I. Welcome

**Present:** Chad Christopher (Coordinator, Secondary Teacher Education), Nadene Davidson (Clinical Experiences), Scott Greenhalgh (Technology Education), Elizabeth Zwanziger (Modern Languages & TESOL), Dianna Briggs (Business Education), Katheryn East (Teacher Education Faculty Chair), Kay Weller (Social Science Education), Kyle Gray (Science Education), Christina Curran (Special Education-ALT), Wendy Miller (Art Education), Rose Peterson (Student), Courtney Lubs (Teacher Practitioner), Cathy Miller (Math Education), J.D. Cryer (Coordinator, Elementary Education), Nikki Skaar (Professional Sequence-ALT)

**Absent:** Kevin Droe (Music Education), Sheila Benson (English Education), Trey Leech (Physical Education/Health Education), Danielle Crowley (Special Education), Marilyn Shaw (Speech & Theatre Education), Ben Forsyth (Professional Sequence)

**Guests:** Rob Boody (Coordinator of Assessment), Lyn Countryman (Coordinator of Student Teaching)

II. Approval of October 16, 2014 and November 20, 2014 Minutes

Dianna moved to approve Joint Senate minutes and Nadene seconded. Minutes approved.

Scott moved to approved November 20th minutes and Kay seconded. Minutes approved with edits.

III. Update on matters arising at the National/State (Christopher/Cryer)

Proposed Federal Regulations for Teacher Preparation Programs Announced

Secondary Coordinator provided a white hand out with the proposed regulations for TE and how to prepare teachers and practitioners. Dean Watson, Dean of COE, sits on the AACTE Executive Leadership Board and helped develop the response to the regulations.

Senate watched Video message from AACTE President & CEO Sharon P. Robinson (https://secure.aacte.org/apps/rl/res_get.php?fid=1513&ref=rl)

A PowerPoint from the CEEDAR webinar by Dr. Jane West on December 5, 2014 was sent out to faculty members summarizing the regulations.
January 2, 2015 is the due date for feedback about the financial impact of data collection.

Concerns voiced were:
- What does rigorous exit requirements looks like?
- Survey and retention rates of teachers staying in a school or profession.
- Teachers staying in a high need school for three years or same school district

The state will have a lot to say in making definitions on the proposed regulations and it will be important to have representation when the state asks for service on this topic.

The secondary coordinator asked the senate what he would need to do to help communicate the sense of urgency about the proposed regulations.

This topic was being shared with the Executive Council the next day.

Comments are due February 2, 2015 through the Federal eRulemaking Portal or via postal mail, commercial delivery, or hand delivery. The U.S. Department of Education will not accept comments by fax or by email. To ensure that we do not receive duplicate copies, please submit your comments only one time.

A template for faculty comments will be made available closer to the comment deadline.

IV. New Business
a. edTPA and Praxis II/Licensure discussion
   i. Information needed for future vote

   Lyn Countryman, Coordinator of Student Teaching, presented information via PowerPoint on:
   edTPA Data from Fall 2014 Student Teachers

   - All 249 student teachers completed the performance assessment (Educational Performance Assessment – edTPA).
   - All scored locally
   - Of those taken, 2% needed a hard redo which is a rewrite.
   - Approximately 38% need remediation.
   - Approximately 60% pass first time and have all 3’s (Planning, Instruction & Assessment)
   - With regards to national scoring, in the fall of 2014, 66 students elected to have their edTPAs nationally scored.
This is being paid for by the Teacher Quality Partnership (TQP) grant.

**edTPA results – Academic Year 2013-2014 using 2.8 as passing**

- 1% would require a hard re-do
- 25% would require some remediation
- 74% would require no remediation
- N=236

Dr. Countryman would like:
- Data to be analyzed at the department level.
- The Elementary and Secondary Senates to set an accomplished score for local rating.
  - The state sets 42 points for all 15 rubrics for most edTPAs.
  - The student teaching coordinator looked at overall scores in planning, instruction and assessment with 3.0 requiring no remediation, 2.0 requiring remediation and 1.0 is hard remediation which equals a rewrite.
  - ESA’s will be brought to you on the pilot data so you can discuss these and make recommendations on these and request additional ones
  - Once national scores are available we will use all the data from local ratings, national scores and ESA scores to make recommendations on licensure requirements.

Yellow handout with the title “Which tool should we use to meet the State licensure requirement?” was shared.
- Praxis is our current licensure requirement so Teacher Education Program will need to decide if the program continues with that option or use edTPA.

V. Old Business
   a. Teacher Education Governance
      i. Governance Structure and Budget
         Information was provided detailing the Governance Section of Chapter 79.
In regards to the flow chart, who do Teacher Education Faculty think the head of the unit is?

Senators believe The Executive Council communicates with the Senate.

One member mentioned that they feel the Senates have taken on more authority in making policies. It has been helpful having Interim Provost Michael Licari on the Executive Council.

It was mentioned that the budget line for Teacher Ed. comes from the Provost Office. The physical unit is unclear because the Teacher Ed. Office is in Schlinder Education Center where most of COE is located.

Possible spaces for the Teacher Education office were explored but eliminated due to spaces did not meet the needs of the office. There is no common space besides SEC. Currently, the Teacher Ed. office is part of the renovation talks that are going on concerning Schindler.

A member mentioned that Dean Watson is overseeing people that are in COE but not Teacher Education.

Cathy Miller made the motion to ask the Executive Council to show us a budget for how Teacher Ed. program is funded. Nadene seconded. The motion passed.

Governance information was provided.

The definition of unit and who is the head of it is an important part of accreditation

For the Governance section of the state report the state had concerns on the following:

- The unit of education is not consistently defined nor operationalized given that this is a university-wide program.

- 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.
ii. Definition of Unit
The definition of unit as of Nov. 2014 is 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, and the supervision of field experience and/or leading to licensure to practice in the school setting.

Communication and understanding to faculty about the governance structure before accreditation is important. If there are problems the coordinators need to know about it.

iii. Current reality of faculty load, class size, and teaching style

There are budget problems with the loss of faculty over the last several years. There is more required work for departments with fewer faculty and not fewer students.

One member mentioned that there weren’t enough resources to run all sections of a course due to budget issues. This has implications for Teacher Education program and needs to be sent forth to administration.

VI. Upcoming dates (subject to change)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary Senate</th>
<th>Secondary Senate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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-------------------March 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2</td>
<td>April 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 30</td>
<td>May 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>