

Minutes of the University System of Georgia
Educator Preparation Academic Advisory Committee Meeting
December 7th, 2001

9:30 a.m. Meeting called to order by Rob Freeman, Chair. Those in attendance included: Denise Glynn, Hugh Ruppensburg, Mary Ellen Wilson, Curtis E. Martin, Donna Sims, Lawrence K. Wang, Cindi Chance, Janet Fields, Barbara Holmes, Surendra N. Pandey, Linda M. Noble, Larnell Flannagan, Yiping Wan, Paul Beare, Ron Colarusso, Beth Rushing, Ed Wheeler, Bob Michael, Derek Mpinga, Ellen Burleson, Thomas Reed, Thomas Harrison, Julia J. Dorminey, Harold Nichols, John Black, Kathy Sisk, Sue Wilson, Ron Barnette, John Austin, Douglas Tuech, Jim Cottingham, Tim Goodman, Janis C. Reid, Andrea Hardin, Virginia Carson, Bari Haskins-Jackson, Rob Gingras, Lynne Gaskin, Ed Pettit, Dorothy Zinsmeister, Jan Kettlewell, and Kent Layton, Secretary.

Item 1: Approval of the Minutes from the May 14 EPAAC Meeting
No changes were voiced. Approved.

Item 2: Proposal for Articulation Between USG Early Childhood Education Programs and DTAE Early Childhood Care Education Programs

Dorothy Zinsmeister presented the background and rationale for the proposal. Presentation points included philosophies and substantive change conditions; national trends; federal changes, course to course articulations vs system to system articulations; Area F; syllabi, learning outcomes, auxillary materials, and textbooks; COC accreditation issues; institutions participating; and the specifics on two recommendations.

Discussion points included degree completer emphases; COC accreditation requirements; qualification of faculty; impact on two-year colleges; mini-core; implementation dates; types of students with whom the new policy would apply; possible issues of confusion for students completing early childhood courses; SACS and AAS program issues; growth issues ... 20-30 now ... 200-300 in the future; issues surrounding equivalency of AAT and AA degrees; HOPE eligibility; and general education transfer issues.

Rob Freeman restated the recommendations on page two of the proposal.

Additional discussion points ensued and included the issue of quality with regard to the education courses compared to the core; more background and history on the work of the previous subcommittee; questions about where the charge for the currently proposal originated from; possibly misleading students who may believe taking these courses and completing them successfully will qualify them for four-year programs; and past history associated with state-wide/regional(ized) articulation agreements being somewhat difficult.

Rob Freeman redirected the discussion and encouraged the participants to entertain a motion.

Discussion continued. Five major points were voiced and included (1) students would transfer, be evaluated, and articulation agreements would be taken into consideration; then checksheets completed; that students would have to meet all the requirements for entry into an early childhood program, (2) the exact meaning of a two-year technical degree needs to be fully explored and clarified, (3) two-year school needs and issues should be addressed before looking at two-year technical and four-year needs and issues as they related to transfers and articulation agreements, (4) exploring why someone with a two-year AAT would enter a four-year BSE early childhood program needs be undertaken, and (5) unfortunately, many students don't understand aspects between completing a child care courses in an AAT and a BSE... they also think that they only have a couple of more years of coursework to finish which is usually not the case; thus, we create confusion and frustration on the part of students.

Experiences with students and system policies in Minnesota were shared as well as the statewide effects of increasing two-year school instructor salaries on four-year institutions. Concern was noted that the proposal may need to stipulate conditions and limitations so that all the issues previously discussed would be clarified on an additional page of text. Additional

conversation noted some confusion in exactly what the recommendations meant. More discussion revealed the first recommendation to sound much larger in context, than four courses transferring if a student has a degree program. At this point, the thought was put forward to consider eliminating the degree completer criteria in the original proposal.

Noting that the discussion was becoming repetitive, Rob Freeman asked if the recommendations should be voted on as a package or each one individually. Further discussion noted that the first item in the recommendations was a qualifier, not a recommendation; that the second item was a recommendation; that the third item was recommendation tied to an observation. Clarification on the second item was given: 4 courses for 3 courses.

Motion was made by Paul Beare (seconded by Thomas Harrison) to call the question and vote on the recommendations as a total package. Those in favor, 12; those against clearly more than 12; motion failed. Dorothy Zinsmeister asked what the changes in the text needed to be to clear up the recommendations. Rob Freeman suggested those changes be email directly to Dorothy Zinsmeister.

Item 3: Update on Institutional Progress in Meeting Regents' Principles, 2000-2001

Jan Kettlewell distributed one handout [HO3] spoke highly of the progress made by system institutions noting increases and growth on several charts across all principles. Emphasis was given to pages three and four of the report, which revealed significant growth.

Item 4: Update on Work in Addressing the Regents' Principles in Educational Leadership and Counseling

Jan Kettlewell distributed two handouts [HO4 & HO5] and updated EPACC on the work to date addressing the Regents' Principles in Educational Leadership and Counseling. HO4 represented a document for us to think about; HO5 represented a proposal to the deans with regard to comprehensive reviews for Educational Leadership and School Counseling which are due to be submitted in May 2002.

The concern that review schedules had already been turned into the State was voiced. Would institutions be able to stick with what had already been established or follow the new review schedules for educational leadership and school counseling programs? Discussion ensued revealing this to be more of a calendar issue. Too, annual progress reports would be compromised if reviews were too far down the road. Additionally, it was announced that one team would review all educational leadership teams and that they may want to review all programs simultaneously. Thus, everyone should be ready. Discussion continued about a systematic process: rubric first, campuses complete reports, review process; but at what point to start the process was unclear. The BOR intent is for institutions to complete their institutional report of progress toward meeting the Regents' Principles (based upon the rubrics), for this report to be reviewed by both the System Office and an external review team, and then for the site visitations. Jan Kettlewell clarified that the rubrics would be distributed to campuses in January. Rob Freeman asked that everyone provide Jan Kettlewell with input to her proposal as soon as possible.

Item 5: Immunization Requirement for Graduate Students

Discussion centered on immunization requirements being a real hassle for many graduate students. *Bob Michael moved that the Board of Regents' evaluate the need for this requirement and consider removing it. Lawrence Wang seconded.*

Additional discussion centered on the notion that this motion was unnecessary; rationale was based on undergraduate residential experiences several decades ago; graduate students not really residential anymore; RESAs don't require immunization; faculty not required to be immunized; ECORE resolution parallels our current discussion; broader issues for all students vs teacher education students pointed out.

John Black called the question. Unanimous. Passed.

Item 6: Application of Fee Structure to Part-time/Graduate Students

Discussion centered on graduate students being furious for being required to pay for services they were not receiving nor interested in receiving. Fees are killing students who just want to enroll in one or two courses. Adjustments must be made.

Four points were made by Curtis Martin. (1) Your institution can scale fees for _ or less, (2) next level mechanisms for scaling fees already exists, (3) we need some type of voice from a group to move forward, and (4) let's remember we're talking about teachers, who for the most part are underpaid and struggling to make ends meet on beginning teacher salaries.

Paul Beare moved that a systemwide policy allowing adjustments to nonacademic fee structures for students enrolled in less than 9 hours in teacher education. Seconded by Julia Dorminey.

Additional discussion included: many students taking courses off-campus to dodge fees; friendly amendment to include post bachelor's was offered; outdated fees for services no longer in existence such as bus fee, but no busses; VPAAAs were encouraged to bring clarity to the fees issues for the entire system; Jan Kettlewell recommended that this motion be forwarded to the VPAAAs, not the Board of Regents'; proportional ideas and sliding scale notions were entertained; final recommendations were for graduates and post bachelor's students prorated up to 8 hours.

Janet Fields called the question. Consensus yeas. One against. Motion passed.

Friendly Suggestion: Send Kent your data – real and anecdotal for the justification.

Item 7: HOPE Scholarship Monies to Support GATAPP and Other Certification Programs

Discussion began about the need for HOPE scholarship criteria to be modified to include students enrolled in alternative certification and post bachelor's certification programs. *Motion was made by Kent Layton to recommend the Board of Regents' broaden the use of HOPE scholarship money to include students enrolled in alternative and post bachelor's certification programs. Seconded by Thomas Harrison.*

No further discussion. Bob Michael called the question. Unanimous. Passed.

Item 8: Decrease in the Production of Educators from USG Institutions and its Impact on PSC Decisions/Recommendations

The discussion began noting the decrease in the production of teacher educators over the past five years while pointing out that the quality of our teacher educators is much better than ever before. However, everyone appears to be stepping into the breach as we work hard to improve the quality. For example, we've gone from producing 5800 to 3700; now everyone is being encouraged to train teachers... from Sylvan Learning Systems to the Atlanta Teachers Project... to GaTAPP... to RESAs. We've done our job and are now being challenged ... questioned ... by most everyone. The Board of Regents' Principles are drowning us, for better and for worse. Schools and Colleges of Education [SCOEs] are expected to enforce higher standards while our counterparts allowed to cut corners on courses, content, field experience hours, and cost. It's no wonder that most SCOEs numbers are declining. We have become our own enemies. In fact, if we don't plan ourselves back into the hunt, SCOEs are not likely to survive in Georgia. The Board of Regents' and University System of Georgia needs to help SCOEs put out public relations agenda that tells our success story.

Rob Freeman moved that (1) the Board of Regents' Principles be reviewed to determine to what extent they are adversely affecting SCOEs enrollment and future, (2) University System of Georgia develop a public relation plan to support SCOEs, and [by friendly amendment] (3) that a subcommittee be appointed to review the issues raised in the discussion for the purpose of developing a marketing strategy for educator preparation in the University System. Thomas Harrison seconded the motion.

Discussion continued about how important was for the entire University System of Georgia and its constituents to understand that workloads have increased, yet credit hours have decreased with the push for professional development schools, induction and mentoring systems,

increased field experience hours with more labor intensive evaluation and input models. Additional discussion centered on recruitment being our weakest system-wide issue and how Charles Reed, Chancellor of the California State University System, had turned the California system around by focusing on recruitment. Additional suggestions included the formation of three subcommittees: 1) recruitment/marketing, 2) review of Regents' Principles, and 3) development of a new section of the Principles on school counseling. Rob Freeman consented and remarked that the Executive Committee would make the committee membership recommendations.

Bob Michael called for the question. Motion passed unanimously.

Item 9: Announcement of Meetings in January and April to Feature Models Developed at System Institutions in Implementing the Regents' Principles

Early spring meeting reminders were announced which included:

- (1) Jan 31-Feb1 : P16 Network Meeting in Savannah
- (2) April 18-19: Praxis - Closing the Gaps - place TBA

Item 10: As May Arise

1. Item 1 was brought back to the group with an edited version of the proposal with light discussion [HO1.1].

Edited version:

1. DTAE courses that are designed to meet the five learning outcomes of the USG Area F for early childhood education would be acceptable for transfer to USG institutions from those students who have completed the AAT degree in Early Childhood Care Education at a DTAE/COC accredited institution.

Area F Courses

<u>DTAE</u>	<u>USG</u>
ECE 101	Foundations of Education
ECE 103 and 203	Human Growth and Development
ECE 201	Exceptional Children

This DTAE-to-USG articulation/transfer agreement does not prohibit the transfer of additional course work on an institution-by-institution basis (see list below)**.

2. Implementation of the DTAE-to-USG course articulation/transfer agreement in Early Childhood Education would coincide with implementation of the "Mini-Core" in January 2002.

**Students who have been awarded the AAT degree in Early childhood Care Education have completed 110 quarter hours of course work, have approximately 500 hours of field experience, have completed the equivalent of English 1101 and 1102, Math 1101, 1111 or 1113, have taken courses in speech, psychology, sociology, and have completed 16 education courses.

Tom Harrison called for the question. Seconded by Bob Michael. Cindi Chance reiterated the important need for communication and clear articulation. Unanimous vote. Motion passed.

2. Bob Michael reminded everyone to pick up their Georgia Responds pamphlets and asked if there were any additional questions before the upcoming press conference. Janet Field distributed additional information [HO6].

Respectfully submitted January 3rd, 2002.

Handouts Distributed

- HO1: Proposal for Articulation Between USG Early Childhood Education Programs and DTAE Early Childhood Care Education Programs
- HO1.1: Edited version of HO1
- HO2: ECCE Graduates 1999-2001 [bar graph]
- HO3: Regents' Principles and Actions for the Preparation of Educators for the Schools Progress Report

- HO4: Educational Leadership Section of Regents' Principles and Actions for the Preparation of Educators for the Schools – Quality Assurance
- HO5: Proposal to EPAAC for External Review of Current Preparation Programs in Educational Leadership
- HO6: Georgia Responds information