

Educator Preparation Academic Advisory Committee  
January 10, 2007  
Macon State College

The meeting was called to order at 8:38 a.m.

Announcement: Dorothy Zinsmeister announced that the Phi Theta Kappa publication, *Best practice for teacher education*, was distributed to two year colleges

1. Welcome

Robert Parham called the meeting to order at 8:38 am with introductions and a welcome to Kathy Moore who has been named the Founding Dean of the Georgia Gwinnett School of Education

2. Minutes

The minutes were approved with the following corrections:

- Page 2, "After 2010" should read "Beginning 2010, students are expected to complete the new Area F."

- Page 2 in the paragraph beginning "A discussion ensued..."

A motion was made that the approval of the new mathematics course for middle grades be reconsidered. The Advisory Committee on Mathematical Subjects (ACMS) did not discuss the appropriateness of this course being used for Middle Grades. ACMS requested EPAAC reconsider its endorsement of the course for Middle Grades. Dorothy Zinsmeister contacted Claire Pearce at DOE advised the course would not be appropriate for middle grades and does not align with the Georgia Performance Standards for Middle Grades. The course is appropriate for special education and for in-service endorsements.

Dorothy Zinsmeister recommends we delete middle grades (leaving B-5 and Spec. Ed) from the approval. Discussion was positive. Robert Parham called for a vote. The motion was approved by affirmation.

- Page. 6 – Linda Calendrillo requested the minutes remove her name from the section on background checks.

Motion to approve minutes was made by Tom Deering and seconded by Linda Calendrillo.

Minutes were approved.

3. Proposed Revisions – Principles for Teachers

Jan Kettlewell provided the background on Regents' Principles. The Regents' Principles were initiated in 1998. In some key areas, the Regents' Principles were ahead of NCATE. With the evolution of PSC/NCATE standards, the alignment to the Regents' Principles is much greater. A committee has been working with the intent to collapse the Regents Principles into the NCATE framework where it makes sense. Some policy changes in BOR (Double, Double) and (Work in Schools) also need to be included in Regent's Principles. The proposed revisions were reviewed with emphasis on the specific additions of the Regents' Principles to the basic NCATE/PSC framework. Jan Kettlewell recognized the work of Kathleen DeMarrais, Jane McHaney, Trish Patterson and Sara Conner in merging and streamlining all of the standards and reducing the reporting requirements.

Discussion of the Revised Regents Principles for Teachers ensued. Kathleen DeMarrais requested a change on page 7 of the document. It was agreed that the words "awarded the degree" would be dropped.

Thierry Leger questioned the numbering of the NCATE elements which is inconsistent. Kathleen DeMarrais indicated that the document omits NCATE elements that don't deal with teachers.

Sandra Stone (Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs) was introduced and welcomed to EPAAC.

Trish Patterson called attention to the Double Double Initiative and to Principle 4 including the innovations that might be considered as meeting that principle. She also noted the MAT Program bullet defining MAT programs and the Program Redesign bullet requiring programs to adapt to changing school cultures, standards-based schools, and the needs of diverse students. She noted Principle 5, the USG BOR Policy calling upon institutions to recognize faculty contributions to teacher education and school improvement and Principle 6, the continual assessment of the *Principles and Actions for the Preparation of Teachers for the Schools* to determine its contributions to improved teacher preparation, student learning and school improvement.

Jane McHaney presented guidelines for Implementation of the *Principles and Actions for the Preparation of Teachers for the Schools*. The reporting outlined in the *Guidelines for the Implementation of the Regent's Principles and Actions for Teacher Educators for the Schools* is designed to provide a streamlined summary of continuous improvement process in BOR institutions preparing teachers. It is based on where institutions are in the cycle of state/national approval: Developing (p3), Probationary (p.3), and Continuing (p4). The table in the document provides annual reporting requirements. Jan Kettlewell requested an explanation of the acronyms in the document. It was noted that GACE, Georgia Assessment for the Certification of Educators, replaces PRAXIS I and II tests previously required. The reporting requires information on professional development partner sites. Reporting requirements will be assisted by information available from the USG Data mart. Dean McHaney noted that terminology in the rubric has been aligned with PSC/NCATE, "Unacceptable, Acceptable, and Target."

Jan Kettlewell called for a motion to approve revisions to the Regents Principles presented. The motion was made by Cindi Chance, seconded by Jane McHaney. In the discussion of the motion, Linda Calendrillo raised the question of MAT degree (p.12) definition, noted that some A&S departments had MAT programs, and indicated A&S deans were not aware of discussion of MAT in the Education Deans' Group. She offered an amendment to the document requesting a representative subcommittee of EPAAC be formed to draft a recommendation clarifying the MAT degree. Jan Kettlewell noted that Item 4 on the agenda is the proposal for the MAT and requested that the matter be addressed at that point. She proposed removing statement on the MAT from the proposed revisions.

Robert Parham called for a vote. EPAAC approved unanimously by voice vote.

Dorothy Zinsmeister asked if the modification of the Principles would result in modifying the rubrics. Jan Kettlewell indicated the rubrics will disappear. Reporting will be online. Mark Pevey noted the USG Data Mart will help by reducing as much institutional manual entry as possible for on line reporting. Dorothy Zinsmeister noted requirements for content knowledge in the Revision of Principles are not as specific in the Principles as in the rubrics. Dorothy Zinsmeister initiated a discussion about the use of the term of A&S faculty as it relates to faculty requirements. The rubrics were written to be consistent with the SACS definition. This information is not in the

Revised Principles. Jan Kettlewell indicated the Revised Principles could be amended to include the additional specific language regarding qualifications for those teaching Education and Arts & Sciences courses. She asked the sense of EPAAC on including this elaboration in the document. Sarah Connor noted these faculty qualifications are mandated by SACS and do not need to be reiterated in the Revised Principles. Tom Deering stated that faculty who are qualified to teach courses can teach those courses, regardless of their affiliation with Arts & Sciences or Education.

Linda Calendrillo affirmed that schools/colleges of A&S would determine qualifications for teaching A&S courses. Discussion ensued on including this language in the Revised Principles on page 7. Tom Deering noted that borderline courses, e.g. children's literature, might be housed in either A&S or Education. Linda Calendrillo stated that integrated science courses are science content courses and should be staffed by A&S. Ron Colarusso noted that this problem had already been addressed and further discussion was not necessary. Robert Parham noted that EPAAC had previously resolved the decision about appropriate faculty. Dorothy Zinsmeister dropped her reservations about the rubrics being dropped.

Ed Wheeler moved the approval of the revised *Principles and Actions for the Preparation of Teachers for the Schools* and honor past decisions made by EPAAC on operational issues. Cindi Chance seconded the motion. The motion passed.

#### Proposed Revisions – Principles for Leaders

Jan Kettlewell indicated that *Regents' Principles for the Preparation of Educational Leaders for the Schools* are not put forward for approval. Leaders Principles have been on hold awaiting revised PSC certification requirements. A group of faculty listed on document has been working on revisions and while the revisions are incomplete, the committee would like to have the endorsement of the major direction from EPAAC. She noted that EPAAC is requested to give its approval to the first two sections and that after the third section is developed, it will come before EPAAC for full approval.

Anne Duffy spoke of the significance of adding a quality assurance and a list of performance strands. She noted it was a collaborative document aligned with ELCC standards, DOE school standards and the new PSC certification standards. She also noted that the assessments in the strands on page 2 are the same as used for PSC/NCATE approval. The challenge remaining is defining the new work of collaborative partnership with the schools. The new certification requirements throw out a flat certification structure based only upon a degree. If motion is approved, the flat structure will be replaced by a two tier certification structure. The masters' degree provides a non-renewable certification allowing a school leader to be hired in a leadership position. The Ed.S. Requires demonstrated work and performance on the job. This change signals a new relationship between school districts and universities. Superintendents are included in planning leadership programs. Leadership faculty and districts will continue to work, but timeline is critical. A progress report is due on July 1, 2007. New programs must be approved for admission of students in fall 2008.

A motion to adopt the direction of the revisions to Leaders Principles was made by Ron Colarusso. It was seconded by Judy Carter. The motion was approved by voice vote.

#### 4. Proposed Definition for MAT

Kent Layton reported that in spring 2006, the Education deans were asked to clarify a framework to help USG understand MAT proposals. The deans began a discussion about MAT's around the country. The Education dean's sub-committee proposed the MAT should be redesigned for initial certification only. The M.Ed should be used for advanced degrees. Such clarification would provide clarity to USG and aid in reporting for USG, PSC, AACTE and NCATE. A friendly amendment to the original proposal added P-12 areas and special education to the list of programs appropriate for the MAT.

Jan Kettlewell provided additional context regarding the reporting requirements for BOR/PSC/NCATE. Data analysis and reporting requires clear and separate definitions of degrees. Using the M.Ed for both initial and advanced certification is problematic for institutions and for USG. She noted that some institutions have an MAT that has nothing to do with certification. She noted that USG has no interest in regulating those degrees. She noted that MAT's in A&S are not concerned with teacher preparation and are not in the scope of EPAAC.

Linda Calendrillo stated that leaving A&S deans out of the discussion is not appropriate. She suggested that EPAAC reconsider the MAT Definition Proposal. Ed Wheeler also voiced concerns that this document might be the defining document beyond the MATs used for initial certification. He suggested the proposed definition be amended to state it is not intended to define the MAT for the system, but to clarify the MAT is the degree for post-baccalaureate certification. Discussion ensued. Ed Wheeler then proposed having the MAT Definition Sub-committee membership revised to include A&S deans and that EPAAC defers action on the MAT definition until the revised sub-committee submits a proposal. Ron Colarusso moved to table the MAT Definition Proposal pending the outcome of the revised committee. The motion was seconded by Linda Calendrillo. The vote was 27 to table and the motion carried.

The discussion moved to the revised committee membership. Kathleen DeMarrais suggested that the committee include representatives from institutions with MAT degrees in A&S departments. Linda Calendrillo added that the committee should include representatives of institutions currently developing MAT programs in A&S. Dorothy Zinsmeister noted that the committee should include representatives from West Georgia, UGA, GASOU, Clayton State, and Georgia Southwestern. Kent Layton will stay on as chairperson. Cindi Chance was concerned about the timing of the decision and the need to submit degree changes. She suggested voting electronically. Jan Kettlewell noted EPAAC will have another meeting this spring in April. Institutions currently having an alternative M.Ed may go ahead with the conversion to the MAT.

...

Dorothy Zinsmeister was concerned that MAT degrees that do not lead to certification do currently exist. She questioned what would happen to those degrees. Jan Kettlewell stated the revised sub-committee on the MAT will resolve this nomenclature issue and will clarify what an MAT means for the system. If institutions want to submit an MAT that does not lead to certification, it will be on hold until nomenclature issues are resolved. Proposals requesting conversion of an alternative M.Ed to MAT will be considered.

### 5. Prior Learning Assessments

Trish Patterson, Phil Gunter, Linda Calendrillo and Sherry Gravett presented on Prior Learning Assessments at Valdosta State University. PLA support attempts to recognize the valued experiences of adult students and career changers. The Valdosta program is supported by grant funding and consultants from the Council of Adult and Experiential Learning. Valdosta plans to implement a PLA documentation in Fall 2007. They are currently advertising for a PLA counselor. Faculty assessors are being trained and policies and procedures are being defined. Jan Kettlewell thanked the Valdosta faculty for the presentation and shared her excitement about the PLA initiative.

Sherry Gravett presented a PowerPoint on PLA at Valdosta State University. EPAAC members discussed the PLA concept and its implementation at VSU. Jan Kettlewell stated PLA methodology has potential for many programs, especially for non-traditional programs. She noted broader applications are possible; degree programs in educational leadership may be a natural fit with their well-defined performance outcomes. Sherry Gravett stated PLA is friendlier to non-traditional students. The documentation course helps them focus and creates a more welcoming and accepting environment. Cindi Chance asked about start-up cost and the amount of the grant. Phil Gunter indicated the largest cost has been training faculty. After some start-up cost, PLA would eventually be self-sustaining. VSU had a \$30,000 grant for start up. The cost should be lower for other USG institutions based upon VSU's experience. PLA courses will be available at both at graduate and undergraduate levels at VSU. Sherry Gravett said VSU plans a pilot for 4 to 6 students. Then they will revise and scale the PLA program. She agreed to share the PLA PowerPoint presentation via EPAAC listserv.

### 6. Approval of Area F for B-5

Dorothy Zinsmeister presented the recommendation for AREA F for B-5 Programs. The proposal was developed by a consortium of DTAE, DCAL, 2 year institutions, PSC, universities, and EPAAC. The April 2006 EPAAC recommendation holds for pre-education courses in Area F. The consortium identified the other 9 hours of AREA F as courses from Health, Physical Education and Recreation, Psychology and Sociology consistent with NAEYC and DEC standards.

In the discussion of the proposal, Linda Calendrillo asked if these courses currently exist. Dorothy Zinsmeister stated the courses exist in some institutions; but not in all. Gainesville College has these courses but the program does not currently lead to certification. Jan Kettlewell noted PSC has recently developed a certification option for baccalaureate degree programs that will certify up through kindergarten. Mary Deming shared the recommendation from most national groups that B-5 teachers have a baccalaureate degree leading to certification. Jan Kettlewell clarified that this certification is an option. No institution is required to offer it. She noted there is much enthusiasm for this option. Questions were raised about the programs ability to pass comprehensive program review given the issues of low salary and low demand. Jan Kettlewell noted the consortium wants to present an across institutional submission." This collaborative submission will be jointly reviewed by PSC and USG. Cindi Chance asked if additional certifications could be added to this degree by testing out. JAN stated PSC will probably allow certified B-5 teachers to do that.

Jean Mecon asked if institutions could adapt an existing class if it meets the same objectives. Jan Kettlewell said yes. Linda Calendrillo asked if courses have to be designed specifically for the program. Jan Kettlewell indicated they do not. Jan informed EPAAC there was dialogue with institutions that have child development programs and that the courses were selected by consortium faculty representing marriage of family studies, child development, special education ,

and teacher preparation. The certification courses will meet requirements of all of BOR Principles, NCATE, DEC or NAEYC. A lifespan course will not substitute for child development. Dorothy Zinsmeister noted courses must meet outcomes of NAEYC and DEC standards and course descriptions unless the document is amended. Jan Kettlewell stated it was not the intent of the consortium that institutions must design courses with these titles only for B-5 certification candidates; nor is it the recommendation that institutions use an existing course that does not meet the description and/or the standards. If a course is aligned and consistent with course description the intent is met and it may be opened to other students. Ron Colarusso asked about reciprocity. If the names of the courses are not consistent then reciprocity is endangered. Linda Calendrillo indicated that having identical names meant institutions could not use existing courses. Jan Kettlewell shared that current core requirements have differed as to the requirement of exact title and course number. This committee chose to recommend identified courses and numbers in professional education, but did not mandate the same titles and course number for the other area F courses. Dorothy Zinsmeister suggested the consortium intended to make this a common course number for those beginning a new program. Common numbers in core happen when they exist in Areas A-E; Area F titles and course numbers (if not in A-E) tend to vary. Jan Kettlewell recommended not requiring common numbers for these HPER, PSYCH, SOC courses because of enrollment. The key issue is what is in the course description and meeting the goals.

Linda Calendrillo asked about the need to have the sociology department create a course because the proposal's course descriptions speak of teachers and are not general. Robert Parham stated no institution has to offer the program. Mary Ellen Wilson spoke of the need for advising at the two year level. Ellen Burleson suggested working with DTAE in a collaborative way. Mary Ellen Wilson raised a question of block credit for the core? Dorothy Zinsmeister stated the articulation is block credited. Jan Kettlewell asked that EPAAC members just consider Area F for the time being. Sandra Stone suggested that the A&S folks need to be involved in the planning. Dorothy Zinsmeister noted A&S folks were represented in the consortium. All institutions were invited; all did not accept. The group that worked was a consortium group speaking for the system. The decision to offer the certification is an institutional choice. Institutions with child development programs are probably fine, but for those institutions without early learning, new courses will need to be approved. Cindi Chance asked why the Area F for B-5 is different than the ECE Area F. She reiterated her concerns about the test out option. Mary Ellen Wilson noted that existing courses for ECE Area F do not satisfy NAEYC. Jennie Rakestraw noted the consortium started with standards and built a program. She acknowledged it would be good to have a solid background in science and math, but that background is not required by the standards.

Ellen Burleson moved to substitute "student" for "teacher candidates" in the course descriptions. Jan Kettlewell and Dorothy Zinsmeister agreed that would be agreeable to consortium. Linda Calendrillo moved to change the words "course description" to "course expectations." Jan Kettlewell clarified the wording of a possible motion to approve: Institutions would offer these courses with substitution of the word "students" for "teacher candidates" and that these courses would meet the content objectives through a course that has been developed or an existing course that has been modified. Martha Venn requested the consortium send the documents with standards-mapping to all deans. Jan Kettlewell will distribute the documents via list serv

Ron Colarusso moved to approve the B-5 Area F proposal as modified above. The motion was approved by a voice vote of the EPAAC members.

## 7. Approval of USG/DTAE Articulation Agreement for B-5

Dorothy Zinsmeister stated the document distributed with agenda has been modified. Three pages dated January 9<sup>th</sup> are presented for EPAAC consideration. The consortium represented: USG (2 year, and colleges and universities), DOE, DCAL, DTAE and private institutions. The 110 quarter hours in the proposal translates to about 75 semester hours with 500 hours of field experiences. DTAE programs are standardized across all COC accredited institutions. The articulation agreement includes only COC accredited institutions—you may need to look at accreditation year in determining whether you will accept transfer credit. COC is part of SACS. The subcommittee on articulation looked for have alignment of courses in DTAE and Area F...sometimes DTAE agreed to realign courses to make them consistent. The consortium recommendation: *DTAE degree completers in Early Childhood Care in Education (coursework and field experiences) would be able to transfer in a block of courses that would count for Area F.*

Jan Kettlewell stated that lead teachers in B-5 need an access route to a baccalaureate degree as a result of federal changes. Tim Goodman raised the issue of whether SACS does recognize transfer of block credit. He noted BOR had to eliminate block credit from the transfer policy. Dorothy Zinsmeister said SACS enforcement of this has been inconsistent. NCATE has also been inconsistent. She suggested going to SACS/COC for clarification of the block credit transfer issue. Cindi Chance said if SACS requires a course by course for any major these courses must be accepted by any major. Dorothy Zinsmeister said the consortium would not recommend a course by course approach. In a course by course approach, this agreement would not work. The consortium proposal is 75 hours of semester credit for 18 hours of credit. If a student changed major, the courses would count. Robert Parham asked about next steps given these questions and concerns. Jan Kettlewell asked how EPAAC can consider Recommendation 1 given Tim's concern. Does EPAAC want to consider the other two recommendations or table the whole discussion pending clarification on Recommendation 1.

Dorothy Zinsmeister requested EPAAC discussion on Recommendations 2 and 3. Recommendation 2 does not have to be accepted as a block. EPAAC would be agreeing to accept certain courses for elective credit. Marty Venn indicated counting the courses as upper level would be a problem for Early Childhood programs.

Jan Kettlewell said the proposal serves two populations: traditional students and teachers with two year degrees needing the BS who would need an access route. The question is doing you honor as much as possible or hold the line on transfer credit.

Marty Venn noted PLA gives detail about experiences; this process does not seem to be as rigorous. Dorothy Zinsmeister said because courses in Area 4 are electives, transfer students can bring in previous coursework as electives. Jennie Rakestraw noted prefixes don't have to be identical. Dorothy Zinsmeister said the commission expected that identical prefixes would be used. Linda Irwin DeVitis asked if accepting these courses would allow programs to meet the upper division hour requirement.

Dorothy Zinsmeister asked for a vote on Recommendation 2. Cindi Chance reiterated when we accept courses they must apply to any degree requiring those same courses...i.e. pre calc.

Dorothy Zinsmeister said that has already been approved and is policy. IHE's would not have to count these courses as upper level automatically. Linda Calendrillo asked about holding to the requirements of upper division status. Dorothy Zinsmeister said when the issue is course to course transfer, it is possible a course numbered at 2000 or 3000 may be very arbitrarily assigned to the level. There is no problem with accepting courses across levels, across institutions, across states based upon actual content and pre-requisites.

Robert Parham asked about calling the vote on approval on Recommendation 2. Ellen Burleson called the question. The motion carried by a voice vote.

Tim Goodman moved to table Recommendation 1. The motion carried by a voice vote.

### 7. Recommendation for Math 1113

Ed Wheeler spoke on the need to include pre-calculus for middle grades students. Institutions advised students to take this course; but it was not required. He stated students need this course to be able to teach to the new GPS. Tim Goodson moved to add Math 1113 to middle grades requirements for core. Dorothy Zinsmeister stated Area A has a list of courses approved including Pre-Calculus and the list of disciplines which requested that pre-calculus (mostly sciences). Middle Grades math concentrators are not currently included in the list. Discussion to require pre-calculus for Middle Grades teachers has occurred in math advisory committee. Cindi Chance asked who was making the proposal. Ed Wheeler said the recommendation originally came from EPAAC and was confirmed with Mathematical Subjects Advisory committee. Now the proposal is back for EPAAC approval for Area F. Kent Layton said the group also was worried about mathematics performance on Praxis I as well as GPS. Cindi Chance asked what would be the effective date. Dorothy Zinsmeister stated some institutions already require pre-calculus and that moving the pre-calculus requirement from area A to area F was not favorably looked on by institutions already requiring the course in Area A given the 129 hour cap. Right now, Area F for middle grades in math consists of 9 hours in education and the remaining 9 hours includes 2 courses in one concentration, and one course in the other. This proposal requires Math 1113 if course has not already been taken in Area A or D.

The question was called and the motion was approved by voice vote. The effective date will be Fall 2007 for entering students.

### 8. Professional Development

Sarah Conner announced Area F professional learning registration ends this week. There were still slots available. Deans should check with the P-16 office this week. Deans are encouraged to attend. Dorothy Zinsmeister announced professional development for math and science courses in Area F. The workshop for Math 2008 was held in December. The evaluations were excellent and there were requests for follow-up. Workshops for science will be Feb. 19 and 20 in Macon. If you have other faculty who wish to attend, talk with Dorothy.

### 9. Discussion – Implementation of Area F

Beth Rushing stated that a number of institutions were struggling with staffing. Those who were newly hired would also need training. Other serious issues for implementation of the science



courses included lack of facilities for labs. Linda Calendrillo asked about courses being developed with separation of lecture and lab as an alternative. Dorothy Zinsmeister said the intention was for integrated courses, but reality may not permit that. Campuses must make their own decisions. Jan Kettlewell reminded those present of the purposes of the courses: improving scientific literacy, preparing better elementary science teachers. An integrated science background helps teacher implement a more effective hands on approach. Campuses should target ways to achieve the goal in light of the realities. Beth Rushing noted campuses had competing demands and that it put them in an untenable situation.

Dorothy Zinsmeister asked whether Math 2008 should be a pre- or co- requisite for some science courses and/or math courses. This is done on some campuses, but is an area of disagreement. Should EPAAC include the pre-requisites? Ed Wheeler responded that having the whole Area D be a pre-requisite is not a good idea. Ellen Burleson suggested pre-education course(s) be a pre-requisite for the science courses to weed out those who do not want to pursue education prior to the integrated science courses. Dorothy Zinsmeister stated that the Area D array of science courses is not aimed at specific content. The goal is exposure to scientific ways of thinking, methodology, problem-solving and communicating scientific information and findings. Linda Calendrillo said it is tempting to see philosophical reasons as support for pre-requisites. The reality is that we are having difficulty offering enough slots for students to complete core. Pre-requisites would aggravate the situation. Dorothy Zinsmeister said advisors generally urge students to finish Area D prior to taking Area F. Cindi Chance suggested EPAAC take no action on the issue of pre-requisites and let campus faculty continue to make the decisions. Dorothy Zinsmeister advocated a system wide decision

No action was taken on the issue.

Kent Layton shared a summary of the discussion of Area F implementation. Deans discussed problems with staffing, supervision of field experience, and the location of the special education at the upper level. He noted the majority of programs are at 129 hours. There was discussion of clarifying the responsibility for submitting changes to programs of study required by the new Area F. Most institutions are going to MAT programs for secondary education. A couple of institutions have already implemented Area F and several institutions have concerns about the curricular approval process. Others are getting a late start but progressing.

#### 10. Goal Quest

Trish Patterson and Mary Deming talked about the implementation of Goal Quest to help achieve goals of the Double Double Initiative. Candace Summer (P16 communications person) is working with Goal Quest on recruiting candidates. The initial target is 2 year students. EPAAC members were urged to go the website [www.usgteaching.com](http://www.usgteaching.com). The site is also targeting career changers. Schools may or may not be participating. Ten schools are participating currently. Others are urged to participate. The next steps are to increase the number of users (250 to 300). If a student logs on, they will receive periodic emails. Institutions need to forward HTML. If you have a virtual newsletter, GOALQUEST can be linked. Submit teacher related websites and institutional websites to Candace. Also forward key dates, students, names of alumni or faculty who want to answer questions or share experiences and success stories. Institutions need to provide a contact person. Other ideas are welcome.

### 11. On-Line Modules for Reading and Mathematics

Phil Gunter described reading and mathematics modules for special education teachers not currently meeting HQT guidelines. These modules support Housse and are available without cost. They can be used however faculty choose to use them. Many Valdosta faculty members are using these courses. David Monetti provided two handouts: CORE CONTENT PROJECT and CONTENT INVENTORY. The modules are Web Vista based. They have had extensive review by special education teachers and are technologically polished. Modules are being piloted now. They include text, readings, interactive activities, video, assignments, discussions and quizzes. There are two versions for reading—teacher led and stand-alone self directed. For math all modules are teacher led. To get into a course, contact David Monetti at Valdosta State University.

### 12. Distance Ed Programs – Masters Level

Jan Kettlewell described the system initiative for collaborative M.Ed/MAT online programs. These programs will be designed to increase access, meet the goals of the Double Double Initiative. She asked for institutions who are interested in pursuing an online MED/MAT. She stated that UGS is losing market share in education graduate programs. Chris Bissinger will be working with the institutions to support the online development. Those interested in the MAT included: North Georgia, Kennesaw (A&S), West Georgia (A&S), Georgia Southern, Albany State, Georgia State, Armstrong Atlantic, Augusta State, University of Georgia and Georgia Southwestern. Campus based discussions. Institutions interested in collaborating on the M.Ed. included Valdosta, Columbus State, Kennesaw, Augusta State and Georgia Southern... **Please double check!**

### 13. Faculty Academy Presentations

Presentations on the Faculty Academy Campus Projects were made by:

Georgia Southern  
North Georgia  
Clayton State

Jan Kettlewell thanked the presenters for three excellent examples of disseminating learning from the Faculty Academy across the campus and highlighting the focus on standards-based classrooms.

### 14. Role Alike Meeting Reports

Kent Layton summarized the education deans meeting:

- The USG Teacher Education Unit will begin a full fledged electronic reporting system for NCATE and PAAR.
- NCATE accreditation issues were discussed including concerns with process, product, and services. A meeting with Art Wise is scheduled to discuss concerns.
- Area F concerns and issues
- Liability insurance – clarify issues of coverage for student teaching vs. all field experience

- Data Mart – (web-based graduate survey)
- Six Sigma - Education deans will be involved in training. This may tie in to online MED.
- Faculty Academy
- Educational Leadership redesign
- Regents Principles
- Georgia Frameworks for Teaching

Beth Rushing summarized the A&S deans meeting:

- MAT
- Area F
- Travel reimbursement for candidates
- Six Sigma and other initiatives

Rob Gingras summarized the Two Year VPAA's discussion:

- Math 1113
- B-5 proposal and transfer of block credit
- Support services: student clubs and organizations, GACE workshops, guest speakers
- Area F implementation - not anticipating problems
- Appreciation for the workshops for Area F courses--could workshops be videoed?
- Adjuncts are a problem and need training
- Virginia announced the NACCWTP meeting in New Orleans

15. Other business

Jan Kettlewell will look into offering Area F workshops for adjunct and newly hired faculty this summer.

Robert Parham adjourned the meeting at 2:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Linda Irwin-DeVitis