Educator Preparation Executive Council
Monday, March 11, 2019
2:00-3:00 pm
Seerley 119
Minutes

Present:
Jim Wohlpart, Leslie Wilson, Brenda Bass, Gaetane Jean-Marie, Colleen Mulholland, Maureen Clayton, Cathy Miller, Olly Steinhorsdottir, Nicki Skaar, Chad Christopher, JD Cryer

Absent: Darcie Davis-Gage

I. Governance Model Update
   A. Cathy Miller presented two flowcharts: Decision making and Communication to Elementary Senate and Graduate Licensure Council
   B. Feedback
      1. Make clear that Provost is head of unit. He/she will have final say when it comes to financial resources.
      2. Make connection between two charts
      3. Who will chair the Executive Council in model?
      4. Who will chair the Leadership team in model?
   C. Discussion
      1. The Dean of the College of Education will be the chair of the Executive Council from now on.
      2. The Provost will be the chair of the Leadership team
      3. We will use the models in a trial run before changing Teacher Education Bylaws.

II. Educator Preparation Program Task Force Update and Feedback Gathered
   A. Discussion took place around the Task Force Draft #1 Proposal
      1. The scope of the charge is too narrow
      2. Needs to include reviews of TESI, Social Emotional/Mental Health, and Resilience so both our teacher candidates know what to do for themselves, but also want to do for their future students.
      3. Need to revise the charge and be more specific. This seems to be too general. If given to the Justice League committee they could miss somethings if they are not listed specifically in the charge.
      4. The Task Force seems to be assuming that the right people will be on the Justice League and subcommittees and will know the concerns of the program to address. This is a risk. The charge needs to be very specific about these concerns so there are no assumptions made.
      5. Are there opportunities within the charge to talk about state requirements such as the new dyslexia law? Where in our program do we teach this?
      6. What about finishing in 4 years?
7. Human Relations course and cultural competency? Is the expertise there to teach concepts appropriately?
8. How is all the work of TESI integrated into the charge? Needs to be there
9. Much of the charge has us trusting that the subcommittees will have the right people as members.
10. The charge does not emphasize enough “action”. There is an assumption that things will be implemented and things will change, but it is not stated. It needs to be in the charge that the work of the Justice League will result in change and a new teacher education program.
11. People are not seeing the charge as action-oriented
12. People are not seeing the charge as all-encompassing
13. We need to start with the Educator Preparation Program Belief Statements and turn these into specific outcomes for our program. This will allow us to back map our program. This is not in the charge. We need to work with backward design of the entire curriculum.
14. The recommendations from the state gave us a context for why we need to reexamine our curriculum, but it shouldn’t drive our work.
15. We cannot be solely focused on what the Department of Education recommended in the state report. We need to understand where the field is moving and progressing. This will allow us to know how to connect and enhance what we are doing.
16. We have to base all of this on assessment and data
17. We know change is happening in Iowa/Nation/World related to so many things: mental health, English Learners, special education needs so we have to be very intentional and know what is being taught in our program, where it is being taught in our program, and if we are being successful in teaching these things to our students.
18. With all of these areas and concerns, we do have to be mindful that we have a goal of students matriculating in four years. We need to pay attention to this.
19. What is the approval process for all of this work?
20. We need to try to follow the example set by the General Education Revision Process. We need to set up smaller stages of the overall process so at each step the stages are approved. For example. We need to set a process for the Task Force in selection of the membership on the Justice League. Is this representative? Are all voices included? Once this process is approved within our new Governance Model, The Justice League committee can be formed and approved. Then we move to the next stage in the process. The Task Force creates the charge. This charge will be vetted for feedback. After applying all of the feedback the Task Force can present its final charge for approval within the Governance model. Then we can start working on the Learning Outcomes and so forth.
21. We should have the Task Force go back to the original charge from the October Joint Senate meeting to see if the new charge matches the goals of the original charge.

III. Watermark Update
A. JD presented that the committee leading this investigation asked for the consultants to provide information to faculty, students, clinical faculty, and support staff. They also asked that a smaller team go to ISU and U of Iowa to talk with their constituent groups directly. The committee would gather all of the information and provide a report to the Senates, Graduate Licensure Council, and Executive Council in May.

B. Discussion took place
   1. When would we be trying to start this rollout?
   2. Can this actually be done by the fall?
   3. What is the complexity of this for IT to make necessary changes?
   4. What is the cost for implementation?
      a) IT time?
      b) Cost of work time to absorb this?
      c) Are there extra “charge backs”?
   5. How could this tool be used in the Curriculum Mapping and needs of the Justice League committee work?
   6. Need to start with Outcomes first
   7. More information is needed.

IV. NCTQ Update
   A. Dean Jean-Marie informed the council that the decision was made to provide NCTQ with the information they requested. Chad and JD are compiling the information and will submit for the university.

V. Elevating Educators: Educator of the Game Update
   A. JD provided update
   B. Questions from Provost: How to pay for this? No outside funding has been secured. So far, Provost’s Officer has provided funds. Should this continue without external funding? How much can we spend as a university?

VI. AACTE 2020 proposal writing opportunity - AACTE 2019 participants
   A. Proposals for AACTE 2020 are due on May 29
   B. Colleen is organizing a zoom meeting for April 2 to increase interest and writing of proposals to submit
   C. The Scholarspace has been reserved each week in order for people to meet and write their proposals

VII. Enhancing visibility idea for undergraduate teaching majors - Associate Deans/College Marketing/Comm Mgrs
   A. Group is looking at addressing concerns associated with the confusion of “Teacher Education” across campus and with recruiting measures.
   B. Looking at universal messaging starting with consistent language right from first touch with interested students.
   C. An example would be the Landing Page for each department associated with the Educator Preparation Program. There would be consistent information with a link stating “Be a Teacher”. Link would take them to specific information, maybe a map of their journey, and a connection to FAQs. Maybe a checklist.
   D. This work would help all of us know and understand our Ed Prep Program better.
   E. Work is being done to strengthen the Visit Days. For example, co-locating all teaching departments together at the McLeod Center.
F. Having a specific “Teacher Day” in the mix with “Visit Days.”

VIII. Other
   A. Jane Elliot is coming next fall on September 13. We will want to promote this event. Blue eyes/Brown eyes. Specific involvement of 40 people at this event to participate.

**Executive Council Meetings**
Monday, April 22 2:00-3:00 pm

**Teacher Education Senate Meetings**
- Elementary Education Senate
- Secondary Education Senate
  - March 14--Joint Senate Meeting

**Teacher Education Convocation**
Wednesday, March 27 4:00 PM GBPAC