I. Welcome

**Present:** J.D. Cryer (Coordinator, Elementary Teacher Education), Tony Gabriele (Professional Sequence), Linda Fitzgerald (Early Childhood Education), Merrilee Betts (Teacher Practitioner), Denise Tallakson (Elementary Education), Chad Christopher (Coordinator, Secondary Teacher Education), Lynn Ensworth (Middle Level Education), Sohyun Meacham (Literacy Education), Katheryn East (Chair, Teacher Education Faculty), Ellen Neuhaus (Liberal Arts Core), Kim Miller (Special Education), Katlyn Anderson (Student)

**Absent:** Amy Lockhart (Clinical Experiences) Excused: Deockki Hong (Physical Education and Health Education), Excused: Michelle Swanson (Music Education) Chris Schulte (Art Education) Matt Webb (Assistant Professor)

**Guests:** Rob Boody (Director of Assessment), Becky Hawbaker (Coordinator, Student Field Experiences)

II. Approval of minutes for September 4, 2014

Denise moved to approve minutes and Lynn seconded. Minutes approved.

III. Old Business

- Proposed Associate Dean of Teacher Education Feedback
  - Concern that split duties between Teacher Education and Dept. of Teaching might cause problems with view of Teacher Education across campus
  - Not completely sure about the details of the job description
  - If the position could be connected to the Provost’s Office this would be better for Teacher Education—an Associate Provost for Teacher Education.
  - This would be a good position to have towards a Visionary Leader for Teacher Education, especially if we move towards CAEP accreditation someday.

- Conceptual Framework/Mission and Vision
  - J.D. presented the past accreditation Conceptual Framework. He also presented the Conceptual Framework from another institution to compare models of how to display the information.
  - Discussion took place regarding the models and which one to use in order to present our Conceptual Framework for the next accreditation report.
  - To work towards accreditation, we will need volunteers for a subcommittee to update research for our Conceptual Framework.
IV. New Business
Review Governance section of report
   - Concern #1 from the last State accreditation visit is that “the Unit of education is not consistently defined nor operationalized, given that this is a university wide program.”
   - After careful discussion, the definition of Unit was proposed as follows:
     - The “unit” at UNI can be defined as all those programs in Educator Preparation involved in the instruction of strategies and methods for teaching, the professional sequence, the supervision of field experience, and/or leading to licensure to practice in the school setting.
   - Concern #2 from State visit, “almost everyone contacted refers to the teacher education program as a “university-wide” program, but it was apparent that there is a lack of understanding of the concepts of unit and unit governance. Team members were told that this is a university-wide TE program when it is convenient to be so, otherwise it is a program of silos.”
   - J.D. displayed the current “Teacher Education Dual Governance Chart” that was established in the fall of 2011. Senators discussed this new governance system and if it is meeting the needs of the Teacher Education Faculty.

Senators feel the new system is working. Examples were given about setting of the new Praxis Core Cut Scores, edTPA as the Unit’s performance assessment tool, and the use of ESAs throughout the program. These examples demonstrated how faculty voiced their opinions through their senators; senators discussed each area in meetings, both elementary and secondary senators voted on each issue and the results of each vote were brought to the Teacher Education Executive Council by the Teacher Education Coordinators. The Deans of each College along with the Provost of the University accepted the decision made by the faculty.

- edTPA and Praxis II/Licensure discussion
  - J.D. said our next major decision by the Teacher Education Faculty will be if we decide to continue to use the Praxis II tests as our means to meet State licensure requirements or will we decide to switch and use the edTPA.
  - We will need to make a decision by May 2015 as we move from the Exploratory phase to the Implementation phase.
  - Consensus was that all TE faculty need to be involved.
  - Questions came up regarding what the 25% score on edTPA means?
  - Questions came up regarding the politics of using the edTPA if everyone else is using Praxis II. What are the implications for our TE Program and students?
  - At fall ICTE meeting it was presented that Illinois is mandating use of the edTPA starting in 2015.
J.D. asked what information will senate members need in order to make this decision.

Senators indicated that the faculty needs to understand the benefits and concerns with both tests.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00.

V. Upcoming dates (subject to change)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary Senate</th>
<th>Secondary Senate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 20</td>
<td>December 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 4</td>
<td>December 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 15</td>
<td>January 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 5</td>
<td>February 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 5 (joint)</td>
<td>March 5 (joint)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2</td>
<td>April 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 7</td>
<td>May 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>