Secondary Teacher Education Senate Meeting  
3:30-5:00 pm, Thursday, April 1, 2021  
Zoom: https://uni.zoom.us/j/9688303349

Minutes

I. Welcome

Welcomed everyone

Reminder about the changing of our names

Cathy is using the newly branded slide template. If the font, if it is difficult to see, let Cathy know

Jill will be the official representative for Kyle from Science Education and Karen will be a guest

JD is with family today, thanks to David for taking notes.

If you don’t want to be recorded, please turn off your camera

Check-In, Care, and listen to each other

II. March Meeting Minutes

Seven out of 20 voted to accept them with the suggested edits.

Cathy will resend the minutes vote to get more input. [They were approved with the extended vote.]

III. Reports

A. Teacher Education Clinical Committee

We will hold on for the next meeting since there was not much to report from constituents' thoughts about the document.

B. IEP law Implementation Committee

Continue to work

2-tier system, something to be implemented in fall 2021, and a second plan to have this be an integrated part of the program, which will be done later.

If you have any resources in your subject area and your bigger ideas to share, please share

If there are any people you would like Cathy to share any resources
More will come during the April 29th meeting

We are collaborating with the Department of Special Education with David, Whitney, and the entire department

C. Teacher Education Content Study Committee

We will have more for April 29th where they will share a report.

D. Admission to Teacher Education Program Task Force

We need this but there does not appear to be data from other institutions or research regarding what this should look like.

The committee has a question for you: What is the purpose of admission criteria to the TE program? Please take this question back to your colleagues so we can get a sense of what TE faculty think.

Karen: Is admission to the university good enough? Or do we want something else?

Karen and Elizabeth: One purpose is making a serious decision about becoming a teacher, which can be built on in the Levels.

Jill: Do we need to take away anything?

Cathy: If we admit students, we are making a commitment to see them through the program, including student teaching and PRAXIS 2.

Karen: How we make them think of the seriousness of the commitment. PRAXIS Core was a filter and a hurdle for students. We need to know, without the test, that students are committed to the profession of teaching. We have been gathering data for 2 to 3 semesters, without the names, of challenges during student teaching. Those look dispositional. We need something that makes it clear what it means to be a professional and that sets the stage for their work in the program.

Kevin: Great feedback from the senates, what was the purpose of having this extra hurdle [the admission to TE requirements]. Is it needed? Do we have to turn students away?

Cathy: Since PRAXIS core was dropped abruptly, giving us no time to think, we are not turning anyone away unless their GPA is less than 2.5. I look forward to bringing back to the joint senate meeting to hear what your colleagues think.
Rob: We don’t need it [admission requirements, other than GPA]. Additional requirements were there to consider commitment and academic skills. PRAXIS Core was about reading, writing and math, which are the LAC course required for admission to TE.

Lisa R: Level 1 is for discernment, and orientation to the program. Many students are doing that Level at community colleges and high schools. We might reach out to those places to find out what is expected of students at Level 1 in those places.

Cathy: We will have a later report

E. 21-Day Challenge with Athletic Department

Lisa M: met with the people with the athletics department. They have a good setup to use for the 21-day challenge, which will be good for our students to be educated about diversity, social justice, and inclusion. The materials need to be updated with examples related to education. There are 3-7 modules and some of them will be OK.

Cathy-- The Athletic Department’s intent is to also share the program with teachers in the state as well, but right now, it would just be for our students and faculty at UNI. It will be hosted and published by the athletic department. You could require it as part of a course once it is established and a certificate for the new general education. They are willing to be our partners. It appears that some of the modules used in the QUEST study being done by some on campus might be used in this.

Elizabeth asked who would facilitate the groups. Cathy replied that it is a good question and they should find out.

David: Shared an update about what the subcommittee is doing regarding curriculum and DEI. The work is ongoing and important.

Old Business

IV. Feedback to the Teacher Education Clinical Committee about their draft recommendations and draft Field Placement Guide.

It was agreed on that a system developed to make the work [Clinical placements] better.

One recommendation is to have a full time clinical coordinator in the teacher education office.
Some wondered why in the teaching education office and not the Department of Teaching. Cathy reminded people that the Dept. of Teaching in the College of Ed, and that the Teacher education office was established to serve the entire TE program across the university. Cathy referred to the beginning of the report noting that our program is very large, so no wonder we struggle to make this work program wide.

Cathy -- The Dept. of Teaching coordinates field experiences in Levels 1, 2, and some Level 3 and student teaching. There are other practica not aligned with the levels as well. The committee thought there needed to be a central place where everything is coordinated and resources in place to make sure we all work together for field experiences. It is also important that we are not overly burdening certain schools. We can collaborate with the department of teaching to make sure we are using all the sites in the Cedar Valley.

Karen: How we spread out all of our levels 1, 2 and 3

Cathy: Kim and Megan would know this; they were chairs of the committee and faculty in the Department of Teaching.

Karen: We would want to make sure the systems would build more communication among faculty who supervise field experiences.

Cathy: If you tried the links on the Proposed Placement Guide, not that the website links to not all work. This needs to wait until we have a new Assessment system for TE. Were you able to share the Proposed Placement Guide with your colleagues? Please do since there are many people who would use it if it were adopted.

Jill: Science Ed thought having a coordinator is a good idea.

Cathy: Are we far along to make a motion? [no response] Please share the Clinical Committee's recommendations with your colleagues between now and April 29,

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

I have contacted the provost office to find out if the C/NC will be automatic again this semester. I have not heard back yet. If I hear something, then I'll share it with you.

V. Governance documents questions.

Listed below questions from the DRAFT EPP Constitution.
Everyone would vote on these, the entire EPP faculty

Article I

1.1 Who decides about the applications to join EPP faculty? Do we want people who do not regularly teach in the program to become program faculty?

Cathy: If someone is hired in a teacher prep program, we sign you up. We don’t need to have an application. They don’t want to be part of the EPP faculty and you don’t get to vote.

Jill: How do I fit in? I am a content person, but teach teaching majors.

How is this related to someone’s need to do the 40 hours? Cathy will ask JD about this.

2.2 Challenges to the roster should be sent to the EPP Faculty Chair and then voted on by who?

Have there been challenges? Cathy doesn’t think so, but will ask JD. Seems we may not need to include this.

Article II

1.1 Who should handle the vote to elect the EPP Faculty Chair?

Cathy: JD and Chad did it before as Teacher Education Coordinators. The faculty senate has a secretary, which is next for us to discuss. The secretary might do this.

1.3.6 If the EPP Faculty chair becomes unable to do the work, this provides a way for the senates and grad licensure council to vacate the position and find someone to fill it for the remainder of the term. EPP did not have anything like this before. Should we?

Cathy: I think we need a structure and a secretary and continued one course release for the EPP faculty chair for the position to be reasonable for faculty to have in the future. I knew this would be worked on when I agreed to serve, but we need to do this so people will agree to be nominated in the future.

2. The University Faculty Senate allows the chair to appoint a secretary of faculty to help manage senate meetings. Since we are no longer able to obtain clerical help, should we do this as well?
Cathy: I think this would be important moving forward, with the changes to our governance it would make the position of EPP faculty chair manageable. I also hope that it would be a reasonable university service option for pre-tenure faculty and faculty building their resume to apply for promotions. There were no objections to this.

Article III

2.1 How do we want to handle the option for EPP faculty to petition for a meeting? How it was before in the EPP constitution is different from the Univ. Fac. Senate? Which would serve us best?

There was agreement that EPP faculty should be able to do this

2.3 The senates or grad licensure council were not able to call a special meeting of EPP faculty before. Do we want to add this?

Faculty said it seemed like a good idea.

8. The current definition of a quorum for a special meeting is 20% of voting members. The Univ. Fac. Senate has 15% of voting members. Do we want to change to 15%?

Faculty agreed that consistency is good.

9 Currently senate and grad licensure council meetings and special meetings are open to the public. Do we want to add a note that there can be a vote to hold closed meetings to the public if needed?

Rob: Since we are a public university, open meeting laws apply. Meetings can be closed only when there are personnel issues being discussed. The TE senates do not address these kinds of issues, so there is no need for closed meetings. In fact, they would be illegal.

New Business

VI. Contacts of faculty who teach courses with teacher candidates who may be interested in the Middle Level Endorsement program.

Cathy: Course work allows teacher candidates to be specialists about young adolescent learners. If you are interested in learning more about this option for your students, contact Carolyn Weber.

Someone asked about this being redundant, since secondary teaching majors earn licenses to teach in grades 5 - 12. Cathy agreed, but said if a
teacher candidate is focused on middle school jobs, it adds more specialization for that age learner.

VII. **Current Legislation** related to education in Iowa. (Link is to the education bill-tracking page on Iowa’s Department of Education webpage.)

There were concerns about taking a side, and wondering about being neutral better. Others indicated that our expertise needs to be part of the discussion in Des Moines. How to manage this in a timely manner, given the pace of some work done in Des Moines. We may need to call special sessions to react.

Cathy: Mary Braun is UNI’s representative in Des Moines. Should I invite her to the joint meeting on April 29 to find out how we can support her work? The response was yes.

VIII. Other items to note.

The COE will pay to attend the AACTE in New Orleans in February 2022.

**Upcoming Dates (subject to change, all on Zoom)**

**Joint Senate**
April 29, 2021 (will be needed)

**Secondary Senate**
April 1, 2021

**Elementary Senate**
April 15, 2021