

10-18-2012

University of Northern Iowa Secondary Teacher Education Senate Meeting Minutes, October 18, 2012

University of Northern Iowa. Secondary Teacher Education Senate.

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©2012 Secondary Teacher Education Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.uni.edu/te_ssdocuments



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Secondary Teacher Education Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Secondary Teacher Education Senate Meeting Minutes, October 18, 2012" (2012). *Documents - Secondary Senate*. 104.

https://scholarworks.uni.edu/te_ssdocuments/104

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Secondary Teacher Education Senate at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Documents - Secondary Senate by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

Secondary Teacher Education Senate
Thursday October 18, 2012
3:30
Curris Business Building 319
Minutes

I. Roll and Introductions

Present: Cherin Lee (Coordinator, Secondary Teacher Education), Melissa Heston (Coordinator, Elementary Teacher Education), Dianna Briggs (Business Education), Larry Escalada (Science Education), Terri Lasswell (Clinical Experiences), Barb Bakker (Physical Education/Health Education), Becky Hawbaker (Teacher Education Faculty Chair), Chad Christopher (Social Science Education), Cathy Miller (Mathematics Education), Katherine Lavelle (Speech & Theatre Education), Doug Hotek (Technology Education), Kevin Droeg (Music Education), Rick Knivslund (Art Education), Joyce Milambiling (Modern Languages & TESOL-ALT), Rick Vanderwall (English Education), Ben Forsyth (Professional Sequence)

Absent: Chris Curran (Special Education)

Guests: Rob Boody (Director of Assessment), Tony Gabriele (Educational Psychology and Foundations)

II. Approval of September 20 Minutes

There was a question about the TWS/TPA information on page 2 of the minutes. Cherin explained that the TPA advisory committee will come to the Senate with a recommendation.

Cherin noted that the Elementary Teacher Education Senate meeting in November has been moved to Nov. 8 due to the Teacher Education Induction Convocation on Nov. 1.

Doug Hotek moved to approve, Larry Escalada seconded. Minutes were approved.

III. Added Agenda item - Standing Committee members

Standing committees need to start functioning. Cherin clarified membership or asked for new members on the following committees:

Teacher Education Diversity Committee – Cathy Miller will continue.

Teacher Education Faculty Committee – This committee monitors programs for compliance with all aspects of Chp. 79, including the team teaching requirement. It reviews requests for voting membership, determines minimum membership requirements, and assists the Coordinators with Teacher Ed professional development.

Joyce Milambiling volunteered to replace Chad Christopher. A replacement for Karen Breitbach is needed.

Teacher Education Clinical Committee – last year Ashley Jorgenson was listed for secondary education. The Senate determined that it was appropriate for Ashley to continue. Cherin will contact Ashley. Dyan Meyer will also be asked to continue.

Teacher Education Curriculum Committee – Chad Christopher and Ben Forsyth will represent the Secondary Senate.

Teacher Education Assessment Committee - Dianna Briggs volunteered as secondary representative.

III. Updates:

A. Praxis II status (Melissa)

Things seem to have settled down. We did get more testing opportunities for October. The only glitch we have run into is the registration process. If students want to take 2 exams the same day they must register for both at once (ETS will not allow them to go in a second time to register for the second exam).

Some students are getting notices of “not available” when they try to register. If this happens please contact Melissa. ETS will open more slots if they know that we need more slots. It was noted that UNI as a testing center is going from 300 to over 1,200 tests per year as we provide Buena Vista, Wartburg, and other small schools a testing site. We are also now doing both Praxis I (PPST) and Praxis II. Thus there is a great deal of competition for testing slots and the testing center is only open ½ days Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, and two Saturday mornings a month with restricted hours. The testing center on campus will need more resources for staffing more days and more slots.

A discussion ensued about one Senator’s information that as students are making the choice between which test version to take, they talk about the fact that the computer test monitors how well you are answering and makes the test harder. Also, students who take the computer based test get fewer questions and presumably you could do better taking the shorter test. Therefore, some students are moving towards paper/pencil for testing. The Senate discussion centered on the equitable (or not) nature of the two test formats, sampling, and students’ perceptions that the tests are not doing the same thing.

Other comments on testing included: The math content test says that students need a calculator, but it has to be “cleared” on entering the testing site and this takes a long time.

Melissa requested something in writing to put it in a FAQ.

B. IACTE Report (Melissa and Cherin)

(1) Iowa Department of Education Director Jason Glass explained the recommendations for the Career Ladder: A Residency year for the first year of employment, the initial license (at the end of 2 years), then the following levels – career, mentor, model, leader with possible pay increases for each rung of the ladder.

Cherin commented they have renamed the first year. It’s not an internship. Teachers would still go through the 2-year license. Their residency year is the first of those two years. For the residency there is an expectation that higher education is involved in mentoring, seminars, etc. Question arose in the Senate as to how do we manage this across the entire state? Other things about the career ladder include possibilities of more avenues for student teachers with the mentor and model teachers.

Terri noted that a missing piece is we don’t know how to evaluate practicing teachers. The Task Force believes that principals will do this but the evaluation system needs to be reformed. Also

how do people move up the ladder? Melissa added more explanation will probably happen in the following year.

Someone asked about how this applies to the alternative licensure by internship program. What is our responsibility in that first year for them? Cherin commented that it is that program's responsibility to heavily mentor during the internship year. Merrie Schroeder makes arrangements with people to do it, usually former principals or retired teachers. The reason that people are in this alternative program is because they are place bound. This program does not find them a job. If they don't find an internship year, they have to student teach.

(2) The Board of Educational Examiners (BOEE) plans to do "peer reviews" of the new Elementary Education Curriculum Exhibits (to take effect Sept. 2015). They will get a group of people to do this peer review. Melissa added that this may be a future mechanism for all of the reviews, farming them out to higher education faculty. The BOEE would get feedback and then make approval decisions. Melissa noted that given the (slow) speed of the process she wouldn't be too anxious.

C. Transcripts required along with recommendations for licensure
The BOEE wants transcripts from each student upon graduation (it's basically a "trust and verify" issue). Melissa, Cherin, Phil Patton, Lyn Countrymen, Greg Reed, Cathy Humke, and Barb Hill are meeting tomorrow to talk about process, procedure, and cost. At this time, we can only send paper.

D. Need for self-advocacy by Higher Education institutions
Melissa commented on the need for self-advocacy given the powerful voices working to create a national agenda to end college/university-based teacher education and replace it with alternative licensure and other routes. Also, federal rules are likely to require ranking teacher education programs into four tiers with only students in the top two program tiers eligible for federal financial aid. We need to become active in our state legislature and convince our legislators that they should not rate teacher preparation programs on the achievement scores of the students of alumni. We don't want to get ranked or judged just on P/K - 12 academic scores. Missouri was able to avoid that model. There is a chance this may be considered in Iowa.

E. Update on NCTQ
There is a group of well-funded individuals wanting to end teacher preparation by higher educational institutions. There is a notion that we are the problem. NCTQ has taken out a full-page ad that criticizes teacher education programs for not responding to their data gathering request. Sarah commented on the rubrics used by NCTQ for data analysis. Melissa noted that the rubrics are all online. You can read them to see how they are written.

The private institutions in Iowa didn't cooperate in the NCTQ request for data gathering. UNI was required to as a state school. However, UNI has been judged as uncooperative based on excessive fees charged for the data.

NCTQ has nefarious ways of getting information. If someone asks you for something such as your syllabus, be sure to ask questions. You may not be happy with how your input is used. However, Melissa and Cherin can't tell you not to share.

IV. Old business

A. Update on Level I and Level II Field Experiences

Level I is much the same, however, the support model has changed. The previous model had emeritus teachers supervising but only available to one half of the schools. Now all Level I students have a field experience coordinator in the school, directly grading the journals, helping students be more involved in the classroom. Becky said that she is really impressed with her peers from the Lab School and how they are doing as Field Experience Coordinators.

Becky has been working with Educational Psychology on the syllabus. She asked if the “old” InTASC Standards were the ones to follow. Melissa noted that Chap. 79 is based on the old standards. The new standards are different with many criteria.

Level II started with what already existed from PLS for the foundation. Two thirds of what is in the course was in the course in the past. The biggest change is how the students register for the on campus component and the field experience times.

Becky noted that students have finished the first 8-week session. This week is the seminar week for Session B. Data is being gathered from students. Some early feedback was done in the seminars on campus. Thus far all of the issues are things that we anticipated.

Ben noted that teachers in schools want students in a particular time slots. He has had students that say the only time they can teach is during his class. Is that common? Becky countered that this shouldn't happen. When it does happen most likely the student was scheduled to teach and something happened. In other cases, it was something goofy with the schedule. It is something that we need to work on - the K-12 school culture versus university culture.

B. Curriculum changes for Level I and II Field Experiences

The plan is to move EDPSYCH 2017, and 3128 to the Department of Teaching through the regular curriculum cycle. Educational Psychology and Foundations will drop those two courses and the Department of Teaching will add these two as new courses. Every department will get an email, thus providing total transparency.

In November the Senate will get full information about the courses. As a Senate we will take a vote on this curricular change. From here the departmental proposals move to the College of Education Curriculum Committee and then on to the College of Education Senate. Approval at that level happens by the end of May. Next fall it goes to the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and then to the University Faculty Senate.

Rob Boody suggested that if everyone is fine with it, we should ask for an expedited process so we can make the changes at the end of spring and in Fall 2013 we could start with new departmental numbering (for planning the Spring 2014 schedule).

Cherin noted that if any departments have curriculum changes to teaching majors, they need to go through the Teacher Ed. Curriculum Committee and if more than trivial, possibly through the Senates.

C. LAC Math admission requirements

There have been some issues with transfer students with math courses that counted for their AA or AS but would not count for credit at UNI (example - college algebra). There is also an issue with students who complete a Regents institution general education program that is automatically accepted as completing the UNI LAC and thus meet the math requirement. Students who transfer without that being completed, but who took the same math course as the other students, don't have that course accepted. This issue concerns mainly secondary and K-12 teaching majors as the Elementary Education majors have a specific math course required in their major.

This has become very difficult and messy to manage and to do so equitably. Melissa and Cherin recommend that the Senate either a) drop the math requirement for admission entirely or b) re-write the requirement and have it refer to the types of courses or their equivalencies that will be accepted.

Cherin provided the example in the sciences where some students have taken pre-calculus but UNI can't accept that because here at UNI that course is not on the LAC list. We make the student take Math for Decision Making, which is certainly a less rigorous course. Doug added that some Technology students took trigonometry elsewhere and they too have to take Math for Decision Making at UNI.

Rick Vanderwall moved that the Senate amend the math requirement for admission to Teacher Education to do away with the connection to LAC Category 1C and to specify courses from a list which will be supplied later. Doug Hotek seconded the motion. Discussion items included the need to make the requirement equitable for all students and the possible impact on (reduced) enrollments in math courses.

Motion approved unanimously. Melissa and Cherin will work on wording.

Cathy Miller offered to compile a list of acceptable courses (to the Math Department and to majors).

D. Transfer Students and Exploring Teaching

This discussion addressed the issue of transfer credit for the initial field experience, Exploring Teaching. What type of field experience does UNI wish transfer students to have and at what level?

More specifically, Level I field experiences taken elsewhere are quite variable. Example, currently DMACC requires 160 hours and they are structured. Becky noted, however, that one student doing this experience clocked 80 hours at his high school, sitting with his friends, observing. Unlike UNI's Exploring Teaching, he didn't stay with any one teacher. That's many hours, but different from a structured experience. Additionally UNI requires a one-hour weekly meeting, curriculum that goes along with the course, and we build in multiple topics. Thus, there is a field experience quality mismatch.

Every Community College is doing what it is doing and we don't know if it is dual credit or at the Community College after high school graduation. Also students transferring in Exploring Teaching credit don't get the Orientation to Teacher Education and thus don't know the process or procedures associated with the teacher preparation program.

Rick Vanderwall commented that this is only one example of the larger transfer problem across campus. He is more aware of the writing issue. Transfer students aren't prepared for college writing. Question asked, is it better to deal with our specific problem, or seek larger solutions to transfer issues?

Cherin commented we do not want to create barriers for transfer students. Would a non-credit version of Exploring Teaching for transfer students be a solution?

Becky suggested we consider preparing our transfer students for the Level II field experience and beyond. We could require a virtual version of the course where students would not have to come every week but it would include the mandatory training sessions and a mini-field experience. It would capture the things that the transfer students are currently missing. One idea was a zero credit course which could require students to attend meetings but not do an actual field experience. Another idea was an online course that would include information provided in the Orientation to Teacher Education session.

Melissa noted that one of the advantages of the online, through Continuing Ed., is that students could do it before they arrived at UNI.

Several Senators liked the idea of a zero credit course for transfer students. It solves the problem without forcing people to redo the total field experience and is a way of making sure that they are ready for Level II. If students do not do well in Level II then they won't be ready for Level III. Dianna offered that this is more important now without Price Laboratory School as a buffer.

The question is how does a zero credit course count for faculty load? Kate suggested that it could be a one-hour course and thus be able to count for faculty load.

Chris inquired if faculty could make the transfer acceptance decision? They would need to document the field experience hours. If the transfer is not accepted then have to take the one-hour course in the fall. Rick clarified that acceptance is determined when they get here. "Who made the decisions?" someone asked. Cherin answered there are established articulation agreements and Admissions makes the transfer course decisions.

Ben added that we don't want to discount people with good experiences. Melissa suggested that additional field experience review could take place to determine if future training is needed. Part of the issue is the quality of education; did they learn anything from that? We need to be able to document their hours. Can we do that for anyone?

We could say that we don't accept high school cadet teaching and at the same time talk about the equivalency of the experience. Students are currently supposed to be able to provide documented evidence of the quality. In this new scenario the "testing out" would be a review of the students' experiences. However the problems would be number of reviews and figuring out expectations.

Cherin asked how many students are we talking about? Becky estimated 60 to 80. This would be quite a few students to review. Could we devise a form of questions for the review?

Melissa noted this issue is part of a larger question – if we do start to be held accountable at the K-12 student level, do we want students with 80% of their professional core coming from somewhere else ultimately labeled as UNI graduates? At present students must take Level II

Field Experience and Human Relations and methods here, everything else can transfer in. Dianna added that we get a lot of requests for Human Relations transfer credits.

Becky suggested that we start with a no-credit, online orientation and student consulting and gather data. This would not hold up transfer students and they will get the most important things about the programs. Rick notes that there will be a cost in the set up – someone will have to get paid to create the course or else get a grant to create it.

Cherin suggested that the Curriculum Committee meet and come up with a model. If this cleared the Senates prior to scheduling for Fall 2013 we can do an experimental course. She also noted that the experimental course could be Online but reminded the Senators that an experimental course can only be offered 3 times. If we thought we were ready we could do off-cycle in the fall in the curriculum process.

E. Monitoring OSHA and Mandatory Reporting

Masa is making it so that faculty can check to see which students in their course have completed each seminar.

We need to decide if we are going to officially make this a program requirement versus something done in Exploring Teaching. If a program requirement will it be a requirement for admission to Teacher Education or just of the Teacher Ed. Orientation with the intent to monitor completion of the seminars? Since a decision needs to be made Melissa and Cherin will craft wording to submit to both Senates.

IV. New Business

GPA Discussion postponed until the November meeting.

Meeting adjourned, 5:00 p.m.

Upcoming Dates

| | |
|-------------|--------------------------------------|
| October 30 | *Teacher Education Executive Council |
| November 1 | Teacher Induction Convocation, GBPAC |
| November 8 | Elementary Teacher Education Senate |
| November 15 | Secondary Teacher Education Senate |
| November 27 | *Teacher Education Executive Council |
| December ?? | Senate meetings as needed |