

Elementary Teacher Education Senate Meeting
3:30-5:00 pm, Thursday, November 7, 2019
Curris Business Building 319
Minutes

Attendance

PRESENT:

- Scott Ellison (Professional Sequence), Allison Barness (Clinical Experiences), Betsy Zan (Early Childhood Education), Irene Walker (Elementary Education), Carolyn Weber (Middle Level Education), Kim Hurley (Physical/Health Education), Olly Steinhorsdittir (Math Education), Cathy Miller (Chair, Educator Preparation Program Faculty), JD Cryer (Coordinator, Elementary Teacher Education)

ABSENT:

- Wendy Miller (Art Education), Louren Kilburg (Undergraduate Student), Michelle Swanson (Music Education)

I. Welcome and Remarks

- JD noted Chris Kliewer's passing.

II. October Joint senate meeting minutes electronically approved.

Reports

III. General Education Revision Committee Update

- Cathy provided update to senators
 - Feedback sessions completed.
 - Received support for 3-tier structure.
 - Faculty want more details of the model once it is filled in.
 - Goal is to create a curriculum that is “coherent, flexible, sustaining, and—we hope—inviting to both students and faculty” (Campus Update, Oct. 24, 2019).
- Questions asked about ensuring that there is enough content course information in the proposed general education requirements that our students will be able to pass Praxis II content test and teach well in the future.
 - How will students get the content they need if we move to lower number of classes required for the LAC? Science for example?

- How will transfer work? Will they have enough science to pass the Praxis II?

Old Business

IV. Motions to discuss and vote on:

- To have the diversity committee to do an assessment of the program to see where EL is already in our program in order to support our faculty and think about next steps.
 - Senators voted. Motion passed.
- To have EPP Chair as leader of senates and graduate council. (Note that this is contingent upon the EPP faculty chair having a one-course buy out each semester of service.)
 - Discussion took place
 - Scott stated that there appears to be a broad support of EPP chair doing this--if course release is in place.
 - Kim asked if there has been any push back.
 - Cathy--no, there hasn't
 - Betsy asked for clarification, is it one course per year?
 - Cathy clarified, no; it is one course per semester. What I have now was negotiated by me to do this work, before I accepted the nomination.
 - JD explained this person meets with Provost, Deans, and other administrators making faculty voice heard all the time.
 - Olly wondered how do we have continuity.
 - Cathy said a model we would look at is that of the university senate with an incoming and outgoing chair model.
 - Olly asked if we should we have a structure in place with a vice chair before we vote?
 - Irene believed that we would still have the flexibility to amend and rewrite the structure after the motion.
 - Betsy called the question. Senators vote. Motion passed.
- To recommend a position be created in the Teacher Education Office to do the day-to-day work involved with both elementary and secondary teacher education programs.
 - Discussion took place
 - What would this role do? What duties would there be? What qualifications would this person need?
 - JD and Cathy: Duties would include overseeing: Applications, NOCs, Trainings, Communicating with the state, Chapter 79 compliance, and others.
 - Whom do we want to do this work? Faculty? P&S? Other?
 - How long is position? Two or three year term? Long term? P&S would be more permanent. Someone with an education background? Master's degree? What about experience with advising?
 - We need a job description for this position.
 - Cathy agreed to pull together a position description based on what Chad and JD wrote already. It was agreed that a position description is needed before senators vote.
- To have EPP Faculty Chair receive updates from the General Education Committee and share information related to EPP with senates.
 - Senators voted. Motion passed.

- To have the Level II Field Experience evaluation updated with a new category, “with distinction” and use this rating to recommend teacher candidates for Preservice Substitute Authorization License
 - Discussion took place
 - Level II had some concerns with using their rubric as the only measure for the recommendation. During Level II is it our responsibility tell students that they need to have a mark of distinction or not? Dept. of Teaching is okay with adding it to the rubric, but not advertising.
 - Need to be transparent with students and let them know our expectations.
 - There are some holes in this plan and we might need to fill them in the future.
 - We would need to suggest they get liability insurance.
 - Will the mark of distinction be a lock?
 - No, it seems we would need information to make a recommendation.
 - Do we have to have a rubric for what distinction means?
 - There is something similar to this on the Level I field experience rubric.
 - Could this open the Department Teaching up to many grievances?
 - Maybe, yes.
 - Senators voted. Motion did not pass.
 - New discussion took place
 - What else can we do that is not based on one thing?
 - How about any 21-year-old student who has finished Level II without any NOCs.; also GPAs--at least 3.0.
 - Betsy made a new motion: Students must be 21 years of age or older and meet the following requirements to be recommended for a Preservice Substitute Authorization License.
 - Successfully complete Level II field experience
 - Have no NOCs on file, and
 - Have a 3.0 GPA overall, in teaching major and professional sequence.
 - Scott seconded the motion.
 - Senators are asked to discuss this with constituents and be ready to vote on this at the December meeting.

V. Who completes strategic/visionary work of EPP? Finding #2

- Discussion took place
 - Cathy presented slide and shared that the Provost is the head of all units, but does not lead the strategic visionary work needed to grow programs.
 - Scott asked what the strategic and visionary work looks like. What does this person do and what does this person not do?
 - Allison wondered if it could be the EPP Faculty Chair. Cathy shared that being the faculty voice and growing the program would be too much. Carolyn agreed and asked if another faculty member might be this person? Cathy asked about faculty roles, how to make sure no group feels left out. Carolyn stated to make sure secondary is represented.
 - JD shared that he thinks the Leadership Team and Executive Council in the new Governance Model are working.

- Carolyn and Scott think a faculty member, accountable to the TE senates and Grad Council would work. JD asked how this is different from the faculty senate.
- Allison wondered if the work could be done with two people. One would do the day-to-day; the other does the vision leadership work to grow the program. This idea was clarified to say the two coordinators of TE could do this.
- Scott reminded that we need to figure out what we mean by leading for this job. In the end, this person would work closely with EPP Faculty Chair. Cathy will do a draft of a job description.

VI. Who is the leader or head of unit for EPP? Why not the College of Education Dean?
Finding #5

- Discussion took place
 - Leader/Head of Unit for EPP is the Provost because that position has final say over all academic areas and is in charge of the budget.
 - So question then is who would do the work associated with leading the EPP towards vision/mission, strategic plan and overall continuous improvement?
 - Does the COE Dean have the time to do this in addition to being Dean? Is this part of the job of COE Dean?
 - What can this person do? What can this person not do?
 - What about having two associate deans sharing the position and collaborating together?
 - We don't need another administrator. This person should be a faculty member and accountable to the Senates. To do the work the person could have course releases.

New Business

VII. Information from State

- IACTE Update
 - Model Core of Ethics for Educators (see handouts from IACTE that present this concept, and make it distinct from Iowa Code of Ethics for educators).
 - IACTE had a grant from AACTE to develop case studies to use with preservice teachers. They are being used in several Iowa institutions. At UNI, these are being piloted within the Department of Teaching
 - IDOE Director Ryan Wise Highlights
 - Mental Health continues to be a focus. The Iowa Instructional Framework has been rolled out. The next part of Iowa Core to be revised is the 21st Century standards.

VIII. EPP Assessment and Support

- JD shared that since UNITED is on its last legs, the senates charged a faculty task to study and learn more about Watermark and Tk20. The committee did this last year and last May brought a recommendation back to the senates that Watermark/TK 20 be adopted. The recommendation was given to Dean Jean-Marie and Provost at the end of spring 2019. There were concerns at that time with cost and timing so adoption has been put on hold.
- Betsy said this was like a meteor about to crash into the earth.
- Allison asked what we could do.
 - Cathy suggested senates make a motion to adopt Watermark and make a formal recommendation to the Provost with a description of meteor.

IX. Other

- Need a new student representative starting in January.

Upcoming Dates (subject to change)

Elementary Senate

December 5 (CBB 319)

Secondary Senate

November 21 -Oak Room (Union)

December 12-Presidential Room (Union)