Minutes


Guest: Julie Johnson

I. Welcome

II. Minutes

Minutes were passed with fairly small votes. CM noted that September minutes will not be posted, since there were no minutes and it was mostly informational.

III. Reports

A. Teacher Education Clinical Committee

B. Teacher Education Content Study Committee

C. IEP law Implementation Committee

D. Governance Document Committee

KH asked, with an apology since she missed meetings last week, about waiting for reports from the Clinical committee. CM said their report will be presented at the Joint Senate meeting in March. KH asked about the Dept. of Teaching curriculum change, and if it is related to the Clinical Committee’s work. These are not related. KH said she will wait with her questions to that meeting, but wondered what other K-12 programs thought about this. WM and MS said that the Level III field experiences were over several weeks. KH asked since the licensure is over all grade levels, and is the 30 hours per level, or overall. WM said in Art they have Level I in elementary and Level II in middle school and Level III in high school, and only 30 hours. WM offered to meet with KH about how they address the multilevel endorsement.

CM asked when the senate expects the report and shared that the Secondary senate said sometime in April, either the regular meeting or Joint meeting tentatively scheduled for the end of April. BZ asked what they will report. CM shared that the committee is looking at belief statements and made descriptors for each one, and will survey faculty (not all, but one per course). ScE shared that my summary made sense. April was OK.
CM thanks Jennifer Anderson and Sarah Bryans-Bongey for helping editing and taking care of obvious questions on the governance document. There are some questions remaining. The secondary senate requested that the questions be distributed across the next two senate meetings to be discussed. The Secondary Senate did not think that there should be a subcommittee to do this, since they affect the entire program. BZ and others agreed that this was OK. BZ asked if the questions could be embedded in the document (agenda and report document).

We had a little Nasa chat.

**Old Business**

IV. How can we find a student representative for the senate and an elementary representative for the committee convened to create a plan to implement legislation about all teacher candidates knowing how to work on an IEP team?

CM asked how we can find a student who would serve us and be served by their participation. WM has met an elementary teaching major who attended a book study and had sent an email out to her. CM asked that WM contact her to let her know if this student might join us. SE asked about requirements to be student representative. CM responded that they should not student teach for at least a year. BZ had tried, and the meeting time did not work for them. JD added that we want the student to complete Level II. If WM's student says no, CM will send a note asking for more nominees.

CM shared that the IEP Task Force met. David Hernandez-Saca and Aliza Fones met and thought that having an elementary representative would be good. CM asked them to check with constituents to see if there is a volunteer. CM noted that the Special Ed department is ready to help and support this work.

V. Motion from November meeting:

Executive Council Representatives from the senates shall serve a two year term and renewable one time, if desired.

There was a vote, the motion passed unanimously with the reminder to remove the words crossed and polished.

VI. 21-Day Challenge adapted for educators, an invitation from the Athletics Department, there are no volunteers to help with this work. What next?

CM reminded everyone that we were invited to work with people in the Athletic Department to revise what they did with the 21-Day challenge to assess the work. They will have an estimate of how much work it will take to do this. Two people volunteered to meet with the Athletic Department people, Lisa Millsap and Kyle Ruddik. This was approved as the way for them to move forward.
VII. Invitation to join Education Lab Group questions.

CM reminded everyone of Dean Mullholland’s presentation at the November senate meeting and of the session in December with representatives from the Education Lab Group. CM shared that after the December meeting, it was clear that the expectation is that we are all part of the work including school partners. CM says we can get back to them with no, or not now (pandemic time is challenging).

ScE said he was excited by the idea, but the details were less impressive. CM added that she did not see what was in it for us, how would our program benefit. BZ and SaE said they did not think it was the right time, we are stretched too thin already with pandemic teaching. MS agreed, and wondered if our energy should be used on a new endeavor, or to maintain what we are already doing. MS added the note that she did not attend the December meeting so does not have an opinion regarding the invitation now. She also thinks that we need to find out if there is a financial cost associated. CM said she would share these concerns with the leadership team to say “not now” and that we hope to revisit the invitation later, maybe in the fall.

New Business

VIII. The EPP Leadership Team asks that faculty review the admission requirements to the Teacher Education program.

CM reminded senators that the Leadership Team is JD, Colleen and her. She shared that the rationale for the request is related to PRAXIS Core being gone, which was a big part of the admission requirements. Does the rest of the requirements stand alone? CM also referred to Data Day conversations, calling for admission to be less of a gate that keeps students out. JD shared that the admission requirements had not been updated since he started. He wondered if the admissions requirements were a barrier or any students from marg populations or transfer students. He added that admitting students means we support them until the end of the program, including PRAXIS II and asked us to think about admission requirements and how we support them to complete the program.

KH asked about the testing and if there was any data to show us if students are accessing study resources available in the library. CM says this would be some data we could try to get to study this. JJ shared that she emails every students who are student teaching information about PRAXIS II, where to find the free study materials and ETS study materials that cost $20. The paid materials are available to the student for 10 uses of 90 days. She noted that the books that used to be in the IRTS lab were removed, due to being from another company and not aligned with the new version of the test. WM shared that she got practice books in the Art Dept. and her students check
them out. No one was sure if there were resources for PRAXIS II available in Rod Library.

BZ noted that this is a hard ask, studying admission requirements. She wondered why we have admission requirements at all. Is it a gate? Do we need a gate? This is a huge conversation. BZ asked that there be a task force to look for it. CM noted that the state code used to require PRAXIS Core, but no longer. Now what is stated is that we have “high quality” teacher candidates, but that this is not clearly defined. JD concurred that this is code and the program needs to figure out what it means to have high quality candidates in the program. Now, GPAs are the measure used. For us 2.5 and at other places 3.0. SaE asked if removing PRAXIS Core is permanent, the answer is yes.

BZ said we have two things; we want more students in the program but also need rigor in the admission requirements so they finish. ScE added that another pressure is to get students through in four years. CM asked if it is time to study this now, given these pressures. KH asks about students who have not been admitted who want to take courses and can’t. JD and BZ noted that there are four LAC courses required for students to have a C- or better in three of them to be admitted. BZ wonders why C- is used, which is lower than a 2.5 GPA. CW notes, and JD agrees that three (all but oral Com) were required since they can help students with PRAXIS Core.

IW asks that we identify students who are not passing PRAXIS Core, so we can explore why and maybe it is that students do not take advantage of the study guides JJ sends them. AB asked if there is a correlation between students with NOCs and struggle with PRAXIS II. Maybe something else we can check. CM says this is similar to the secondary senate discussion, where there were calls to find and use data. ScE says mass emailing might not be the best way to get these resources to students. KH says at first we talked about getting students admitted to program, and now we are talking about the end of the program. She noted that we need to be consistent with these two ideas, starting and ending the program. CM noted that she thinks admission and finishing is related. JJ shared that ETS no longer makes print versions of study guides, so we are not able to put them on library shelves. Anecdotal, JJ says students do what their peers do to prepare for PRAXIS II.

SaE said that based on this discussion there appears to be a lot for us to consider about making decisions of the admission requirements and that needs to be a committee to do this study. Then, we need to refine the charge -- are we looking to attract students? Are we looking for a gate? Are grades of C- good enough? Etc. CM said that the secondary senate wanted there to be a task force to study this, and that it needs to be under the purview of the senates. KH suggests we invite the student representatives of the senates to be on this task force. CM shared that Rob Boody volunteered to be on this task force. CM said this would be important work and needed to be done well instead of
quickly. SaE and AB volunteered to join the task force. CM notes that maybe they are not ready for a charge, but that the small group can try to focus the work some.

IX. Statement to the Provost regarding the change to cr/nc grading late last semester. (Presented at the Elementary Senate meeting last November.)

CM shared that the secondary senate did not find this problematic, and thought that the kindness of this policy allowed them to move forward was good. KH asked for clarification of the concern. BZ noted that the concern is about students moving forward who may have squeaked by in courses for three semesters and not knowing who they are so don’t know who to support and get help so they succeed in student teaching. The concern is there could be students who need extra support, but we don’t know how to find them. Others agreed with BZ about this concern. Another concern is about methods courses, which need a grade of C or better -- not C-, so should be exempted from C/NC grading. CM asked if the Elem. The Senate wants to draft a statement to send to the Provost, or if we should collaborate with C and me faculty, where the concern started. BZ made a motion **that the courses in the professional sequence, including methods courses, be exempted from C/NC should it be an option this semester.**

JD wants to be sure that people know what professional sequence courses are -- In EPFLS, C and I (Ed Tech), Field Experiences, Human Relations, and area methods courses. ScE seconded the motion.

WM asked about professional sequence and Level III methods courses, noting there are multiple methods courses in some programs. WM wants all methods courses included. CM shared that they can chat with constituents about it to see if it should be all methods courses. KH said we need to look at advisement reports to see what methods courses are included for each program. SaE asked if math for elementary and other content courses included. He notes that these are courses that students will struggle with C-grades as they move forward. He wonders why we are not including these courses. BZ wonders if this should apply to all courses in major. AB wonders if this will be an ongoing issue, taking courses for C/NC. CM said we don’t know and that it was a late decision last semester. IW says that students may need to write an explanation for why they want to take a course for C/NC, and those reasons might be important. IW heard that some students have reasons not related to what they learned. CM needs to find out this process to inform our work.

X. Other items to note

EPP Spring faculty meeting will have attorneys from the Iowa Dept. of Ed present what the legal answer is to practicum students having access to IEPs and 504 plans. This meeting will be on Friday, April 2 at 3:30. Andre Morse will share an update about work he is doing to support EPP in DC as well.

CM thanked people for the caring conversations.
Upcoming Dates (subject to change, all on Zoom)

**Joint Senate**
March 4, 2021
April 29, 2021 (If needed)

**Secondary Senate**
April 1, 2021

**Elementary Senate**
April 15, 2021