MINUTES

I. Roll and Introductions

Present: Cherin Lee (Coordinator, Secondary Teacher Education), Dianna Briggs (Business Education), Terri Lasswell (Clinical Experiences), Barb Bakker (Physical Education/Health Education), Chad Christopher (Social Science Education), Doug Hotek (Technology Education), Kevin Droe (Music Education), Rick Knivsland (Art Education), Elizabeth Zwanziger (Modern Languages & TESOL-ALT), Rick Vanderwall (English Education), Ben Forsyth (Professional Sequence), Cathy Miller (Mathematics Education), Sarah Semon (Special Education-ALT), Katheryn East (Teacher Education Faculty Chair), Kyle Gray (Science Education), Kyle Kramer (Undergraduate Student), Courtney Lubs (Teacher Practitioner)

Absent: Katherine Lavelle (Speech & Theatre Education),

Guests: Rob Boody (Director of Assessment), Becky Hawbaker (Coordinator, Student Field Experiences), Joel Haack (Dean, College of Humanities, Arts and Sciences)

Cherin introduced Kyle Kramer, as the new Undergraduate Student Senate member and Courtney Lubs (Cedar Falls School District) as the new Teacher Practitioner Senate member.

II. Approval of January Joint Minutes

Rick Vanderwall moved to approve the Joint Senate Minutes and Elizabeth Zwanziger seconded. Minutes approved with one abstention.

III. Updates

Teacher Executive Council – postponed in the interest of new and old business.
Cherin asked that she be allowed to move New Business to precede Old Business. The Senate approved.

IV. New Business

- Amending the approved list of Math course for admission to Teacher Education: Russ Campbell has noted that Analysis for Business Students is similar to Math for the Biological Sciences. Why is Analysis for Business Students not on the list of approved math course for admission to Teacher Education? Cathy Miller said it is equivalent to other courses on the list.
  Rick Vanderwall moved that Analysis for Business Students be added to the list of math courses for admission to Teacher Education. Ben Forsyth seconded. Motion
• **Reminder** of need for catalog changes for teaching majors/minors and methods (including practica) to be communicated to a Teacher Education Coordinator and if deemed appropriate, brought to the Senate.

Cherin has discovered several curriculum items that didn’t come to the Secondary Senate last fall. She will notify the appropriate dept. heads and/or download Leepfrog catalog information for Senate on March 28th. She reminded Senators to remind their departments that ALL changes that affect a teaching major or minor in their department or courses in that program should be sent by the departments to the Coordinator(s) of Teacher Education.

III. Old Business

• TWS vs. edTPA as a performance assessment

A handout was provided prior to the meeting via email. Elementary Senate is doing an electronic vote today on this issue. Cherin asked if the Senate wished to entertain a general discussion before motion making. She asked if the Senate wished to continue with a performance assessment and if so which one.

Rick Vanderwall said that the general feeling in English is they are not happy with the TWS but less happy with the edTPA. They feel that the edTPA is not friendly to English teaching content and methodology and there is limited reflection. They feel that with a little work the TWS would work better for them. He is opposed to the cost to students as well. He doesn’t like the idea of sending assessments to Pearson for scoring. The one portion of edTPA that he does like is the video portion. He would like to incorporate this element into TWS. Doug Hotek, Technology Education, feels the same way.

Cherin clarified that the choice for our UNI program performance assessment is not connected to the state. If we were using edTPA at the time the State decided to change from Praxis II to edTPA then we would say goodbye to Praxis II. Currently, the Iowa Department of Education is considering that a performance-based assessment with national norms can be used for licensure. Rob offered that UNI would send 10% through Pearson and the rest would be scored at UNI. Minnesota adopted edTPA and is only sending 10% to Pearson to score. There is a fee for those that are set to Pearson. The edTPA committee and Dean Watson talked about possibly having UNI cover the cost of the 10% so students wouldn't have an additional cost. The 10% would need to be clarified with Stanford. Rob Boody said we would be able to add in other components (i.e. reflection section) if we wanted to do this. The benefit of the edTPA is that it provides a national check against national norms with external scorers.

Kyle Gray asked what the cost to students would be. Rob Boody said it is $300 per student. We shouldn't assume that if we adopt edTPA that Praxis II will go away. Cathy Miller said that most of her colleagues didn't have an opinion. The only thing was the outside scoring.
Doug Hotek said he is confused as to what content is actually in the content section for the Technology Education majors. He asked the question “What are the standards and where did they come from?” He needs to know what content is in edTPA. Praxis II is good in Doug’s area.

Rick Vanderwall talked to students who took Praxis II and they are sailing through. Chad Christopher asked when we will have student test result data. Cherin and Rob noted that we have not had many students that have not passed the Praxis II.

Kevin Droe said that in Music edTPA content is related to national standards but not state standards. His department liked the video component and liked it more than the TWS.

Elizabeth Zwanziger said her department liked the edTPA, especially the video component. This includes TESOL. Using only written assessment doesn’t give a full picture. However, her department is concerned about the cost.

Barb Bakker said that Physical Ed. really liked TWS but feel the trend is going to edTPA and that we need to get on the bandwagon with edTPA. The video is a good component but it was very hard to hear and see things so the technology would need to be changed.

Kyle Gray said Science Education liked the edTPA and would like to go ahead with it.

Sarah Semon from Special Education said that after speaking with Chris Curran they are inclined to go with edTPA, though some of the edTPA doesn’t reflect the values of some institutions’ special education programs. Rob noted that our TWS doesn’t either.

Rob Boody said with regards to other institutions’ reactions to the edTPA, some faculty members in Massachusetts protested the assessment because of the connection to Pearson and charging students $300 to have the edTPA scored. However, Boston College has a well-known history of protesting Pearson.

Rick Vanderwall said the English department is concerned with the content of the assessment and turning our program over to Pearson. He would like a copy of the booklet sent to him that shows the assessing of teaching writing in edTPA. [Dianna Briggs emailed the access for individual guide books for content areas for edTPA to Senate members at this point in the meeting].

Chad Christopher said Social Sciences would lean toward edTPA because of content and video.

Rick Vanderwall asked if the TWS could be reworked to include a video portion. Rob Boody said if we reworked the TWS it might end up looking like the edTPA anyway. Advantages of edTPA are that it lines us up with national norms and would help us in a substantive way to move forward.
Terri Lasswell said using a performance assessment is a much better representation of how students are doing in their teaching. They liked the video portion but it could make the field experience more cumbersome. This could be overcome. Her concern is also about cost. Becky Hawbaker said that Field Experience Coordinators liked the video portion.

Terri Lasswell said the academic language piece is the glue. She noticed this semester that more of her cooperating teachers are using academic language which supports the edTPA.

Kevin Droé asked “Do we need more time to review this to make a vote?” Rick Vanderwall asked “Why do we need to make a decision now?” “Can we stay with TWS until the state makes a decision?” “If we are split on the issue and we aren’t ready to make a decision what is the down side of waiting?” He said many have not looked at the edTPA yet and need to see rubrics and guides. Cherin noted that she doesn’t want to push for a decision but also doesn’t want to keep putting this off. Rick Vanderwall asked “If we vote to maintain the TWS for a year and study edTPA what is the consequence of waiting?” Cherin asked “What more do we need to study?”

Rob Boody noted that no one should make a decision until ready but there is a concern about waiting too long to make a decision. Currently we are in a relationship with Stanford and may lose the access to the resources. It may be a problem if we wait a year.

Rob said a month from now 63 edTPAs will need to be scored. The suggestion from Rob is that everyone read the guide book for their area and assess an edTPA. Then we all can make a decision at that point. Terri Lasswell noted there will be training sessions in March for edTPA.

Benjamin Forsyth did the national training with Pearson and from a Science Ed. perspective the edTPA is good. Wording may be an issue but the ability to see science being done on the video is nice. Reflection is stronger on the science part in edTPA than in the TWS. He also noted that the professional sequence does not show up in the current TWS.

Becky Hawbaker said we have 100 students doing edTPA and they haven’t had a hard time transitioning to it from their preparation prior to that for doing a TWS.

Rick Vanderwall would feel more comfortable having his department review documentation and have Rob come to meetings before making a final decision. An April timeline could work for them.

Rick Vanderwall moved that we table this discussion until April 18th. This was seconded by Doug Hotek. Cherin asked if the vote should be verbal or ballot. Everyone agreed that verbal is fine. Motion passed with two no votes.
Cathy Miller asked if we could vote electronically in March. The answer is that the edTPAs for scoring aren’t due until the end of Spring Break and therefore won’t provide time for program areas to score them.

The Elementary Senate passed a motion to continue with a performance based assessment in UNI’s assessment system. JD received the electronic votes from the Elementary Senate who voted and 9 out of 9 were for edTPA with 1 person not voting.

- Admissions requirements: GPA

The Iowa Legislature has not mentioned raising the GPA during this legislative session. The Dean of the College of Education at the Univ. of Iowa wanted a 3.0 (she is no longer there). We don’t know about changes at ISU. They are still at 2.5. Kyle summarized data he gleaned from several other schools and the range is from 2.5 to 2.75.

Cherin noted that the Elementary Senate hasn’t gotten to this discussion yet. She asked “What are the thoughts among constituents?” Cathy Miller said that the math faculty in Elementary and Secondary Math have stories of students who had below 3.0 that have become great teachers. She feels that increasing the GPA could affect students with learning disabilities and diversity could also be affected.

Doug asked about separate GPA requirements for content versus overall. Dianna noted that currently a 2.50 GPA is required in the major to student teaching.

Cathy Miller moved that we do not change the admission GPA and keep it at 2.5. Rick Vanderwall seconded. Motion passed.

Meeting adjourned at 4:50.

**Spring Semester Dates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary Senate</th>
<th>Secondary Senate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 7</td>
<td>March 28 (the 21st falls during break)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 4</td>
<td>April 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2</td>
<td>May 9 ???.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Commencement is May 11. Unless Secondary Senate needs to meet we won’t. I will determine that in March.)