

Elementary Teacher Education Senate
October 15, 2015
Meeting Minutes

I. Welcome

Present:

J.D. Cryer (Coordinator), Tony Gabriele (Professional Sequence), Deockki Hong (Physical Education and Health Education), Linda Fitzgerald (Early Childhood Education), Denise Tallakson (Elementary Education), Kim Miller (Special Education), Katlyn Andersen (Student Representative), Olly Steinhorsdottir (Mathematics Education), Amy Lockhart (Clinical Experiences), Melissa Heston (Literacy Education)

Absent:

Lynne Ensworth (Middle Level Education), Wendy Miller (Art Education), Michelle Swanson (Music Education), Merrilee Betts (Teacher Practitioner), DeeDee Heistad (Liberal Arts Core)

II. Approval of Minutes

Minutes for April 30, 2015 approved: Linda Fitzgerald moved to approve, Kim Miller seconded.

III. ESA Tiered Process Vote

Brief history of ESA process described.

- Last year the senates voted to accept ESAs for our TE program
- September 2015 UNI Teacher Education Coordinator of Assessment proposed a new ESA Tiered Process for the Teacher Education Program.
 - Phase I
 - Submitting group will bring specific proposed ESA before the senates.
 - Senates would deliberate and give Phase 1 approval for group to pilot the ESA and gather data.
 - Phase 2
 - Submitting group will bring back data to the senates.
 - Senates will deliberate.
 - Senates will approve the ESA and give the authority for it to be placed into our system the following year.

Question for today: To accept the ESA Tiered Process developed by the Assessment Coordinator.

Discussion took place among senators:

- Are ESAs to be used as critical components of our TEP?
- Do content areas have autonomy?
- The TEP hasn't defined critical components yet. This seems we are putting the cart before the horse.
- Are ESAs to be program-wide markers?
- What do we mean by ESAs?
- There has been no talk yet about making ESAs high stakes.
- Need to create a collective vision about our program and make decisions by data.
- Are ESAs formative assessment or high stakes?
- It would be an over reach of the senates to tell individual departments what they can and can't do for their own areas.
- The senates should have a say if the ESAs impact the entire TEP.
- If an individual department wants to move their ESA to a program level that impacts all areas, it would need Senate approval.

Senators decided to table the question until more information was presented: Linda Fitzgerald made motion to table the question until more information was presented. Olly Steinhorsdottir seconded. Motion passed to table the question.

IV. Level II ESA Vote

Question: To approve the Level II ESA for phase 1 of the ESA Tiered Process

Based upon discussion of ESA Tiered Process and decision to table the question on that vote, senators decided because there is not a established process in place, they can't vote to approve a specific ESA for the overall Teacher Education Program.

Additionally, since there is no ESA process in place, the Teacher Education Senates should not stand in the way of departments wanting to pilot improvement ideas for their own area. Thus, the Level II team should be able to go ahead and pilot the ESA for their area.

Finally, senators decided to table the question until more information was presented: Tony Gabriele made the motion to table the question until more information was presented. Olly Steinhorsdottir seconded. Motion passed to table the question.

V. Music Education Curriculum Question

A brief history of the proposed change in Music Education Curriculum was given.

- New state requirements caused Music Education to propose extending their program.
- The University Curriculum Committee asked them to rethink their proposal so they could meet the requirement yet not have an extended program.
- New proposal is that instead of two 2-hour methods courses, these would become 1-hour methods courses.
- Cathy Humke indicates that they already have 6 hours of methods courses in the overall program.
- UCC was satisfied but wanted TE Senates to provide feedback for Faculty Senate.

Discussion took place among senators:

- Not sure about the value of a 1-hour methods course.
- Music Education already has many 1-hour courses.
- State doesn't have any specific requirements for what this methods course must encompass.
- Tony Gabriele made motion to approve music education revised curriculum proposal pending that other curriculum changes are also approved so it doesn't become an extended program. Olly Steinthorsdottir second. 7-yes. 2-no.

VI. State Completion Exam Recommendation Discussion

Brief history of State Completion Exam Recommendation Timeline given:

- September
 - Joint Senate meeting. Senators receive report from the Teacher Education Program Assessment Committee
 - Senators communicate this report to their departmental colleagues and begin to gather feedback
- October
 - Senators continue gathering feedback from their departmental colleagues
 - Separate senate meetings to discuss feedback
- November
 - Survey will be placed on MyUNiverse for faculty input
 - Individual senators will vote for their department during separate Senate meetings using a "Roll-Call" procedure
 - Teacher Education Executive Council will receive all information
- December

- Provost Wohlpert will make a final decision on our State Completion Exam

Senators discussed and debated the benefits and drawbacks to continuing to use the Praxis II as the state completion exam and the benefits and drawbacks to switching to the use of the edTPA as the state completion exam.

VII. State Completion Vote Process Described

- Next month (November, 2015)
 - Survey will be placed on MyUNiverse for faculty input
 - Individual senators will vote for their department during separate Senate meetings using a “Roll-Call” procedure
 - If senator can’t be at the meeting, alternate can make the vote.
 - If neither person can be at the meeting, senator must contact Coordinator of Elementary Teacher Education by 3:00 pm with vote. This will be read aloud at the senate meeting.
 - If no contact is made, the senator loses the chance to vote and this will be noted in the minutes.
 - Teacher Education Executive Council will receive all information

VIII. Chapter 79 Team Teaching Requirement Compliance

Questions from September, 2015 meeting:

- What does 40-hours of teaching at the appropriate grade level mean?
- Does the 40-hours of teaching mean anything in the teaching cycle (planning, instruction, assessment, material development), not just standing in front of the class teaching?

Answer from the state presented:

- According the Iowa Department of Education, “Team Teaching” refers to any work that faculty do in the appropriate instructional setting to engage with students. This could be as simple as helping to support students as they complete individual work, joining a small group of students to facilitate discussion, or up to full large group/whole class teaching. The goal is to have faculty collaborate with the classroom teacher in order to actively engage with students and not just sit back and observe students working.

IX. Upcoming Dates

Elementary Senate

November 5, CBB 319
 December 3, CBB 319
 January 15, CBB 319
 February 4, CBB 319

Secondary Senate

November 12, CBB 319
 December 17, CBB 319
 January 22, CBB 319
 February 18, CBB 319

March 10 (Joint), CBB Rooms 1 & 3
April 7, CBB 323
April 28 CBB 319

March 10 (Joint), CBB Rooms 1 & 3
April 14, CBB 319
May 5 CBB 319