

**Minutes of the University System of Georgia
Educator Preparation Academic Advisory Committee Meeting
March 23, 2004**

Members Attending: Jeanette Arrington (for Barbara Frizzell), Byron Brown (for Linda Calendrillo), Louis Castenell, Ron Colarusso, Ellen Burleson (for Derek Mpinga), Virginia Carson, Louis Castenell, Cindi Chance, Mary Gendernalik Cooper, John Culbreath, Evelyn Dandy, Larnell Flannagan, Tim Goodman, Philip Gunter, Rob Gingras, Richard Harrison, Thomas Harrison, Caroline Helms, John Hutcheson, Grace James, Wilsie Jenkins, Wendy Kennedy (for Joan Darden), Jan Kettlewell, Bob Michael, Virginia Michelich, Beverly Mitchell (for Yiping Wan), Linda Noble, Surendra Pandey, Janis Coombs Reid, Mike Stoy, Tony Strange, Doug Tuech, Ed Wheeler, Mary Ellen Wilson, Sue Wilson, William Wysochansky, Dorothy Zinsmeister.

Visitors Attending: Sara Conner, Ann Duffy, Ray Huebschmann, Linda Hughes, Patricia Paterson, Mark Peavey

The meeting was called to order by Linda Noble.

A motion to approve the minutes was made by Mike Stoy. The motion was passed.

Linda Noble made several announcements:

- An EPAAC listserv has been established by the System Office. Members of EPAAC should send Virginia Michelich a message if you are not on the listserv.
- The new teacher preparation information website address is www.usg.edu/P16. The website has the Principles and rubrics for all programs.
- EPAAC sent a collective response to the GA DOE regarding the proposed standards for school curriculum. Linda appreciates our sending faculty to the meetings to look at standards and give feedback to USG.

Dorothy Zinsmeister reported that selected academic committees were asked to respond to the GA DOE standards. In some cases the feedback was short, in other cases the feedback was extensive. The academic staff at the System Office will take each of those reports and pull out salient points. They will be incorporated into a letter from the Chancellor to Cathy Cox. The reports themselves will also be sent to Cathy Cox. Additionally, they will be posted on the DOE website. The website is structured such that the GA DOE can pull out responses by group, such as parents, USG, committees, individual faculty members. The GA DOE has assured us our responses will not go unnoticed. USG received a lot of feedback from UGA. Life sciences, History, and math departments wrote extensive reports.

Linda said that the sense she got from faculty was that there is philosophical support for raising the standards in GA, but that people are aware of challenges we will face in preparing new teachers so they can help their students meet these standards.

By-Laws:

Linda Noble described proposed changes in the EPAAC by-laws:

One recommendation was to amend Article III to allow voting by listserv. The chair or secretary would be responsible for calling for a vote. Ron Colarusso expressed the concern that there is no timeline for voting. He suggested a two-week period. Linda believes, based on experience this year that two weeks is too long. She suggested that we could say that whenever possible, discussion for two weeks will be allowed, with a minimum of one week.

The EPAAC committee recommended the following wording for Article III to allow voting by the listserv:

Official votes can be taken at meetings of EPAAC or on EPAAC's dedicated listserv. The chair will be responsible for posting voting items on the listserv and the secretary will record all final votes. Whenever possible the chair will allow two weeks for discussion, but no less than one week before calling for a vote.

A second recommendation was to refer to meetings as called meetings instead of fall and spring meetings.

Article IV, paragraph two covers the representation on the executive committee. A recommendation was made to add a statement to reflect ex officio liaisons from BOR

Each year the secretary should be responsible for updating membership on listserv.

A recommendation was made to add a statement regarding the rotation of the chair. It is what EPAAC has been doing; it is just not reflected in the by-laws.

Ron Colarusso moved that we suspend the rules and vote on the by-laws revision.

Tom Harrison moved to accept the revisions.

Feedback on Rubrics for Two-Year Institutions:

Dorothy Zinsmeister explained the history of the development of these rubrics.

Tom Harrison moved to approve recommendation on the rubrics.

Discussion:

The work on these rubrics started about two years ago in trying to determine how two-year colleges could play a role in teacher preparation. The areas that this group thought two-year schools could address came from the Principles.

A question was raised as to what implications these rubrics might have for NCATE and PSC. Some two-year institutions around country are moving into teacher post-baccalaureate certification.

Jan Kettlewell asked what do we want the role to the two-year colleges to be? Jan proposed that we put together a think tank to address this question. Should the USG have more 4-year, two-year partnerships where a 4-year institution offers a baccalaureate on a 2-year campus? As far as NCATE, Jan does not feel our two-year rubrics will make a difference. This document creates a line between the two-year and four-year campuses. The two-year campuses already have a route to offer post-baccalaureate certification through PSC.

The committee who developed the rubrics felt accountability was important. They are trying to make the transition with four-year institutions seamless.

The EPAAC committee addressed each rubric to see if there were questions or comments.

Discussion on IC:

Cindi Chance commented that Human Growth and Development at most four-year institutions has field experience required in the course. She expressed concern about seamless transition as transfer students come into four-year institutions with considerably less field experience. Dorothy Zinsmeister commented that we need to look at Area F recommendations that came out of this committee in 2001. The committee agreed at that time that field experience would be only in Foundations. If institutions have field experience in other courses that was their individual decision.

There is a question about instructional technology and where that belongs. It is problematic.

Cindi Chance commented that EPAAC is not keeping up with changes mandated by NCATE and SACS. They are moving toward performance-based assessment. Are two-year institutions going to be responsible for these performance-based skills? The question is how are we going to assess where these students are when they do transfer to four-year institutions so that the four-year institutions know they have mastered performances.

Jan Kettlewell commented that the committee tried to align the rubrics. She has plans to establish a committee to look at expanding the role of 2-year institutions in teacher preparation.

Principles in theory are fine, but there is still a very serious core issue in Area F.

Tom Harrison suggested tabling this until we look at performance standards.

Ron Colarusso commented that he doesn't see a need for II E and II F; they should be included in IIB, IIC, IID.

Linda commented that she was hesitant to endorse the idea of tabling this. This issue came before us because our students are having a lot of trouble in transferring. We need to make a step towards having something tangible for 2- and 4-year institutions to move forward with.

Cindi Chance commented that she was trying to point out that two-year institutions have not seen what they have to do in terms of assessment. Two-year institutions will have to show that students transferring to four-year institutions have met performance standards.

There was much discussion on Area F compliance.

Ron Colarusso suggested letting the committee that Jan forms decide on the field experience (II E and IIF). In other words the operationalization of IIA, IIB, IIC, IID.

Linda supported Ron's suggestion; it gets us looking at Area F and we would then have to address technology issues as well as field experience in Area F.

A motion made by Ron Colarusso to eliminate IIE and IIF.

Tom Harrison called for the vote. The motion passed.

The vote on eliminating IIE, IIF was 17 for, 8 opposed.

Discussion on IIG:

Is the Praxis I now under the purview of two-year institutions? That is not the intention. It can't be part of graduation standards. Virginia Carson asked how we will find out the scores of two year students? Additionally, students may not complete program at a single two-year institution.

What will the sanctions be if institutions don't meet the 80% pass rate? Will it put two-year schools out of the teacher ed business?

Ron Colarusso commented that really it is the Arts and Sciences faculty, not education faculty who are responsible for Praxis I pass rate.

Dorothy Zinsmeister said that to answer Janis Reid's question, this does not mean that Praxis I is the purview of 2-year institutions; it is the responsibility of both sets of institutions.

Ed Wheeler moved that we remove IIG from the rubrics.

Jan spoke against the motion because the same issues exist whether we approve this or not. What IIG does is bring alignment between 2-year and 4-year institutions. Ed commented that there is no rubric on 4-year institutions so this will impose a rubric on 4-year institutions. Cindi Chance commented that it does exist even if not in the Principles.

A concern was expressed for two-year schools as they don't get the data like four-year schools do regarding Praxis I.

Ed Wheeler expressed concerned about voting a percentage before we have data of the population. We need data on population, pass rates, etc.

Title II requires 80% for both Praxis I and II. This just aligns BOR Principles with what is required.

Mark Peavy commented that we have real questions that we need very real answers to. This group is important to resolving issues, defining issues, etc. The System will have pieces put together to build Praxis datamart by the end of the summer. Some states require students to take (not pass) Praxis I to earn associates degree.

The vote was 14 to eliminate IIG, 10 opposed.

Discussion on IIIH:

The intent of this rubric is to show evidence of ongoing collaboration.

Mary Gendernalik Cooper called for the question on document. Twenty-six voted in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstention.

Jan Kettlewell reported that in counseling and leaders (Principles) before any institutions wrote a state-wide report, the System Office met with faculty. Beginning fall semester the System Office will have a conference with faculty at two-year institutions, teacher education and arts and sciences, along with partner 4-year institutions.

Proposed changes in rubrics for 4-year institutions:

Trish Patterson explained that they inserted sections they called explanations so rubrics were clear to institutions. Additionally they made several recommendations for modifications to the rubrics.

Recommendation 1 was to reorder rubrics.

Recommendation 2 was to use branched rubrics. Now that rubrics have been in place for awhile the scores should be 1 or 4, you either did it or not. If an institution receives a 1, they would then move to an implementation rubric.

Recommendation 3 was to adjust the 5 point scale. There is no longer a 0.

Recommendation 4 was to add rubrics: mission and role of 2-year institutions, collaboration and Area F compliance, page 15 and 16 of document.

Recommendation 5 was to add a rubric that as we develop rubrics for preparation for counselors and leaders they should be in collaboration with teacher preparation and vice versa (Pg. 12).

Recommendation 6 was to clarify expectation for 2nd career teacher candidates (pages 13 and 14).

Recommendation 7 is that if an institution achieves a 4, they still would be required to undergo periodic review.

Tom Harrison asked how do we address field experience for 2nd career folks who do not have classroom experience as paraprofessionals?

Jan Kettlewell said that we hold the same outcomes for everyone. Would have to say how you are documenting and verifying.

Tom Harrison moved that we accept revised rubric for Principles for preparation.

Educational Leadership rubrics changes:

Jan Kettlewell commented that the rationale for changes is the same as in teacher preparation

Tom Harrison moved to accept the recommendations.

Secondary Education Admission and Transfer Issues:

EPAAC discussed the challenges transfer students are having. Additionally, two year schools have difficulty advising students because of the differing requirements at four-year institutions.

What are admissions policies for teacher education of 4-year institutions?
Linda Noble is trying to gather information from 4-year institutions.

Jan Kettlewell commented that this issue is tied to aligning the documents. We need to put this issue with other issues we decided to study this morning.

Dorothy gave the history of some of the issues with secondary education.

Most 4-year people at meeting said they require the 3 professional courses for admission to their College of Education. That's a problem; two year institutions want to have program of study of 69 hours.

Dorothy recommended that 2-year institutions have their students follow a program of study for secondary education that includes the three professional courses, but then students face the problem of possibly not having all the content courses accepted.

GA Southwestern requires the nine hours of professional courses in conjunction with upper level courses. So transfer students are better served by having the Area F for content.

Mary Gendernalik Cooper commented that students lose nothing by coming in with an Associate's degree in content even without the professional courses.

For other schools, there is a problem if the students do not have the professional courses.

Forgiveness Policy:

The sub-committee who worked on this policy recommended that the most current recent attempt grade in a course be used to calculate GPA for entry to teacher education programs. Ron Colarusso suggested amending the recommendation by inserting the word "may" after College of Education (first line) then end sentence. Leave out Institutional GPA as it is not the same for all institutions. In other words, this gives the institution an option, but it is not required. Cindi Chance suggested that the GPA be calculated only for those courses necessary for the degree in teaching. Jan Kettlewell says current policy mentions only those courses required in the degree major (in Regents' Principles). Cindi recommends we insert language that speaks to courses required for major, not all courses. Apparently some institutions already are using a forgiveness policy in calculating the 2.5 GPA. Dorothy Zinsmeister commented that she is not comfortable with "may." She thinks that all institutions should be same.

Linda Noble asked Larnell Flannagan to use specific wording in the Principles and post that to the listserv. We can vote on the listserv. Ron Colarusso said that we need closure on this issue. Ron does not want to look at every transcript and recalculate GPAs. They look at all factors and may admit students with lower than 2.5 GPA based on a number of factors. Ron Colarusso commented that we need to let institutions know what a 2.5 is. Not all institutions are following a 2.5 literally. Jan Kettlewell gave the history of the 2.5 GPA. The Regents are concerned about the quality of teacher education people compared to students in other areas. The BOR has approved a strict calculation of GPA. Jan Kettlewell commented that as we are shifting to outputs then inputs, such as incoming GPA, will become less important. Linda Noble suggested that we send the proposal back to subcommittee for specific wording.

120-hour cap:

The EPAAC committee had a positive response to the proposal for extending the 120 hour cap on early childhood and middle grades education programs. Linda Noble will post their report on the listserv; EPAAC will discuss the proposal and vote. The question of whether two-year institutions will be allowed to exceed 60 hours if this cap is

exceeded was posed. That will be discussed on the listserv. Bob Michael expressed a concern that institutions won't receive money for the extra hours. Students don't have to pay for courses they take above 12 hours. Tom Harrison wants to look at making the same recommendation for physical education. Cindi Chance said why not move forward and make the same recommendation for special education. We have more federal requirements; we will have to add more science. Jan will work with two people from the committee to craft a recommendation to cover MGE, ECE, physical ed, and special ed.

PSC certification changes:

Linda Noble expressed the concern that Arts and Sciences folks look at these changes as an opportunity. It is possible for Arts and Sciences to recruit students and help them pass teacher certification tests without those students ever having a pedagogy class. There is a concern about eroding of the collaboration between Arts and Sciences and Education Colleges. Jan Kettlewell commented that we need to learn to adopt a corporate perspective. We ought to push our efforts along the line of outcomes. We can be firm on marketing and compete for people who can go through an alternative route. We can market the outcomes of what our candidates can do. In the long run, quality will prevail. Cindi Chance noted that programs are popping up all over the state. They are taking students with bachelor's degrees. There is a concern about dips in enrollment in programs. Tom Harrison suggested that we appoint a group to come together and express concern, plan a course of action and start moving.

Proposed Committee on expanding the role of 2-year institutions in teacher preparation:

Membership:

Bob Michael

Ellen Burleson

Virginia Carson

Virginia Michelich

Louis Castenell

Sarah Conner will replace Dorothy Zinsmeister as the Arts and Sciences liaison (Dorothy will be working 50% time on PRISM).

Data Mart: –

Mark Peavy reported on the USG data mart. The data mart is being designed for use and relevance. He will need our input on data and definitions. Mark would like a subcommittee from EPAAC. From every institution he needs a technical person, dean

person and program type person. Two-year schools are included. Most importantly, he needs a program person and a data person from each institution.

Mark will put together a request for specifics in terms of what he needs. He will post it to listserv.

University System/Department of Education Collaboration on Partner Schools:

Jan Kettlewell reported that the partner school model is embedded in the Regents' Principles. There has not been an equal push in the DOE. One way that improvement can occur is by partnerships with USG. DOE does want to collaborate with us. Mary Gendernalik Cooper will co-chair this design group with the DOE, to frame what that model might look like.

Elections:

The results of elections for EPAAC officers are as follows:

Chair, Ron Colarusso

Past chair, Linda Noble

Vice chair (chair elect), Virginia Michelich

Secretary, Sue Wilson

Representatives:

Arts & Sciences, Bill Wysochansky

Education, Mary Gendernalik Cooper

Two-year colleges, Rob Gingras

Closing comments:

Jan Kettlewell thanked Linda Noble for the outstanding job she did as chair of EPAAC. She thanked Dorothy for many years as liaison. Jan said that the BOR is very close to asking what happens when an institution does not meet Principles. Jan would like the executive committee to work with her to find a solution that is supportive to institutions and allows us to answer to the Board.

Respectfully submitted,

Virginia Michelich