

The Georgia Board of Regents' Educator Preparation Academic Advisory Committee (EPAAC) met at Macon State College on December 7, 2005.

Virginia Michelich, Chair, called the meeting to order at 8:45 AM.

Those present were asked to sign an attendance list. The individuals who signed were:

Name	Institution
1. Nancy Knapp	UGA
2. Mary Ann Ronski	GSU
3. Trish Paterson	BOR
4. Sara Connor	BOR
5. Marti Venn	MSC
6. Hugh Ruppensburg	UGA
7. Tom Deering	Augusta State
8. David L. White	U West GA
9. Cindi Chance	Georgia Southern
10. Anny Morrobel-Sosa	Georgia Southern
11. Virginia Carson	Georgia Highlands
12. Caroline Helms	Abraham Baldwin
13. Dorothy Zinsmeister	BOR
14. Ron Swofford	Georgia Perimeter
15. Tim Goodman	East Georgia College
16. Kathleen deMarrais	UGA
17. Pat McHenry	Columbus State U
18. Joan Darden	Darton College
19. Rob Page	Georgia Highlands
20. George Stanton	Columbus State U
21. Kent Layton	U West Georgia
22. Chris Jespersen	North Georgia
23. Ellen Burleson	Waycross College
24. Miles Anthony Irving	Area F
25. Carol J. Rychly	Augusta State (guest)
26. Robert Parham	Augusta State
27. Bob Michael	NGCSU
28. Surendra N. Pandey	Albany State U
29. Mike Stoy	Gainesville State College
30. Wilburn Campbell	Albany State
31. Thierry Leger	Kennesaw State
32. Susan B. Brown	Kennesaw State
33. Mary Edwards	Dalton State
34. Douglas Tuech	Coastal
35. Gina Kertulis-Tartar	Dalton State
36. Patricia McGuire White	Dalton State
37. Tina Butcher	Columbus State
38. Linda Irwin-DeVitis	Georgia College

39. Michael McGinnis (for Beth Rushing)	GA College and State U
40. Louis Castenell, Jr.	UGA
41. Phil Gunter	Valdosta State
42. Ron Colarusso	Georgia State University
43. Mary Ellen Wilson	Middle GA College
44. Rob Gingras	Bainbridge College
45. Jane McHaney	AASU
46. Ed Wheeler	AASU
47. Linda Calendrillo	VSU
48. William Wysochansky	Georgia Southwestern S. U.
49. Virginia Michelich	Georgia Perimeter College
50. Joanna Sanders Mann	Atlanta Metropolitan College
51. Mark Pevey	BOR
52. Kit Carson	South Georgia College
53. Randy C. Braswell	South Georgia College
54. Larnell Flannagan	Clayton State
55. Jamie Lewis	UGA
56. Miles Irving	GSU

Minutes of the December 3, 2004 and May 27, 2005 meetings were distributed. A motion for approval of the minutes was made by Phil Gunter and seconded by Surendra Pandey. The motion passed.

There was conversation about Article III of the Bylaws as to whether proxies can vote. Some of the comments were:

- Some small institutions find it difficult for the chief academic officer to attend all meetings. Unless the representative votes, the institution will have no voice.
- There was a question about official membership - if there is more than one representative from an institution, will there be more than one vote? It was clarified that the memberships for four-year institutions are the dean of education and the dean of arts and sciences and for two-year institutions the vice president for academic affairs. Each of these persons has a vote.
- It was stated that it is sometimes a problem that due to many substitutes attending the meetings that the substitutes may not be well informed on committee matters.
- There was a reminder that some recent decisions were made on very close votes, so votes of substitutes could play heavily in decision-making.
- It was suggested that it was the responsibility of the institutional representative to submit the substitute's name in writing in advance.
- A preference was expressed by a member to be able to send someone to attend AND be able to vote.
- It was suggested that if a substitute is not allowed to vote that committee participation will be reduced.

Surendra Pandey moved to amend the Bylaws to say that proxies can vote. The motion was seconded by Cindi Chance. After discussion, the motion was amended with

approval of the maker and seconder to state that dean or vice president designees can vote. The motion passed.

A question arose about the voting composition of state college delegations, after state colleges are approved to have teacher education. Jan Kettlewell stated that this matter has already been addressed. As an example, Macon State and Dalton State now have as EPAAC members their education deans or designees as well as an arts and science representative and no longer have a VPAA on EPAAC. In response to a question, she further clarified that the list of EPAAC members distributed at the beginning of the meeting is not the official membership list. The group agreed that the Executive Committee will handle this.

Virginia Michelich announced that there was a need to select a two-year college representative to the Executive Committee to replace Derek Mpinga who moved to Texas. Rob Gingras volunteered and was elected by acclimation to serve in this capacity through the Spring 2006 meeting when officers will be elected for 2006-2008.

An extensive discussion of proposed Area F courses followed.

Pre-education

Jan Kettlewell summarized the process of creating the three new education courses. She stated that the course structure was approved at the last meeting. Then the education deans were tasked with defining the framework for three education courses to be used for degrees in early childhood education, middle grades, and secondary (all P-12 certifications). Note: The three professional education courses are required for secondday education teacher candidates, but they are not part of a secondary Area F. These courses would replace the current two education courses and the human growth and development course. The education deans appointed faculty members to work on course outlines.

Jan drew attention to the list of faculty committees that worked on the courses and the overview for each of three courses. The committees tried to walk the line between a single set of three courses for Area F without tying the institutions' hands by being overly prescriptive.

Jamie Lewis from the University of Georgia gave a presentation on *Investigating Critical and Contemporary Issues in Education*. She noted the alignment of course standards with INTASC and NCATE Standards.

A question was raised regarding sequencing the three courses. Jan clarified that institutions should "sequence as they see fit." No particular order is recommended. None of the courses is intended to be a prerequisite to any of the others. While there was conversation from those present about other prerequisites such as GPA or a C English, none were established. It was stated by Jan by that the courses would have common numbers at the 2000-level. Jan said the courses are intended to be "fully transferable" within the University System of Georgia. A question was asked as to whether the courses

should be recommended for sophomores. It was stated that such recommendations be “open to schools.”

A question was posed about field experiences. Ron Colarusso said that the education deans thought the best approach was 10 hours field experience in each course defined locally. Another question was raised as to whether the field experience hours should be included in the course description.

A question was asked as to whether completion of learning support courses was a prerequisite to the three courses. Jan said that as replacement courses that the same policies continue to be in place.

Jan affirmed that although EPAAC is aiming for Fall 2007 implementation that institutions have the right to begin earlier.

The procedure is that any recommendations will go to the Regents’ Advisory Committee on Academic Affairs in February 2006.

A question was asked regarding whether a student who has taken two of current courses would fill in with third from the new courses. It was determined that the institutional catalog in effect for the student would be the ruling factor.

Jan stated that sunset dates for the existing courses would be institutional decisions.

Dorothy Zinsmeister noted that as you read the language it becomes easy to forget that we are trying to say “new framework . . . for all teachers” but NOT Area F for secondary. She reminded the Committee that there is significant confusion regarding what is Area F for secondary. Thus, making that clear is important.

Miles Irving from Georgia State University gave a presentation on *Exploring Socio-Cultural Perspectives on Diversity in Education*. The course helps students understand culture and how culture influences what we do.

A question was raised on the qualifications for teaching the course, would graduate hours in sociology be necessary. There was a suggestion that the course might be team taught.

It was requested that the education deans might develop resources to support institutions, since it is clear that campuses may not have the necessary expertise. Miles noted that several different things are happening. The USG cross-cultural initiative may be relevant, course has to have expertise there. The course development committee is committed to supporting institutions.

A comment was made that Arts and Sciences cannot take on another 3-hour sociology course. A question was posed as to whether an education prefix meets the necessary credentials questions for SACS. Jan said, “It is an education course” and will “prepare teachers for today’s schools.”

Suggestions for institutions looking for teaching expertise were to consider WebCT components, possible distance options, team teaching with distance learning, team a larger institution with a smaller one. Jan told the Committee that the on-line consortium is converging their work with these three courses. There is no timeline yet. But this might make it possible to assist the two-year institutions who might not have the expertise.

A comment was made that a good grounding in other courses is necessary to immerse in ethics and culture. It can't be packed all in one course early on in student's career. Miles said that a "self-reflective process" can carry students through and that it would be "easily understood if delivered in right way."

A question was raised regarding the content on language diversity and special education that suggested that extra support may be required. Jan suggested that a small committee of two-year VPs should be established to meet with Miles and Nancy to look at next steps.

Nancy Knapp from UGA presented information about *Exploring Learning and Teaching*. She said that the course is trying to accomplish one main goal: having preservice teachers understand how people learn – how teaching enables people to learn. Secondly, students are to understand the complexity of teaching and demands but that it is rewarding. Not everyone learns or is motivated the same way. The course exists in four contexts: students' own lives; vignettes from actual educational events; field experience 10 hours; and the class itself models principles we are teaching. There is a large on-line resource bank by topic.

It was stated that at some institutions the prefix might shift to EPSY or EDUC but with the same number. The committee was comfortable with either.

Ron Colarusso moved that EPAAC accept the new framework for three Area F courses as described with a common prefix of EDUC. He added that the committees should continue to develop resources and that there be 10 hours of field experience in each course. Phil Gunter seconded the motion.

Dorothy Zinsmeister stated that the Registrar won't recognize different prefixes. There was conversation about credentials requirements, with the reminder that the institution has the responsibility to write up justifications.

In answer to a question as to whether special education will be taught at the upper level, the response was yes.

There was a request to have all common prefixes and numbers to eliminate confusion. Jan said they would put a generic EDUC prefix. A member reminded the Committee that you cannot reuse course numbers, so there will be a need to find common numbers.

A motion was made by Linda Irwin-DeVitis and seconded to establish EDUC numbers. The maker and seconder of the motion accepted this as a friendly amendment. The motion carried.

Jan publicly thanked all the faculty who worked on the development of the courses.

Science

Virginia Michelich drew attention to the list of committee members who worked on the two proposed science courses. She stated that the courses were “designed a little bit differently with the intention to present a framework rather than specific courses.” This will leave it up to institutions to develop. There will be common course numbers. The purpose is to have inquiry-based courses for early childhood education programs that address the content GPS for K-5. The courses are content-driven with common learning outcomes aligned with the GPS. They are theme-based courses with each institution making those decisions. They are activity-based but with no separate laboratory. They are four contact hours each, with 3-semester credit hours each. They are not a sequence. There is life science/earth science in one and physics, astronomy, and chemistry in the other. Virginia M. stated that these integrated science course may be taught by anyone SACS-certified to teach science. She noted that some education faculty have 18 hours of science.

Extensive discussion followed.

- A concern was expressed from an arts and sciences representative that they are already overworked if they teach in the college of education. It was remarked that it is a common practice to transfer funds within an institution.
- It was said that it will increase expenses for courses to hold down the number of students for laboratory sections. Virginia M. said this will be an institutional decision.
- A question was raised as to whether faculty will be paid for four hours and noted that this involves additional expenses. Virginia M. said that the committee did not look at this.
- It was acknowledged to a questioner that these courses will involve additional faculty responsibilities.
- It was stated by an arts and sciences representative that at her institution the additional number of students is equivalent to a new faculty member. She is missing not only the number of faculty necessary but also laboratory equipment availability. She already has space limitations.
- The question regarding whether the courses are open only to education majors has not been addressed. They are for Area F for early childhood education.
- It was noted that the courses are very broad and asked if the courses have college-level depth. Students already have other Area D courses. There is a lot of material to be covered, and students could get a richer information base in a 3-hr science course. Virginia M. said that “teachers do not have the science knowledge they need. It is also hard to hard to entice those majors into a science

- course to excite them about science.” She further said they “rote know a lot of stuff but do not understand and cannot explain to students.”
- A statement was made that institutional faculty reviewing the courses described the curriculum “as a great ninth grade course with so much material the students can’t get any depth.”
 - Virginia M. said the committee looked at whether or not to require a specific Area D course and do something different in Area F, but the committee did not recommend this option. The committee considered the “way Area D is taught.”
 - It was noted that the objectives are “written on process level with content secondary.”
 - It was stated that the premise for course development seemed to be that “students who are education majors take Area D but don’t learn anything so new courses have been created that will help them learn and be excited about science. However, the faculty who teach the new courses will be the same ones.”
 - Dorothy said, “Area D is buffet of courses. Some institutions have stipulated two science courses for all non-science students to take. For most institutions, students pick one, so we don’t know what they will bring with them. A new set of courses designed to align with the GPS will make sure future K-5 teachers will have content. The intent is to ascertain what they already know and build on that. When we use the term activity-based, I don’t think we are dumbing down the course. Get teachers away from worksheets for their students. This is an opportunity to look at courses and develop them in a different way.”
 - Virginia M. said the committee “talked about integrating but did not do that within this framework because they did not want to prescribe the course.”
 - In answer to the question how is the course different from the physical science that already exists, Tim Goodman said, “We will be covering same topics. This needs to be presented in a manner that is a little more exciting than chemistry and physics are presented now. Make it activity-based and make it more exciting. You’re doing the teaching, so you’re the one dumbing down. There are some faculty members that I would not put in this class. This is not science for science majors.”
 - “?mathematical modeling, same faculty teaching the course as other courses they have to take, make faculty more exciting?”
 - Virginia M described her experience in the recent Quality Undergraduate Education Project. Project participants explored “what do you want a student to know and be able to do by the time they finish, and what do you do in your classroom that helps your students that helps align with the concepts.” She said this is a “different way of thinking and teaching” and it is “hard to get someone who has taught the same way a long time to do.” Virginia M. reminded the group that “Jan has started the Academy for Learning to help us move in that direction.”
 - It was noted that the “strengths are to create these two courses and give them a try.” The weakness is that it doesn’t “give the institutions much flexibility.” It seems to force the segregation of K-5 students much earlier in the curriculum. It is useful to them in the early part of their careers to learn with people who have other goals than being K-5 educators.”

- It was asked why an extra science in Area D could not be required. The speaker was “bothered by word ‘exciting’” that occurred often in the discussion.
- A comment was made that “if the framework does its work properly, this will change the way science taught at core level.”
- It was noted that it will be very expensive to address the entire science core and would required double or triple faculty.
- It was suggested that the courses are the ideal in general education for non-science majors and that the courses should be available for anybody not majoring in science.
- A comment followed that this is the right issue and this is the “way we want to do it but do not have the resources to do it with our own students.”
- Agreement was stated regarding general education and segregating students and that science is “pretty abysmal.” The concern is that “with Area F we are chipping away with the little bit left of liberal arts education. If we go to a normal school model, this creates other kinds of problems.”
- Virginia M. reminded the group that EPAAC voted to have six hours of science.
- A point was made that “credence be given to what is taught in Area D to do more with Area F. Maybe that does mean looking at how Area D is taught, and see more flexibility in Area F courses without redoing what has been done in Area D.”
- Jan noted that it would be “wonderful if there is interest in strengthening Area D, and focus on how those courses are taught. The issue presently is turning out teachers who have had Area D courses who cannot teach science because they don’t know science. The new science performance standards changes a mind set on what that means, for whoever is teaching the course to know that children have to meet performance standards. If children have to be able to demonstrate mastery, then the teacher needs sufficient content to help children get there.”
- It was then suggested that professional development is a great consideration in new approaches.
- It was stated that it had been the “consensus of the arts and sciences deans to get more courses into education. But it is essential to have to go back to faculty and facility resources?” It this is mapped out, “it cannot be staffed the way it is written.”
- The Arts and Sciences Deans presented a resolution, read by Linda Calendrillo. “Even as we applaud the visionary step of requiring two science courses of all K-5 teacher candidates, we recognize that the task of creating and staffing these science courses will weigh heavily on the faculty and laboratory resources of USG Colleges of Arts and Sciences. We encourage the VPAA’s of the University System and EPAAC to join the leadership of those Colleges in creatively solving these resource problems.”
- An education dean responded that the same resource questions apply for education as well. The VPAA’s have to know about both matters. Sending one resolution does not provide that information, so education should be added to the resolution.
- A VPAA stated that they “don’t have resources. The resolution needs to be directed to the Board.”

- An arts and sciences dean stated that they don't want to make this sound like they "are passing the buck," but they can't do this. If implementation is Fall 2007, then hiring would have to start now. If there is "some discomfort with the way we scientists are teaching, and if you cannot entice tenured faculty to teach a course like this, will have to hire new faculty. We want to be able to do this."
- Dorothy said that "at one time the discussion centered around the model . . . if biology was taken in Area D, then physical science in Area F, etc." That led to conversation about how many courses would need to be developed for Area F." While the committee discussed resource issues, the committee "didn't acknowledge that implementation would be an issue. We've got 8-10 VPAAAs in this room, and they have expressed their comments about resources as well. The resolution would be reiterated at RACAA and then the Board."
- A comment was made that "somebody is going to lose, since money doesn't follow missions, and there is a two-year lag."
- Virginia M. said that it appears that the proposals are acceptable as long as there are resources.
- There was support for getting the resolution in place.
- But someone expressed opposition to the proposals until the resources can happen.
- Virginia M. reported that after the proposals were sent to all the institutions and advisory committees only one set of comments was received by her.
- A comment was made, "I think that's damning. That says they know that can't teach it so why respond."
- Sara Connor said that the "BOR expects there is some flexibility on campuses. The resolution would be a big mistake." She suggested that some things can be shifted and have honest discussions with the president.
- It was commented that this is not just an allocation of resources but 3-4 hours mandates a laboratory class.
- Sara suggested that the "barrier has to be fought in a context other than resources."
- It was commented that it is "important to have funds available at" the institution. It is not just a matter of two courses. There are many proposals a year that call for resources. It was suggested that the group decline to vote for implementation until there is money"
- A statement was made in defense of the arts and sciences deans reporting an institution with "no budget for library books and funding faculty lines out of the question. We don't get quality teacher education on the cheap."
- Jan replied that the "BOR is aware" of these concerns. She stated that the economy has started to turn around, and people would be surprised if we got budget cuts.

Surendra Pandey moved that the resolution from the Arts and Sciences Deans be approved. It was seconded by Mary Ann Ronski.

A friendly amendment was offered by Mike Stoy to have the resolution go straight to the Board and bypass the VPAAAs. Jan said that RACAA is the next stage of discussion for

these proposals. Sara Connor suggested a friendly amendment encouraging VPAAAs to approve the courses and then seek funding.

There was a question about what the motion contained. It was determined that the motion stood as read. The motion passed.

Tim Goodman moved the approval of the two science courses. The motion was seconded by Linda Calendrillo and passed.

Mathematics

Rob Gingras said that there already was a mathematics course in Area F. The committee looked at the existing courses and worked to bring some uniformity. Mathematics and education faculty from both two- and four-year schools gathered sample courses and found some commonalities. There were concerns about implications for Praxis I and whether the mathematics course should include pedagogy. The committee concluded that the courses should be taught by mathematics faculty, not necessarily prepare for Praxis I, and would not have elements of pedagogy. The course number and name will be Math 2007 Foundations of Numbers and Operations and is a standardized course for all institutions to adopt.

Dorothy Zinsmeister reported that the Advisory Committee on Mathematical Subjects “brought to the table some perspectives on teaching the course. The format is one that the mathematicians use for other courses that are in common. There is real interest in having additional topics that would be up to the instructor who is teaching the course as is the same format for college algebra and mathematics.” The courses are inquiry-based. Professional development for faculty was a big component of the discussion.

Tim Goodman moved and Surendra Pandey seconded that EPAAC accept the mathematics course as proposed.

A question arose regarding the fact that some existing mathematics courses are upper-level courses. Dorothy Zinsmeister said, “We want to make sure everybody understands that with mathematics in Area F, currently every institution has developed its own mathematics course, because that’s what we voted to do at the time. There were developed three upper-division math, so there is a package of 12 hours that students take. We agreed to do a common course in Area F so this will necessitate every institution looking at the 12 hours in mathematics, make modifications, and move on.”

The motion carried.

Middle grades concentrations

Sara Connor deferred to Larnell Flannagan for the report. Starling at KSU chaired the committee. The courses selected from a list total at least nine hours with courses chosen to deepen and broaden students’ knowledge. There are two concentrations, based on list approved by advisory committee.

There will be a list of courses from which to choose.

Jan said the “two academic concentrations taught in arts and sciences already define what courses count for each of the concentrations, currently 9 hours in EDUC and silent on third course. Now there will be two in one and one in other.”

Dorothy Zinsmeister noted a “clarification on the comment in parentheses, make sure that students can complete based on their choices Area F in 18 hours.”

A question was posed regarding students who elect a middle grades concentration in mathematics or science. Should those students take the mathematics or science majors courses in Areas A and D? This is not the case.

Larnell Flannagan moved that EPAAC accept the middle grades proposal. The motion was seconded by Joanna Mann and passed.

The meeting recessed for lunch at 11:45 AM and resumed at 12:50 PM.

Ed Wheeler proposed that precalculus be the Area A requirement for middle grades, since algebra will soon be taught in the 6th grade. Jan suggest that this was an advising issue so that students would take college algebra in Area A. Dorothy stated there are some institutions who do not offer college algebra. It was determined that the Council on General Education has the authority for such a decision.

Ed Wheeler moved that EPAAC ask the Council for General Education to consider the inclusion of middle grades mathematics concentration students in the list of students that have precalculus as their Area A course. It was seconded by Linda Calendrillo. It was stated that such a plan might encourage students to take back door to mathematics by taking a Praxis exam.

Linda Calendrillo asked to make a friendly amendment to the motion to include the necessary mathematics content in Area F. Ed Wheeler revised the motion to say that “middle grades mathematics concentration in Area F will include precalculus. A question was raised as to whether this would involve a hidden prerequisite of college algebra. Ed withdrew the motion but said this leaves a problem on the floor to be solved. Jan asked Ed to chair a subcommittee on the subject. Members of the committee will be Larnell Flannigan, Dorothy Zinsmeister, and Caroline Helms.

Jan Kettlewell gave an executive summary on work toward the Implementation Plan to Double the Number, Double the Diversity of Teachers Prepared in the University System of Georgia. For Phase I, the adoption of the Regents’ principles continues a real push strengthen quality. Phase II is the grant-funded experiment with teaching models. Phase III is the double-double. Looking at all data by the year 2010, the state of Georgia will need 14,500 additional teachers. In 2004 as a baseline, the USG prepared 3,157 teachers. There are increased population in schools, with increased ethnic, cultural, and language

diversity. The USG has fairly level teacher production. Research says what makes the most difference for children is the teacher.

The strategies approved by the BOR include the approval for two-year colleges to have 69 hours to be included in program for secondary education majors. The number of teacher preparation institutions has increased with the approval of bachelor degree programs at Macon State and Dalton State. Both Gainesville State and Georgia Gwinnett are preparing program requests. The USG will ramp up production without lowering quality.

The FY '06 budget request was not supported. The FY '07 double/double budget request is the second highest priority for System. \$2 million has been requested. What are the production targets and what will the money be used for: hiring faculty in content areas. (If you didn't get money, it's because your president did not ask for it.)

Ron Colarusso gave a report from the Education Deans. There has been conversation about professional development, Area F, and the online consortia regarding how much online should there be. The Deans are excited about the teacher success committee and the teacher impact committee. They have discussed minority student recruitment and retention as well as the possible new program from Birth – age 5. They seek to answer research questions on teaching.

There was no report from the Arts and Sciences Deans.

Trish Patterson reported on the G-STEP framework, coalition of institutions under the federal grant. The purpose is that someone trained in one institution would go into school system would be supported using that same vision. In a five-year period of an iterative process over 400 educators participated. The project is likely to be sustained under the Georgia Committee on Quality Teaching. There are some gap areas: integrative performance standards - did not share standards across agencies and across teachers' careers.

Mark Pevey stated that the project that will follow students from USG institutions into Georgia school systems has been completed. He is seeking requests from institutions regarding data projects to consider. There was a request for representatives of two-year institutions to serve on a committee. Tim Goodman, Ellen Burleson, Doug Tuech, and Rob Gingras volunteered.

Trish Patterson reported on the Cross-cultural Teaching Group.

Sara Connor reported on the Draft System Policy recommended by PRISM Strategy 10 Committee. Cindi Chase moved the adoption of the policy. It was seconded by Louis Castenell and approved.

Cindi Chance distributed information on the International Networking for Educational Transformation Conference to be held in Augusta from April 23-27, 2006.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:45 PM.