Secondary Teacher Education Senate Meeting
3:30-5:00 pm, Thursday, November 21, 2019

Oak Room—Maucker Union
Minutes

ATTENDANCE

PRESENT:
Aliza Fones (alt. Modern Lang and TESOL), Alex Oberle. (Alt. Social Sciences), Barb Baker (Physical/Health Ed), Nicki Skaar (Professional Sequence), Lyn Countryman-Teaching (ALT-Clinical Experiences), Elizabeth Hughes (Mathematics), Kyle Grey (Science Ed.), Samantha Goss (Art Ed.), Cathy Miller (EPP Chair), JD Cryer (Coordinator of TE)

ABSENT:
Jennifer Anderson (Business), Sheila Benson (English), Dominick Manusos (Technology and Engineering), Kyle Rudick (Speech and Theatre), Kevin Droe (Music), Mary Doyle (Clinical Experiences)

I. Welcome and Remarks
JD shared that Chris Kliewer, faculty member in the department of Special Education and a member of the Elementary Teacher Education senate, passed away last month. JD acknowledged the work Chris did and that he will be missed.

II. Joint senate meeting minutes electronically approved.

Reports

III. General Education Revision Committee Update
CM shared the update
- Feedback sessions completed.
- 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).
- Invited senators to send her questions/concerns so she can share with Gen. Ed Revision Committee.

Old Business

IV. Motions to discuss and vote on:

A. To have EPP Faculty Chair receive updates from the General Education Committee and share information related to EPP with senates.
   - JD asked for any further discussion to the motion.
   - No further discussion
   - Vote taken. Motion passed.
B. 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.
   - Cathy reviewed the history of this concern with EL.
   - Lyn shared that the COE is using “Tubbs” money, to hold a two-day seminar in January that will focus on EL.
   - JD asked if the seminar is for faculty or students. Lyn says it is for both.
   - Cathy asked if seminar is for COE or all Teacher Ed faculty. David is on the committee and will help with clarifying this question.
   - Vote taken. Motion passed.

C. 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)
   - JD reviewed current structure and his leadership. However, motion would change this to EPP chair leading.
   - Kyle asked if Cathy believes it is likely the one course buyout will be supported by Provost. Cathy said yes.
   - Vote taken. Motion passed.

D. 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.
   - JD explained that the Elementary TE Senate did not vote on this motion during their November meeting, instead they asked for a job description related to the day-to-day work done in the Office of Teacher Education.
   - Cathy explained that during the work for revising the Governance model, it was discovered that there are two types of work needed -- day-to-day, and visionary/strategic. In past model, Coordinators of Elementary and Secondary completed much of this work.
   - Lyn asked what the day-to-day person does. Cathy provided a short list and told them that she is working on a better job description using what JD and Chad wrote last summer.
   - JD shared the data from the fall EPP faculty meeting survey.
   - Motion was made by Nicki to table this decision and wait for the job descriptions. Kyle seconded motion.

E. To have the Level II Field Experience evaluation updated with a new category, “with distinction” and use this rating to recommend teacher candidates for pre-license substitute authorization.
   - JD reviewed the discussion from the Elementary Senate November meeting that they voted “no” on this motion and drafted another motion to replace it.
   - JD explained that the elementary senators thought current motion would be too burdensome for Level II faculty and open up all sorts of liability issues.
   - Lyn shared that the department of teaching was happy the Elementary senate voted no on this.
Aliza agreed that if we passed this motion it might skew how the Level II rubric is used. Would we use it in favor of the sub authorization rather than its intended use for the overall needs of program?

Lyn shared her department’s concern that students might miss class to sub.

Cathy shared that the law says they cannot miss class to sub, so if students are caught they lose the sub license.

Nicki asked if no NOC’s meant no active ones or no NOCs ever. JD thought the former, CM the latter. This will have to be clarified.

Currently, JD is making the determination on a case-by-case basis regarding who can be recommended for a sub license. He has created a checklist that appears to be serving the process nicely thus far, but there are still some questions. For example, he had a student interested in a recommendation whose GPA was 2.98 -- does that mean No? JD made the decision to get a faculty recommendation if the GPA is not 3.0, which he did with the 2.98 student. Aliza suggests consulting both the field experience coordinator and the cooperating teacher when making this decision. JD noted that he uses the cooperating teacher’s comments on the rubric too. Aliza then asked if we are engaging in this process as a service to the state or our students. Cathy said both due to UNI being a public institution.

Lyn called the question for the original motion.

Vote taken. Motion did not pass.

Nicki asked that we need to clarify what does NO mean for NOC’s, and maybe add an appeal.

Alex asked about students who look good on paper, but in reality might not be that strong? How does JD’s checklist deal with these situations?

Eliza suggested we add wording “subject to departmental support.” David agrees with that.

Alex asked what percent of students never have a NOC. JD said about 95%.

Barb asked what is the chance that students have days off to substitute. CM said there are some programs where this can happen. JD said also in Thanksgiving/winter/spring breaks, etc. Barb asks if we can limit their substitute teaching to breaks. CM said no, due to it being the law.

Lyn made motion move to base recommendations on the completion of Level II, Level III, or Level IV rubrics with competency in each category of the given rubric, GPA of at least 3.0 and no NOC’s at the time.

Nicki added that program faculty will be consulted when student’s readiness is questioned by TE office.

Nicki also noted the need for due process where students can appeal.

Alex seconds the motion.

Senators will take motion back to discuss with their constituents and vote in December.

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

Lyn said that this person should not be the Dean of COE, due to TE being campus wide.
Cathy shared the two associate Deans idea.
Nicki said that she likes the idea of it not being one person and wondered about if the leadership team could do this work. JD noted that currently the leadership team is working in this type of structure.
Nicki wondered if maybe the leadership team could be the ones who make the decisions and have the Provost serve as head of unit for absolute final decisions and those involving finances.
CM shared what elementary senate suggested about having a Coordinator of Strategic/Visionary Work be the person in charge of doing the work required for the EPP.
Nicki and Lyn like this idea combined with Elementary Ed. senate’s idea.
Nicki said to have a job description of leadership team would be helpful.
Cathy shared that the Provost appears to be frustrated with how long it is taking us to get governance organized. Cathy reminded senators that shared governance is done when administration lets it happen. Cathy encouraged senators to have a motion ready for Dec. meeting so she can share it at Leadership team’s meeting with the Provost.

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

See above.

VII. Curriculum Consultation: INSTECH 1020 waiver from TECH 1022 to TECH 3120—Technology Education
   ▪ No concerns.

New Business

VIII. Information from State
   A. IACTE Update

IX. EPP Assessment and Support
   ▪ Cathy and JD shared the concern that UNITED is running out of time and needs to be rebuilt or we need to get another assessment platform. They reminded the senate that work was completed by a Task Force charged by the senates to investigate this question last spring semester. This Task Force came back with the recommendation to replace UNITED with the Tk20/Watermark assessment platform. However, to make this happen we need to hire a Director of Assessment to lead the work of Tk20/Watermark.
   ▪ Nicki said that Ed Psych wondered how EPP is financed on campus. It seems the TE office and Director of Assessment were funded by COE instead of by each of the colleges across campus. The summer governance committee suggested that funding of TE Office, including Director of Assessment be funded proportionally by all colleges based on number of EPP students in each college.
X. Need a new student representative starting in January.
   - Cathy shared that if senators have a student who would be good on the senate and learn from the experience, to send the names to JD.

XI. Ideas to share of interest to Teacher Education Senate.

**Upcoming Dates (subject to change)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary Senate</th>
<th>Secondary Senate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 5 (CBB 319)</td>
<td>December 12-Presidential Room (Union)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>