

Elementary Teacher Education Senate Meeting
3:30-5:00 pm, Thursday, December 5, 2019
Curris Business Building, room 319

MINUTES

ATTENDANCE

PRESENT:

Scott Ellison (Professional Sequence), Allison Barness (Clinical Experiences), Betsy Zan (Early Childhood Education), Irene Walker (Elementary Education), Carolyn Weber (Middle Level Education), Kim Hurley (Physical/Health Education), Olly Steinhorsdittir (Math Education), Wendy Miller (Art), Cathy Miller (Chair, Educator Preparation Program Faculty), JD Cryer (Coordinator, Elementary Teacher Education)

ABSENT:

Michelle Swanson (Music Education), Lauren Kilborg (Student Representative)

I. Welcome and Remarks

JD welcomed senators and noted that we can't reserve rooms for our spring senate meetings until the beginning of next semester. He is going to try to reserve a room in SEC for the spring.

Cathy explained that her first term as EPP expires in May. Current bylaws say chair can have two consecutive terms. Cathy is willing to serve again. But we will have a vote in March or April.

II. November meeting minutes electronically approved.

Minutes were approved.

Reports

III. General Education Revision Committee Update

Cathy explained there is nothing new to report.

Old Business

IV. TE Diversity Committee was charged to do an assessment of where teacher candidates learn about including EL students in lessons.

- A. We need an elementary representative to the committee.
- B. Who chairs this committee?

Secondary senate approved this charge.

- JD noted that there is a need to replace Chris Kliever and find another elementary representative. JD asked senators how we should move forward?

- Allison asked who is currently on the committee?
 - JD answered Cathy Miller, Gabriela Oliveras, Heather Gallivan, and another elementary representative are the current members and JD has been chairing the committee.
- Aliza Fones, K-12 TESOL professor, indicated she might be interested in serving on this committee. Senators thought that a K-12 person would be okay to represent the elementary. Wendy said she would be willing to serve if Aliza chooses not to serve. Art is a K-12 subject area too.

In terms of the chair of the committee, Cathy spoke to university senate faculty about subcommittees. They have an outgoing chair and incoming chair model to provide continuity. This might be something EPP establishes too.

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 position description to inform or delay vote.)
 - 1. JD referred to the motion by asking if there was any further discussion?
 - a) Cathy shared that the lists are not organized as job descriptions, but lists of day to day and strategic/vision work.
 - b) Senators reviewed the lists and recognized the amount of tasks associated with each list
 - c) Cathy explained that maybe we do not need to talk about this for the motion and reminded people that the Senates only make recommendations to the administration, other than curricular. Because of this, we can think about a recommendation to administration that we feel would help with continuous improvement.
 - 2. Betsy wondered what would happen if we do not get the things done on these lists; that the items on the lists do not appear to be manageable for anyone. Betsy anticipates that the strategic/visionary work will suffer. Faculty asked to do much more than before, so maybe faculty do not have time to do this. If faculty don't have time to do this, who will?
 - 3. Cathy believes the Provost will work to assign administrators to do things.
 - 4. Olly said that maybe we need to move forward and try to make a recommendation.

B. Secondary senate's motion:

Adopt [JD's checklist](#) to use for recommending teacher candidates for the preservice substitute authorization license, with the addition of a due process policy included for students to challenge being denied the recommendation. Part of this process would have a student's program faculty consulted when student's readiness is questioned by JD using this checklist. (For example if one of the GPAs is 2.98.)

The list includes:

1. Proof of age being at least 21 years old.

2. Have completed at least the Level II field experience with competency in each category. If the applicant has completed the Level III field experience, also needs to have ratings of at least competency in each category.
3. GPA of at least 3.0 in all (cumulative/overall, major, and professional sequence) categories (or just cumulative/overall?).
4. No NOCs at the time of application. (This needs more discussion, no NOCs ever, or no unresolved ones at the time of application.)
 - JD shared the “Request for Substitute Authorization Verification Form” he created with students when they ask about this new option.
 - Allison asked if we can share this with students. JD responded, not yet -- it needs to be improved.
 - Cathy added that the secondary senate liked this checklist/form, but wanted due process for students to appeal being denied. For example, a student has a GPA of 2.98 really wants to do this, but is not approved. The Secondary Senate suggests that if students appeal, the program coordinator or student teaching coordinator be contacted to see if they would give a positive recommendation and approve the student, even though the GPA does not meet requirements.
 - Carolyn suggested that we use 2.5 GPA for overall, and 3.0 in professional sequence courses and methods if they have had a methods course.
 - Wendy asked about transfer students who might be 21 when they arrive on campus, they have very few courses. Kim said their GPA would be based on the very few courses. Scott shared a concern that this is just too much work for coordinator.
 - JD suggested 3.0 as it is, and/or recommendation from program coordinator or student teacher coordinator be attached.
 - Betsy supported the two GPAs Carolyn suggested, and make the cut off the end -- no exceptions. Allison said the extra person for approval could be the Level II coordinator.
 - JD is not comfortable with no exceptions, since our students can get a great experience from substitute teaching while helping the children and schools of Iowa when there is a shortage of substitute teachers available.
 - Betsy is also concerned that if our students don't have success when substituting, it might also negatively impact the reputation of our program. She noted that it won't take too many students who do not do a good job for this to happen.
 - Wendy agreed with JD based on what she has seen in schools there have been times when classes have been combined and one teacher is leading a class of 50-60 students. This is not good for anyone.
 - Cathy asked Allison to check with her colleagues in the Department of Teaching to see if they were called on for the appeal, if it would be OK.

- Scott reminded us that we wanted the process to be simple since it is an unfunded mandate.
- Allison agreed, and wonders if the appeal is needed.
- Olly added that she wanted the major GPA included. If either GPA is low and the coordinator says no -- the student is not approved for the license.
- GPA idea we appeared to agree on is overall/cumulative GPA of a 3.0. If the GPA is between 2.5 and 3.0, the student needs to get approval from the most recent university field experience coordinator and add it to the "Request for Substitute Authorization Verification Form".
- In terms of NOC on the form there were questions.
- JD thought it was no unresolved NOCs at the time of request, but Cathy thought it was no NOCs at all.
- Olly understood it as no NOCs ever.
- Kim agreed with JD.
- Allison made a case that an NOC early in the program should not keep a student from doing this.
- Carolyn noted that there does not appear to be standardization of NOCs across programs, so having no NOCs does not make sense.
- Everyone appeared to agree and said no unresolved NOCs at the time of request.

Who is the leader or head of unit for EPP?

At the November Secondary Senate meeting, a suggestion was made that this should not be one person, and that 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.

New Business

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

Allison brought forward the placement requirement document and asked that we take it back to colleagues to see what works or what does not work. Seems there was a methods course at a school, and Level I or II students might have been assigned to the classroom with the other methods class there. This could be a problem. Carolyn shared that the item where we are to ask the Dept. of Teaching has not been helpful. Allison noted that the placement requirements was not approved by the senates when it was presented in 2016. Allison said we need to be more clear with program requirements to make this work. Betsy noted that this policy would burden Early Childhood. Kim has not had good experiences with site coordinators, and was not comfortable reporting back to Tami and get people in trouble.

Continuing questions involved which points would work from the placement guide, would not work, and if we even wanted to use a placement guide? For new methods people a guide would help. JD noted again that this was not approved before due to similar problems and

questions. Carolyn asked if the document can be emailed, JD says yes. Allison said that before items 9 and 10 on the guide were the most controversial and 8 was problematic.

Wendy asked that there be a working group put together for Level III field experience, maybe as a response to the call presented at the Academic Positioning work.. Betsy shared that the department of Curriculum and Instruction is considering updating the Level III field experience. This might include a PDS model.

VII. State Follow up visit update

JD noted that the feedback was overall good. Still some concerns about secondary literacy.

VIII. EPP Assessment and support needs.

The Secondary Senate asked that the Leadership Team share their concern about EPP program's need of Watermark and an Assessment Coordinator, and the consequences that might happen without these in place. It was shared that Cathy and JD will present this information and concern with the provost at the next meeting.

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

Told to send names of student to JD.

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*

E. *Other?*

**We did not get to item "X" during the meeting*

Upcoming Dates (subject to change)

Elementary Senate

January 23--CBB 319

February 4--404 SEC

Secondary Senate

December 12-Presidential Room (Union)

January 30--State College Room (Union)