Teacher Education Executive Council
Thursday, April 21, 2022 | 1:00 -2:00 pm - ZOOM meeting

Zoom link

PRESENT:
Colleen Mulholland (Dean, COE)
Oksana Grybovych Hafermann (Associate Dean, COE)
Benjamin Forsyth (EPP Director)
Maureen Clayton (Associate Dean, CHAS)
Brenda Bass (Dean, CSBS)
Kimberly Hurley (Elementary Senate Rep.)
Cathy Miller (EPP Faculty Chair)
Kevin Droe (Secondary Senate Rep.)

ABSENT:
Leslie Wilson (Dean, CBS)
Darcie Davis-Gage (Graduate Licensure Council Rep)

GUEST:
Sarah Bryans-Bongey (C&I)

Colleen stated that the focus of today’s meeting will be the Curriculum Revision.
Sarah Bryans-Bongey from Curriculum & Instruction was introduced as a nominee for the Ed. Prep Faculty Chair. The election has not occurred yet. Most of the roster has been cleaned up by Benjamin. Hopefully there will be a vote by tomorrow.

She was invited to listen in during a meeting between Colleen, Benjamin and Cathy Miller.

The Executive Council minutes from March 24, 2022 were approved. Colleen stated that the sole agenda item for today is to circle back to the curricular revision charge. We left off last time talking about key ingredients in question.

Where does the Provost stand? Colleen, Brenda, Leslie, and Maureen met with Provost Herrera on March 24th and he reiterated the top three key elements for Ed. Preparation which were shared at the March 29th faculty meeting. There was talk about shortened programs – shortened time on task – under budget – timelier path to graduation – changes of unify - needs to be multiple on-ramps for those who want to become a teacher – rethink our programs – more accessible and inviting for different populations – he needs a leader but would like for us to lead the way – flagship of TE across state and region.

Takeaway – he is supportive of the direction we are going – wants to know two things:
   1. What is the specificity of the charge for curricular revisions?
   2. Where are some of the dissenting voices – barriers – other structures or barriers to block this work?
Member stressed importance of presenting unified fronts – all on board - campus wide effort – faculty voice through this body – guidance and voice along the way.

Questions – how best to finalize the charge and get the right language and parameters? How to roll out charge in what format and setting? It’s important to be a united front for the sake of future students, future of Teacher Education in the State of Iowa and future of UNI as well.

Colleen – the format piece is interesting – March 24th – utilizing the May 5th joint senate meeting where everyone is there and we can close the year out with a charge.

Spectrum for email charge vs. full face to face was mentioned. What is the best format? We need to circle around that which includes digging into the language and the how of the charge and the format. Forming two small groups was suggested to follow up and then get back together with the Council.

Will the Joint Senate be open to all faculty? Yes, per Benjamin. We would want to make a special invitation so all faculty know to come. Cathy Miller reserved CBB, Room 3.

Suggestion is that the roll out will preferably be released on or after the time the website has been revised. There needs to be a place where documents can be gathered – honoring the past work that has been done – share the charge – provide updates.

How Attached you will find the agenda for the upcoming Executive Council Meeting.
The meeting minutes from 2/17/22 are also attached for your review.

Enjoy the rest of your day!

was the Gen. Ed. Charge rolled out? Per Brenda B. it was rolled out by the Provost but went through Faculty Senate and the website and committee members as well. Senate leadership and small group sessions happened first.

Question was asked about a joint approach – challenges – seek different venues to make the charge – sell the case.

Joint senate is an opportunity to present the charge and sell the case with a short PPT that lays out the landscape of the key reasons why – swat – negatives of why – what this can mean for our students, program and faculty – we don’t want to lose an opportunity even if it is small group.

If held in person there will be an opportunity for people to ask questions. What about live streaming?

The word should be the official word to spread – email after the meeting should come from the Provost’s email. Benjamin said yes, the email should come from the Provost with five Deans on the email as well.

After a suggestion and brief discussing regarding whether or not the Dept. Heads should also be included in the email, the consensus was to stay with just including the Deans.
Colleen suggested that a combination of in person and PPT at May 5th Joint Senate.

With regards to the timing of the website posting, should this be ready to go. The thought is that it would be better that the information was thorough and late than early and spotty.

Any thoughts of what faculty would want to see?

Having a committee already in place to work on the charge was mentioned. Benjamin will work on a list of names for the committee to make this more official.

With regards to the structure of the charge, the Provost has been part of that conversation. There are different pieces to charge – secondary majors that are distributed across campus – different accreditation needs. We wouldn’t want a small committee deciding for other departments as there are pieces that impact everyone such as Professional Sequence. There needs to be a steering committee to oversee.

We need to determine the level of specificity.

With regards to the Gen. Ed. Revisions, the charge was negotiated in the fall and the work started the following spring.

As people are exhausted from the school year, the suggestion was to turn this in fall 2022.
Regarding the timeliness and sense of urgency in getting some changes made, other faculty feel the same – with unify and where we’ve been over last 20 years.

One member has had courses cut in her area and feels we are losing priority and balance. There needs to be an open discussion as we want to give our kids the best experience. The sell is stronger for the students.

Colleen brought up the level of urgency with regards to responsivity to profession – teacher shortage – burnout. It is incumbent on us to discuss how we serve our students – how to prepare students for profession for one we want them to stay in – employers are excited to hear that.

Member made an argument that it would be useful to have things available by May 5th so we can move forward – not all programs may not start right away – need to understand parameters over summer for her to talk in fall. We need to give people the opportunity to think through this over the summer.

We need to aim towards steering committee at this point – find some stipends for summer work.

Maureen, Benjamin and Cathy would serve on the advisory committee where the committee won’t be making decisions but will be sounding board and offer resources. The group would also look at Professional Sequence Core.
Benjamin talked about how committees would work – one was a 2 step process – smaller committee first and then larger one to enact. Prof. Ed. Sequence portion - content, methods, field experience are different flavors – split out each with different responsibility.

Question asked about having an oversight committee to pull together.

Clear direction is needed to avoid conflict going forward.

Benjamin mentioned forming a committee of mediation.

From a member’s perspective regarding Gen. Ed., making the case wasn’t just one meeting – faculty within depts. had very different views – integration/steering committee and those leading – provide solutions and suggestions for moving dept. forward.

Member feels that the Prof. Sequence is the common denominator - what changes need to be made immediately – is this first priority? Prof. Sequence will change programs.

Opposing comment - we should be changing together instead of waiting for common denominator – advisory committee - liaison with steering committee – bring people together – help with complex pockets.

Ben feels that the Prof. Sequence is not the common denominator – He mentioned the methods course, field experience, Prof. Core and 3-4 credit changes – content side above state min. average – 17 credits – room for change if you add methods and field experience to prof seq.
We would be working on change together with communication back and forth – achieve change over 1-1/2 years – decisions overall refresh all of Ed. Prep. majors across campus – powerful across state – across campus for the state.

This is a simultaneous process – charge includes – expectation of reporting back – programs and Prof. Sequence are isolated from each other.

Should we report to UNI as a whole – monthly? This is a campus wide venture that should be clear to everyone.

Is it realistic to say all programs need to be within 120 credits?

Ben – feels need to go beyond this and make specific recommendations based on state requirements for cutting courses – Chapter 13 and 79 – what things need to be included in your programs?

Response - Can’t say each has to be down to X number of credits – needs to be equitable but need to use what is best for students Benjamin mentioned Prof. Ed. Sequence - make a charge that this must be no more 16-18 credits – and most be competency driven – based on Chapter 79

- Methods –within 6 credits of req of the state
- Content – specifically laid out with 9 credits of state requirements – flexibility
- Field Experience – all exp must conform to state requirements and be reported
UNI doesn’t have a good way of recording the content instruction that students are getting since they aren’t allowed to get a double major.

Suggestion to draft charge that would allow input - target firm but flexible to let work happen – you need to set number – student debt is an issue – discuss what profession needs sooner than later – alternative credentials – full BA and BAT have been the emphasis – just let students get out in the field to their job and they can come back to UNI – doesn’t all have to be wrapped up in a BA – set up programs that are attractive as working professionals – lengthen relationship and incentive to come back to UNI.

Colleen mentioned that the Provost was open to co majors and double majors to keep the relationships going with our students.

With regards to target goals, who is going to make decision? Steering Committee?

Colleen mentioned that the next step should involve a Google Doc as part of the process, even for this meeting. Getting something in writing that this group can respond to in preparation for the May 5th meeting is preferred. There needs to be a level of specificity – get something in writing that this group can respond to

Cathy will follow up regarding the question about Zoom and/or live streaming the meeting.
It is felt that it would be better to have more people in the room as looking someone in the eye changes the conversation.

Colleen would like this to be strategic and symbolic.

Spring 2022 Teacher Education Executive Council meetings:

- Thursday, May 19, 2022: 1:00-2:00 pm – face to face and zoom options available
- Thursday, June 16, 2022: 1:00-1:00 pm – face to face and zoom options available

Other key EPP dates:
May 5: Joint Teacher Education Senate Meeting if needed