow up visit last week. In the long term, we need to support faculty as they teach reading in their content area, and we need to figure out a way to document what we do to satisfy Ch. 79.

11. Cathy wondered if we should have the TE Curriculum Subcommittee start to organize this next semester.

12. Elizabeth asked when the tables on the form are due. JD said by Jan. 31. If more than one person teaches the methods course, need one table filled out per program.

VII. Field Experience placement requirements for ALL UNI Teacher Education field experiences.

A. Mary passed out the document from 2016 (first draft in 2011) that was begun to organize FE placements. She was asked to bring this back to the senate due to site coordinators and administrators at schools feeling there is inconsistency among Field Experience students in buildings. For example, UNI faculty should not contact teachers directly.

B. It was described that there have been times recently when there are more than one field experience happening in the same classroom.

C. One suggestion from the Field Experience Placement Guide is that all Field Experiences go through Department of Teaching, not because they own it, but to make sure all work together. Schools want this to be consistent.

D. Mary asked that senators take the document back to their constituents and make suggestions about how we can improve our placement process.
E. Jennifer asked if we could be involved before student teaching placements are made. This would help us to be sure that our students have a variety of placements.

F. Mary said student teaching placements are done by student teaching coordinators, and hope they would welcome help.

G. Cathy suggested that we figure out how to open more lines of communication for placements throughout our entire program. That maybe this is something for the Teacher Education Clinical Subcommittee to start reviewing.

VIII. EPP Assessment and support needs.

A. JD shared that we have been told that IT is not making any new updates or revisions to the UNITED system. That because the software is changing and needs to be updated until a decision is made if we want to continue using UNITED or are going to move to an outside assessment system (Watermark) work is at a standstill.

B. JD also shared the charge from the senates last year to have a task force look at using Watermark as our assessment system. At the end of the spring 2019 semester the task force made the recommendation to the senates that we move to adopting Watermark as our assessment system instead of UNITED. The senates agreed and made the recommendation to upper administration to move in this direction. However, upper administration had concerns related to the human resources needed to implement Watermark. There was also concern about the timing related to curriculum revision of the program. JD mentioned that the next state report is due in 2022, and assessment is a major standard in Ch. 79.

C. Kyle asked about a contingency plan if we do not get Watermark. JD said we would continue to use UNITED as much as we can.

IX. Need a new student representative starting in January, send names to JD.

CJ student teaches next semester. Send recommendations to JD, but the student needs to have completed Level II.

X. Work needing to be done next semester, in addition to the routine work needed (curriculum, evaluate pre-service sub license recommendation process, AACTE outreach, question to advisory committee):

A. Write bylaws/constitution for Senates.

B. Use the Diversity committee’s work to plan EL improvement in TE program

C. Create learning outcomes that align and allow us to apply the TE mission/vision statements

D. Regroup committee to revise TE program

XI. Other?

- Continue reading in content area work
- Need to look at reviewing Level III across the program. What happens in Level I and Level II needs to inform our work in Level III. Consistency of Level III FE.
- Need to work on FE placement policies.
• How do we address the recent and historical race issues on campus. Maybe a shared calendar. How can we brainstorm and address institutional change for such recent and historical race issues on campus and its impact on TE?

**Upcoming Dates (subject to change)**

**Elementary Senate**

January 23 in CBB 319

**Secondary Senate**

January 30 (State College Room, MU)