

Elementary Teacher Education Senate
3:30-5:00 Thursday, February 6, 2014
319 Curris Business Building
Minutes

I. Welcome

Present: J.D. Cryer (Coordinator, Elementary Teacher Education), Sohyun Meacham (Literacy Education), Tony Gabriele (Professional Sequence), Rip Marston (Physical Education and Health Education), Ellen Neuhaus (Liberal Arts Core), Linda Fitzgerald (Early Childhood Education), Matt Webb (Assistant Professor, Mathematics), Merrilee Betts (Teacher Practitioner), Wendy Miller (Art Education), Michelle Swanson (Music Education), Amy Lockhart (Clinical Experiences), Katheryn East (Chair, Teacher Education Faculty)

Absent: Jean Schneider (Middle Level Education), Chad Christopher (Coordinator, Secondary Teacher Education), Kim Miller (Special Education), Denise Tallakson (Elementary Education)

Guests: (Rob Boody, Director of Assessment)

II. Approval of minutes for January 16, 2013

Linda moved to approve and Matt seconded. Minutes approved.

III. Update on matters arising at the State

- a. None

IV. Update on Teacher Education Executive Council

- a. Next Meeting Feb. 14

V. Old Business

- a. edTPA—vote to establish ESAs into our assessment system
Rob is going to make the rounds to talk with people to get everyone's input.

- b. Teacher Education External Advisory Board Report
J.D. asked everyone to review the "Teacher Education External Advisory Board Summary Notes" handout.

Someone asked for more information about bullet #4 under 1 that states: Students are able to write well planned out lesson plans, even if they are not necessarily as strong as a teacher candidate. JD said that those on the board are first year teachers as well as

veteran teachers, Early Childhood teachers through High School teachers, a wide variety of content areas are represented, and Elementary and High School Principals. There were 20 people speaking for the teachers of Iowa. The group indicated that our students moving toward licensure seem to know what to do in terms of content and lesson development, but they aren't as strong in the actual teaching and pedagogy aspect. They know how to develop a good lesson plan but need more mentoring for the delivery process.

Someone asked about the definition of Collaboration as listed under II: Areas of Possible Focus. JD said it was recommended that our developing teachers be given many opportunities to interact with others in their programs in order to build their skills they will need in Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and other collaborative group settings. These skills include: social skills, soft skills, listening, and analyzing data as a teacher.

Another area that was discussed had to do with the idea that P-12 teachers want to be more engaged with University faculty and bring their knowledge to UNI. It would be nice to have P-12 teachers come to classes on campus to share their perspectives with preservice teachers.

Connected with this idea of connecting UNI to the public schools there was a wish from the board that the 60 hours of Team Teaching required by the state be broken down into smaller increments such as 10 or 20 hours per year. The board would like to have faculty in the classroom each year instead of once during the program approval process. Classrooms, students, and teaching is changing so much each year that it is imperative that UNI faculty stay as current as possible.

During the conversation, a concern came up that faculty are starting to hear rumors that the teachers in the public schools are starting to feel overwhelmed with the amount of field experience happening in the local schools, specifically in the Waterloo school district because of the closing of Price Lab School.

Following this, someone mentioned that there is a problem with placing Level III students because of the overall demand on local classrooms. A statement was made about rethinking the Level I, II and III distribution of hours in the field given the closing of Price Lab. One thought is to reduce the hours in Level I in order to add more time to the Level III experience. The thought was to put this on the agenda at some point so we can have a conversation about

it with those in the Office of Field Experiences who have more direct knowledge.

Someone asked about how the levels work. They asked about the possibility of pairing students to afford student teachers to have conversations with each other during their field experience. Someone else thought pairing would be good at Level I. There has been some piloting of pairing two students with a teacher that has co-teaching training. However, teachers need to become comfortable with multiple students in the classroom.

Discussion continued around the board's comments regarding Portfolios for Teacher Candidates. Someone asked for clarification regarding portfolios and whether or not they are used. The idea is that candidates will come to an interview with a portfolio. It seems that they aren't getting used during the interview process. Questions came up regarding what types of things are asked during interviews. If we knew some of the general areas, we could help prepare our students to better answer these during the hiring process.

One person said they felt an electronic portfolio makes more sense.

VI. New Business

a. State Approval Process: Chapter 79 Governance (Please see page 2 below)

The document lists what the state visitation team wrote in their recommendation during our last Approval Process.

With regards to #1 of the recommendation, do we still feel this way? Have things changed since we now have two Senates? Someone mentioned that they thought the Senates had the authority to generate policy but they didn't take the reins.

Someone mentioned reviewing the Bylaws. They wonder if we have examples of what we can and cannot do. For example, if we changed Level I from 30 to 15 hours where would this go? Lyn and Becky would have to be involved. Who is going to structure this? There would be an enforcement issue. Along the same line, if a faculty member did not complete the 60-hour requirement for team teaching, what does that mean? Do you get a note from JD or Chad, or you aren't eligible for merit pay? Are you barred from Teacher Ed. course teaching? Does your program area lose its accreditation standing, and thus gets dropped from the program?

Someone mentioned that the same question still rings true as far as who is in charge. They also don't think anyone knows where the leadership and vision of TE sits. Someone questioned who is going to be the driving force to provide the leadership for this to happen. Is this the Executive Council? Is this the two Coordinators? Someone asked if the TE Faculty Chair is that person.

JD and Chad are reading reports from the state and bringing information to the Senates and to faculty to see what has been done. Someone said that JD and Chad are the point people to work with the Senates. It was also mentioned that as Coordinators, if things fail they would be blamed.

Someone said that what is best for TE program at UNI requires someone to do research, talk to people and explore alternatives before senate votes on it. They don't think anyone of us is doing this. That is why a lot of things don't get done.

A final thought involved a review of the entire program in order to figure out what makes the UNI Teacher Education Program distinctive. This was mentioned as a goal at Executive Council.

b. Other

Meeting adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

VII. Upcoming dates (subject to change)

**Teacher Education Induction Convocation
Wednesday, April 2, 2014 at 4:00 pm GBPAC**

Elementary Senate

February 6

March 6

April 8 (Tuesday)

May 1

Secondary Senate

February 20

March 27

April 17

May 8

In regards to questions brought up recently about “Who is the leader of Teacher Education? And who sets the vision for Teacher Education?” I reviewed the Governance Section of the last approval process. The follow is what the state visitation team wrote in their recommendation:

1. Members of the Council on Teacher Education appear to understand that their responsibility is for oversight of the university-wide program. This was clearly articulated during the team meeting with this Council. Yet, members of the Council readily admit that the Council has no or very limited authority. The leadership in the College of Education indicated that the Teacher Education Council has the power to generate curriculum. Yet, when asked about this, the council members were not in agreement. The Council members reported that they were more reactive than proactive with regard to teacher education oversight.

2. Team members asked many individuals “Who is responsible for UNI teacher education?” and were met with different responses, including, “That is a good question. You will need to contact the department heads, deans, and the Provost.” Another response was that no one has the oversight authority for teacher education with regard to the education programs. The answers were inconsistent and did not speak to a well-articulated vision of governance for the “university-wide teacher education program.” Some felt that the Director of Teacher Education was that individual. Some felt that this was a responsibility of the Dean. Some felt that this was the responsibility of the senior leadership group of deans and VPs. Some indicated that this was the responsibility of the Provost.

The team recommends that the institution empower the Council on Teacher Education to be the oversight body with the authority to establish and enforce policies, enhance communications, and address issues that concern the preparation of teachers in any college/department. The team recommends that a constitution for the Council on Teacher Education be written and adopted at all levels which will give greater support to

importance of this council. The line of reporting should include both the Dean of the College of Education and the Provost in a way that best supports the work of a university wide teacher education program.