

Minutes of the University System of Georgia
Educator Preparation Academic Advisory Committee Meeting
September 13, 2002

Meeting was called to order by Janice Reid. Those in attendance were Dorothy Zinsmeister, Ed Wheeler, Hugh Hudson, Ron Colarusso, Susan Wilson, Derek Mpinga, Ellen Burlison, Ann Smith, Virginia Donovan, Bari Haskins-Jackson, Virginia Michelich, Yiping Wan, Linda Noble, Mary Ellen Wilson, Jan Kettlewell, Grace James, Rob Gingras, Louis Castenell, Hugh Ruppensburg, Janis Reid, Jan Kettlewell, Ann Duffy, Janet Fields, Paul Beare, Thomas Harrison, Julia Dorminey, John Black, Bob Michael, Virginia Carson, Ron Booth, Thomas Reed, John Derden, Larnell Flannigan, John Kohler, Richard Baringer, Douglas Tuech, and Kent Layton

Item 1: Approval of Minutes

Item 2: Recruitment and Retention of Teacher Education Faculty

Linda Noble presented background information, data, and recommendations related to recruiting and retaining higher education faculty to teacher preparation programs. Discussion initially centered on internal conflict issues between Colleges of Education (CoE) and Colleges of Arts and Sciences (CAS) with regard to salary differences for professional education faculty. It was noted that College of Business faculty received salary boost some years back... market sensitive hiring practices applied in some areas but not in others... we loose good faculty to institutions who can apply market prices to teacher education. The point was raised, why don't we consider public school years experience in hiring and salary? Discussion continued... as we engage in more and more public school work... we need to be able to hire effective faculty with strong public school backgrounds and salaries that are competitive... terminal degree issue with regard to public school faculty is not entirely fair nor needed for the types of responsibilities they are hired. Moved by Thomas Harrison; seconded John Colter.

Discussion continues. Have any of us talked these issues? Clinical positions for certain Colleges of Education positions was reported at research institutions. Different types of faculty working well for research institutions at the present. Section 3 discussed at length with regard to how to implement. Point made that this recommendation includes K-12 experience for faculty in all colleges. Some universities are beginning to make improvements in this area. This would also include hiring at two-year institutions as well. There was some concern that these recommendations might create barriers regarding joint missions between colleges... when there are salary differentials in the CAS among teacher education focused faculty and non-teacher education focused faculty...More on clinical faculty lines at Georgia State... limited number of these kind of faculty.... but they have not resolved teacher education faculty in Colleges of Arts and Science... however tenure and promotion issues have not been solved and faculty are caught in tough predicaments. Cultural shifts in departmental notions of tenure and promotion very important as we address Section 3.

Item 3: Immunization and Graduate Students

Kent Layton, on behalf of Cindi Chance, presented (see HO2) the state and national findings related to types of immunization cases that had been documented most recently. Given that there were virtually none and that vaccines were currently being prioritized for children, discussion was brief about any concerns for continuing the immunization requirement for graduate students. Motion was made to recommend dropping the requirement for proof of immunization at the graduate level by John Black; seconded by Bob Michael; unanimous.

Item 4: Activity Fee and Graduate Students

Bob Michael spoke about and presented data concerning graduate fees on a uniform basis in the email out to everyone... full time at 9 but no fee adjustment below 9 hours... a system wide review of this issue was recommended.

Discussion ensued... price is all we have to compete with against entrepreneurial or for-profit educational operatives... outside privates “eating our lunch” on this issue...discussion continued about institutional options... some institutions reported having already attempting it ... with little success... institutional options discussed at length again... the discussion reflected that fee structures were different across all institutions. Discussion ensued that this policy might affect all graduate students.

Recommendation for a draft of the same format emerged. Motion by John Black seconded by several... 1 nea. Clarification on motion asked by several. Re-vote requested after clarification... what might the financial impact system wide be? We need as much data as possible to go forward with this recommendation in light of current budget situation. Additional concerns were voiced for Colleges/Schools of Education versus Colleges of Arts and Science ... discrimination perhaps? Would have to be for all graduate students... but a strong rationale for teacher education... present this a strong issues from EPAAC... based on teacher education needs for attracting qualified faculty.

Additional discussion ensued regarding EPAAC’s need to look at the big picture for teacher education... the timing of two of our recommendations is terrible given the current economy and cutbacks... we need to prioritize what’s most important to us... let’s consider the package we sending up very carefully... but there’s an equity issue in part time versus full time students... isn’t this an issue at the undergraduate level too? No consensus. What is our strategy? How do we deal with this... system wide or radar with VPAA/Provosts? Should we make this an institutional issue versus a USG system-wide issue? Discussion returned back to weaving our recommendations together... identifying key elements and removing institutional barriers that affect students... language important... couching carefully... there will be a presentation at the next BOR meeting of our successes in the Principles. New discussion arose concerning our institutions capping tuition at 12 hours... noting that we are essentially giving away 20% of our instruction... we essentially run our program 20% under... financial struggle for some... there is a system committee that has also voiced this concern.

Re-vote was discussed again. Motion for re-vote... all graduate students.... all opposed 3, 3 abstains, the majority vote in favor of the motion.

Item 5: Report on the Dean's Teacher Preparation Recruitment Committee/Two Grant Proposals

Thomas Reed presenting, noting unseen person on the committee: Trish Paterson - thanks to her hard work and energy on this proposal. Clarity provided on two attachments... A and B... some are in two parts. Review of document A... emphasis on one size does not fit all... need for rural and urban schools... and how to retain once there... 5 strategies recommended and articulated in attachment A; graphic discussed and explained; lack of data to make good decisions; more beginning, middle, end, and induction support a must; refinement of BOR principles to support the 5 strategies; rest of document elaborates on specifics. Seven pilot institutions based on high need LEA partners was presented. Jan Kettlewell added ... two grants... move forward... with the resources we currently have... comments... very positive approach ... will there be money tucked into this to say we're doing good things for the public to know... the first real statement that students have special needs from the system... the need for us to collect accurate data about us... PSC data inaccurate about BSEs that we're producing... only tells a small part of the story... the rest of the story shows the number of people we recommend for certification... provisionals... endorsements... add-ons... we are not being portrayed accurately by the PSC nor the media. Jan Kettlewell continues ... potential opportunity... No Child Left Behind... federal legislation... all schools required to have teacher quality plans in place... 75 million... flow through DOE to school districts... they are charged with the idea... a highly qualified teacher in every classroom... steering committee in the PSC... trying to est an operational definition... September 25th plan to be in place by all school districts... steering committee... comments... we don't have a lot of turn over in our state... we need more post baccalaureates and content courses for our teachers... but not at M-T-W-Th mornings... how can the university system work with us? Hard for them to penetrate a university... to seek help... to seek assistance... they have unique needs and requests... they don't understand the IHE system well enough to call and collaborate... how can we collaborate on our needs and not theirs... the Teacher Career Center would meet these challenges... especially in the area of professional development... teacher quality plans will unfold in the months to come... P-16 councils can be powerful to meet these needs.

Question posed by a few... where are two year schools included in these proposals? How do we fit in? not all the students in education come from 4 year institutions; the center was not designed for just 4 year institutions... a university system center... no 2 year school in the pilot... would be great to have them in the picture as well... it might make sense to amend the document to include the 2 year collaborative institutions with the one noted... RESA partners also included. Support for proposition from Lou Castnell... total inclusion important... question... What do I do when I have relationships in these areas because of the nature of our work? Invitations were not sent to all institutions... based on school districts with highest needs... whether or not we get the grant... let's figure out how to do this... it is that important and needed... these "things" would become university system "things" ... showcase and share back through EPAAC and P-16 Councils... some concerns for where the money flows... if the same expectations occur but the money doesn't flow to all... how can this be achieved? Grant opportunities are a way to kick off these ideas... EPAAC could follow up with a system-wide initiative.

Perhaps we need to go beyond this scope... resources... national need data shared... frustrations with catch-22 educational situations... quality and quantity... if you don't have students come to your program, retainment is moot; we're last... national test scores... no reward for growth... no limit... no end... is there a light at end of the tunnel... the more you do the more it comes out of your hide... 75 million will just disappear... all COE deans are frustrated with the pressures they are currently experiencing. Discussion moved to noting the new chancellor... pushing partnerships... much to resurface after the elections with regard to changes in education. Additional comments ensued... all institutions are unique... broad-based suggestions inappropriate... parallel paradigms in play... misinformation... hurt feelings... don't see myself in the picture... everyone seeking attention. Special initiatives in the past... appear to be distributed inequitably over the years... some institutions appear to be losing out at times... the system needs to be more aware. We all come to this from our personal experiences... some pockets more full than others. Response to these concerns provided that state monies through the BOR comes to us based on requests from Presidents. Some institutional presidents chose not to ask for money... BOR does not dictate institutional direction and mission... some institutions have their act together more than others... and get more money as a result of it... fair disbursement of grant monies understood but not directed toward any particular institution.

Request from the group: Do we need to take action? We can pursue this as a grant opportunity or as a university system initiative using the 7 universities noted in the program as a pilot. The grants were coincidental... but begs the question ... do we want this as a university system initiative? Moved by Thomas Harrison to accept the proposal. Seconded by Paul Beare. Unanimous.

Item 6: Report on Process/Timeline for External Review of Educational Leadership Programs

Jan Kettlewell reviewed the BOR leadership initiatives leadership institute... Georgia State selected... research... policy... recs for next round of regent's principles... current leadership programs to be evaluated... 2002-2003 under the leadership person Ann Duffy... designated to run this initiative... the FD Toth of Mass... coordinating the policy work... Atlanta Public Schools... charter initiatives... and coordinating the leadership program external reviews. Leadership programs have already submitted self-studies... committees to have K-12, higher education, and community folks; some folks from out-of-state... for peer review... in the next 4-6 weeks... first review... Georgia State... to help work out the kinks in the process... to make sure we provide good feedback to institutions... will visit for 1-2 days in November and February... reports due to the BOR in late spring... summary reports will be due... so that we can refine the BOR principles next year. Written feedback will be provided to programs in about 6 weeks after their review. Program review... definition? Both degree and certification. The BOR will cover the expenses.

Concern arose about possible misuse of data... what framework do we have to follow in revising our leadership programs? If programs are to be evaluated... what framework are you looking for? Sensitive matter... institutions should not be set up for bad press from the findings of this work. The beneficiary should be us! The data will be used to

improve the regents' principles. Not planning on putting out a large report... this information intended for us to improve our leadership programs. Note that it will be public record and can be accessed... thus potential for harm to Colleges of Education once again... misuse of data issue surfaces. The BOR will send out the status of the stages as they develop. Question emerges: Is this intended to establish new standards for leadership programs? Policy work has lead them to working with 5 related major national organizations ... with major issues surfacing ... 1. ISLIC standards fall far short of well we need to be ... leadership changes are incredible... in reality, ISLIC no longer gets the job done and needs to update their standards... trying to be a catalyst for encouraging program change that's responsive to the schools... the Regent's Principles take us in the right general direction but not far enough nor specific enough... this work will inform us as institutions, the BOR, and the PSC... this is for meaningful analysis to evaluate the preparation of school leaders.

Item 7: Update on Progress Toward Meeting Regents' Principles for the Preparation

Update on teachers only so far... leadership will follow through Ann Duffy. From Jan Kettlewell, general comments about the report. Pleased with the progress we are making... continuing to build on the past slide presentation. Presentation to the Educational Coordinating Council... on our progress... Augusta... UGA... Georgia State... made presentations providing examples of progress... Governor complimentary... second presentation at the next BOR meeting on accomplishments to date... where we are... and what's next... some programs may be invited to present. Would like to have 2-3 first year teachers to talk about how they've been prepared... to show their portfolios... asking us for recommendations... to show case our successes and accomplishments. This is the way we get money... when the board champions our good work, more money begins to flow and opportunities for special funding initiatives happen when we make things happen. Question from the group: Powerful idea for first year teacher... can we pay for subs and a small stipend? Let's make it worth their while!

Item 8: Area F

Dorothy Zinnsmeister goes reviews the minutes over the past couple of years... to dig out our perspective and reminds everyone of the agreements all institutions supported (Recommendations for Area F for Early Childhood Education, Middle Grades Education, and Secondary Education - Approved November 16, 1999 by ACAA.). Then the Outcomes and Associated Courses in the same document were re-presented. In Section D, it was noted that: "In support of the major" is a major confusion... the major referred to content courses not additional courses in education... clarification that was not part of the minutes. Is there still confusion? No reply.

Middle Grades minutes were reviewed next. Question emerges: But if the receiving institution specifies and the sending institution does not what do we do in that case? Essentially the guidelines say that they must be accepted as a transfer in total...within the time frame of 120 hours. If an institution is not recognizing your area F... then we need to get them on the right page. The Omsbudsman person on your campus is there to solve this problem. Is there agreement? Lots of nods.

Secondary minutes were reviewed last noting that compared to the first two, it is somewhat confusing and has been addressed more than once. Two years down the road, the November 16, 1999 stipulation was superceded by b in April 2001.

Discussion continues. As an aside, nowhere does it say that the Area F for math education or someone majoring in mathematics has to be identical? So...it was requested that we disseminate these to all department chairs to scrutinize all of our programs. Question emerges: Didn't we agree that if there were exceptions to this policy... not all institutions would have to adhere to this policy? Do we remember that UGA did not want to adhere... action of this body was to approve this document as it appears here... but a motion was made and approved that institutions could exempt themselves if wanted.

Point being... it depends upon the situation... BS... BA issue discussed at length... Part B reads that we've all got to go back and reconfigure our Area F. Question emerges: Many programs go beyond 120 hours... do we have the lead way to not to have to request permission to go beyond 120 hours?

We've treated it as a double major... content and education. When we had the big meeting of all meetings... the education deans wanted to split.. The CAS deans said it was a major or it wasn't... so we came up with something nobody liked ... essentially... Portch was encouraged to take this to the Board, but he would not... this rule created lots of consternation with faculty at many campuses... there can be no equivalency... So we asked folks not to ask for requests to break Board policy... thus we treated the situations as double majors and when you have a double major the 120 rule is no longer an issue or must be followed... internally... use reason and not greed... do your best to stick to 120 if at all possible... full major in the CAS and meet all courses for certification. If students start writing BOR members... it will go crazy and we'll not be able to manage it any more.

Concern emerges: This is a totally different conversation than we have had in the past... thought we were doing this for respectability... now we appear to be saying that this is not necessarily true. Final Point: Courses for certification need to be outside of Area F.

Discussion continues. Most institutions have done away with Broad Field because they couldn't meet the BOR principles. Question emerges: How many institutions have viable secondary education programs? Only one institution spoke up. Another question surfaces: What impact have the BOR Principles had on these programs as well as others? Point made that there was an adhoc committee appointed to address these issues last year and that many of us at the meeting were members... but that little or no progress had taken place up to this point.

Item 9: Learning Plus

Learning Plus acquired by Plato; no longer valid to continue to using it. Initially, the thought was to sell it to students individually. Several College of Education deans provided input about their interactions with Plato and the program over the past 6-9 months. Overall: very user unfriendly and not well conceived for either distribution nor

for student use including pricing inconsistencies across institutions and awkward sales approaches.

Respectfully submitted,

Kent Layton
Secretary