

Minutes of the University System of Georgia
Educator Preparation Academic Advisory Committee Meeting
October 3, 2003

Members Attending: Gwen Benson (for Ron Colarusso), Byron Brown (for Linda Calendrillo), eEllen Burlison, Virginia Carson, Louis Castenell, Jay Cliett , John Culbreath, Evelyn Dandy, John Derden, Larnell Flannagan, Tom Fox, Brian Gerber (for Philip Gunter), Rob Gingras, Daniel Hagan (for Cindi Chance), Richard Harrison, Thomas Harrison, Caroline Helms, John Hutcheson, Grace James, Wilsie Jenkins, Jan Kettlewell, KaKarynne Kleine (for Linda Irwin-Devitis), Kent Layton, Virginia Michelich, Linda Noble, Ed Pettit, Jennie Rakestraw (for Anny Morrobel-Sosa), Beth Rushing, David Sabatiso (for Janis Coombs Reid), Mike Stoy, Tony Strange (for Julius Scipio), Doug Tuech, Yiping Wan, Lettie Watford (for Mary Gendernalik Cooper), Sue Wilson, Dorothy Zinsmeister.

Visitors Attending: Trish Paterson, Mark Peavey

Welcome

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by Linda Noble, who welcomed committee members and introduced new members.

Brief History of EPAAC

Jan Kettlewell provided a brief history of EPAAC.

EPAAC has three groups represented: Deans of the Colleges of Education, Deans of Arts and Sciences, and the VP Academic Affairs of two-year institutions.

In the 1997-98 academic year, BOR looked at teacher preparation, crafted principles for teacher preparation and leaders.

In 2001, the principles for teacher preparation were revised, and the counselor principles were prepared.

Rubrics, developed by the System Office were added for four-year institutions in order for them to do a self-assessment in how they are meeting principles.

Approval of Minutes

Minutes from the Spring, March 26, 2003 meeting were reviewed.

As the committee was reviewing the minutes, the question of what has happened with the subcommittee studying the “forgiveness policy” came up.

A committee had been set up to look at a forgiveness policy, however no one remembered who was on it. The committee decided that the subcommittee should be

reestablished. The new subcommittee members are as follows: Larnell Flannagan (Chair), Evelyn Dandy, Tom Harrison, and Anthony Strange.

The committee questioned whether this forgiveness policy would apply to other fields as well. Recommendation of the subcommittee would be limited to the scope of teacher education and would not apply to other fields or programs of study.

Jan Kettlewell gave a brief history of the current policy for calculating GPA for entry into teacher preparation programs. NCATE required a 2.5 admission; education deans tried to find a way to have all institutions calculate GPA the same way. What our subcommittee will be doing is to ask us to look at this again and decide if we want to recommend calculating the GPA in a different way.

A motion to approve minutes as corrected was made by John Derden and seconded by Tom Fox. The motion was approved.

Recommendations from the Subcommittee on Seamless Transfer

Linda Noble presented the work of the subcommittee on seamless transition. This committee made six recommendations (handout).

Recommendation 1

The committee recommended that the P-16 Office, in consultation with EPAAC, create and maintain A) a teacher preparation website, B) a listserv for EPAAC and C) a “roadmap” to assist potential education students in their first two years of college (when to take Praxis, apply for four-year admission, etc.).

The purpose behind such a website would be to help institutional departments who aren't primarily teacher education people, but have questions, such as where to get a copy of the Principles and also will be alerted when a document is altered.

EPAAC committee members questioned whether the BOR has the resources to maintain such a website. Jan Kettlewell said that would not be a problem.

Motion to establish website was made by Rob Gingras and seconded by Yiping Wan. The motion was approved.

A motion to establish a listserv for EPAAC was made by John Derden and seconded by Louis Castenell. The motion was approved.

EPAAC members discussed the rationale for recommendation 1C, creating a “roadmap” to assist potential education students in their first two years. Dorothy Zinsmeister pointed out that this is not just a two-year four-year issue. What do we have in place to advise our students? They need to know the requirements for four year programs, when to take Praxis I, and when applications for four-year institutions have to be done, etc.

Jan Kettlewell asked how a roadmap would work for schools such as GPC, where students go to a number of different schools. Ellen Burlison pointed out that two-year institutions still need one to tell their students what to do for various schools. A suggestion was made that Ann Duffy could work with respective institutions to put such information on Teacher Career Center website.

Linda Noble will clarify this recommendation and ask Trish Paterson to communicate with institutions to put this information on the website.

A motion to approve recommendation 1C was made by Virginia Carson and seconded by Evelyn Dandy. The motion was approved.

Recommendation 2

Students who pass Praxis I do not have to take the Regents' test.

This recommendation is for information only. Dorothy Zinsmeister is investigating the possibility. Dorothy commented that this issue has been on the table for this committee for close to two years. This year at a BOR meeting, the BOR passed policy allowing certain SAT scores to exempt students from taking the Regents' test. This action will open the door for looking at this recommendation.

Mark Pevey (System Office) is trying to analyze Praxis I data and trying to correlate Praxis I pass rates with Regents' test pass rates. He will study data regarding Regents' test scores and Praxis I pass rates and plans to have this done by end of year. The difficulty is getting agreement on true Praxis scores to get at questions we are trying to address.

If this goes in to effect, how would that person be treated as far as Regents' test, non-taker, or passer? Now if a student exempts the Regents' exam due to SAT scores, they are counted as having passed the Regents' test. Students can now exempt Praxis I with a combined SAT score of 1000.

Jan Kettlewell suggested that if a student passed the Regents' test we could possibly get PSC to agree that they would then only need to take the math portion of Praxis I.

Linda Noble asked the EPAAC group to make a formal recommendation that the System Office provide relevant data for this committee to discuss the issue of how Praxis I relates to the Regents' exam.

Tom Fox made a motion to approve the recommendation that Linda Noble posed. The motion was seconded by Tom Harrison. The motion was approved.

Recommendation 3

- A. Include 20 hours of field experience in the Area F Foundations course.
- B. Include 10 hours of field experience in the Area F Exceptional Child course.

The subcommittee recommendation includes requiring course descriptions to clearly specify the number of field experience hours required and that specific objectives, expected outcomes, and assessment be in place and specified in the course syllabi. This recommendation should apply to four-year and two-year institutions.

3A. EPAAC members suggested that attaching learning outcomes and assessments to 20 hours field experience in Foundations course should be done at campus/faculty level. Some institutions already have these in place.

A motion to approve recommendation 3A was made by John Hutcheson and seconded by Beth Rushing.

Jan Kettlewell pointed out the relationship of field experience to the Principles. Students are required to complete 900 hours. The purpose of field experience is so the students can show they are meeting the Principles. Thus, if we pass this recommendation, the two-year schools will have to set outcomes in relationship to larger Principles outcomes that teacher education students have to meet. So the four-year institutions would have to have a larger purpose.

Dorothy Zinsmeister commented that field experience for students already admitted to the program is different than for people not yet admitted. In the first two years, field experience is more to help students see if they want to be in teacher education.

Kent Layton had originally suggested adding the field experience hours. He said that adding hours is not necessarily beneficial to students. More important is having a clear set of outcomes so that the experience is of value and goes toward meeting principles.

Jenny Rakestraw commented that the field experience helps students make an informed decision about whether they want to be in teacher education. However, there are five outcomes for Area F and the field experience could help meet those outcomes.

The motion was approved.

3B. 10 hours field experience in Exceptional Child course

Ellen Burlison said that students at Waycross are required to have 10 hours of field experience in the Exceptional Child course and report that the extra 10 hours are very valuable.

A motion to approve recommendation 3B was made by John Derden and seconded by Evelyn Dandy. The motion was approved.

Recommendation 4

The subcommittee recommended that secondary education transfer programs at two-year colleges consist of 69 hours, Areas A-E (42 hours), Area F in the major (18 hours), and professional courses in education (Foundations, Human Growth and Development, and Exceptional Child, 9 hours).

Dorothy Zinsmeister explained that this recommendation would have to go to the Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs and then to the BOR for approval.

Thomas Harrison commented that four-year institutions don't want students at two-year institutions to be able to take 69 hours. That would mean that the four-year institutions are losing 9 hours. However, at many four-year institutions students can't be admitted to teacher education if they haven't taken the nine hours of professional courses. Jenny Rakestraw said that there are plenty of courses for a student to take at the four-year institutions prior to being admitted to teacher education and thus their course of study would not be delayed. Students could take the professional courses and additional content courses in their first semester there. Beth Rushing commented that at her campus it would be a problem if students did take professional courses rather than the subject Area F, because they don't have undergraduate secondary education.

Jan Kettlewell expressed a concern about whether two-year institutions would/would not meet outcomes associated with field experience. If these nine hours are approved, unless four-year schools extend the "time" for completing teacher education, then they have a contracted amount of time to make certain their students meet those outcomes in field experience. Thus the two-year schools would have to take responsibility for meeting some of those outcomes if they do get these 69 hours.

Thomas Harrison said that the two-year institutions have done good job with education courses, however he wanted to hear from Arts and Sciences deans about content courses at the two-year level.

Linda Noble commented that she had been hearing at her institution that students transferring in may not be ready for teacher education. Kennesaw's teacher education faculty want to "see" them first before admitting them to teacher education.

Thomas Harrison suggested that EPAAC table this recommendation and have a group look at this and bring it back to next meeting. Evelyn Dandy made a motion to approve Thomas's recommendation and Thomas Harrison seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

Recommendation 4 will be sent back to existing committee. Wan Yiping pointed out that even their (Kennesaw State University) own students don't get into the teacher education program until second semester of their junior year. Financial aid not a problem at the four-year institution.

Recommendation 5

Institutions should document compliance (or non-compliance) with Area F in the annual report to the System Office on progress in meeting the Principles.

Linda Noble reported that the subcommittee looked at catalogs of institutions. In some cases they couldn't tell if institutions were in compliance.

A motion to accept recommendation 5 was made by Tom Fox and seconded by Rob Gingras. The motion was approved.

Recommendation 6

The subcommittee recommended adoption of two-year college rubrics to document the progress of two-year institutions in the preparation of teacher candidates for transfer to teacher preparation programs at four-year institutions.

EPAAC decided to have members bring this back to their institutions and discuss these, especially since they include strong recommendations for Area F compliance.

Dorothy Zinsmeister pointed out that this is an accountability document, what the 2-year institutions are willing to take on and be accountable for. Linda Noble will call for feedback on the listserv or send this back to subcommittee in some way.

Recommended Revisions for Regents' Principles (handouts)

Jan Kettlewell explained that the Principles for Counselors were ordered differently than the other Principles. Thus, the System Office thought it would be valuable to reorder teachers and leaders Principles the same way.

Jan also commented that when the System Office reviews institutional reports, they look at where there are problems with the rubrics and they can then clarify them.

Trish Paterson went over the recommendations for changes in the rubrics for the Regents' Principles for the Preparation of Teachers for the Schools. These recommendations include:

1. Changing the order of the rubrics
2. Branched rubrics
3. Adjustment of 5 point scale (no 0)

For institutional performance standards, the scale is 1 or 4 (either can meet standard, or can't)

4. Add rubric addressing collaboration with two-year institutions
5. Add rubric looking at preparation of teachers/leaders/counselors together
6. Clarify expectations for second career teacher candidates
7. Institute a system of periodic review for institutions who have achieved a 4 (rating score)

Thomas Harrison recommended that members be given a chance to go back and share this information with their institutions.

The only thing that has changed in the rubrics for leaders is to reorder them and add the one rubric discussed at the last meeting of EPAAC. Additionally the 0 rating was eliminated as for other rubrics.

Jan Kettlewell recommended that we take this rubric back to the campuses as well.

120 hour cap for ECE and Middle grades (handout)

Another subcommittee of EPAAC looked at the possibility of raising the 120 hour cap for early childhood and middle grades education. Kent Layton explained the draft document from this subcommittee.

Jan Kettlewell supports the idea of creating more credit-hour flexibility. The question is the argument that we make. For secondary education we did not request a waiver of the cap. Dan Papp felt if we requested a waiver it would have to go to the Board and they would deny it. So what we did for secondary education is call it a double major, which exempted it from extending the cap.

Would it be possible to conceive ECE and Middle grades as a double major?
Question then is what is the definition of a major?

Linda Noble commented that workload issues aside, this issue has to do with the number of courses in the curriculum. Linda said the question is how are our graduates doing? Do they need more courses?

Dorothy Zinsmeister asked how adding an additional nine hours would decrease workload for faculty?

Louis Castenell commented that the 126-129 hours will increase money, thus faculty can be recognized for their work. Currently faculty receive zero credit for supervision of field experience.

Jan Kettlewell pointed out that in most colleges of education when we went to 120 hours and also increased field experience students got no credit or less credit for field experience and so do faculty get less teaching credit for doing more work.

Mike Stoy pointed out that increasing the 120 hour cap won't bring more money because we won't get extra money for any hours over 12 a semester.

Linda Noble suggested we send this back to the subcommittee and ask them to find out how we can treat this as a double major.

Jennie Rakestraw asked if this change would mean a major curriculum change? Dorothy Zinsmeister pointed out that if a double major is approved for ECE and middle grades education the whole concept of how we talk about a major disappears. It works for high school teacher education, but not really early childhood or middle grades.

Linda Noble asked if this committee agreed that we should move to research considering these programs as double majors.

John Culbreath made a motion for the subcommittee to research the possibility of ECE and middle grades education being considered double majors. The motion was seconded by John Derden. The motion was approved.

Consequences of Non-Compliance with Regents Principles

Jan Kettelwell introduced a discussion on whether there should be consequences of non-compliance with Regents' Principles. Teacher preparation is considered a special funding initiative, and because it is a special funding initiative it is subject to questions by OBP.

Should there be consequences for institutions who are not meeting the Principles? EPAAC executive committee suggested further detail be required from institutions who are not making progress on particular principles and after that if there is no change there should be a visit to campus.

Jan Kettlewell would like to recommend to Dan Papp that a letter goes out to campuses explaining a process that will be followed if institutions are in non-compliance.

Thomas Harrison said that his understanding was that this was a formative process and is not in favor of punitive action unless the System Office is willing to put some assistance in place to help those institutions.

Virginia Carson suggested a peer support group where institutions help each other. Thomas Harrison said it should be kept formative in nature.

Planning for Spring 2004 Meeting

Linda Noble reported that at the summer meeting of the EPAAC subcommittee, Cindi Chance suggested having EPAAC in conjunction with GATE. Linda Noble will explore the details of having an EPAAC meeting back-to-back with GATE.

Update on Recruitment Initiative (handouts)

Trish Paterson gave an update on the Teacher Career Center website. She also introduced Mark Pevey who shared his work on a P-16 data management plan.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:21 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Virginia Michelich