

THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Moderator: Julie Orange
September 12, 2012
3:00 p.m. ET

Operator: Good afternoon. My name is (Robyn), and I will be your conference operator today. At this time, I would like to welcome everyone to the Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee Conference Call.

All lines have been placed on mute to prevent any background noise. After the speakers' remarks, there will be a question-and-answer session. If you would like to ask a question during that time, simply press star, then the number one on your telephone keypad. To withdraw your question, press the pound key.

Thank you. I would now turn the call over to our host for today, Ms. Julie Orange. You may begin.

Julie Orange: Thank you, (Robyn). This is Julie Orange. I'd like to welcome everyone to the Race to the Top Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee Call.

This is a follow-up call from previous discussions from our August 6th meeting, and I just wanted to clarify before we get in to introductions for those that are joining me in the department and then on the committee that this call is open for participants on the committee to ask questions. So, those participants are free to ask questions throughout the call. However, anyone joining from the public may listen in to the information and there's website that you can submit recommendations that will be forwarded to the committee for their considerations.

And our meeting materials are also posted at that website. I'm going to go ahead and give you that website if you want to jot that one if you don't have the materials for today. That website is www.fldoe.org/committees/TLP.asp.

I'll repeat that. It's www.fldoe.org/committees/TLP.asp and you can log on to that and you can pull down the agenda and also the PowerPoint that we'll be going through in a few minutes. And, again, you can submit feedback at the very top of that website if you have recommendations that you would like us to share with the committee at a later date.

We will definitely make sure that they have access to that information. And, again, I'm Julie Orange and I'm going to be helping to facilitate the call today. And I'd like to go ahead and start with introductions here in the room.

Eileen McDaniels: Hi, this is Eileen McDaniels, Bureau Chief for Educator Recruitment, Development and Retention.

(Mindy Fike): This is (Mindy Fike), a program specialist for the Bureau of Educator Quality.

Eileen McDaniels: And just so everybody knows, I just want to add this is our new Rebecca Harris. So, I know you all will welcome (Mindy Fike) to our team.

Eileen McDaniels: Welcome, (Mindy).

(Mindy Fike): Thank you.

(Candy Castro): (Candy Castro) with the Office of Educator Preparation.

Julie Orange: OK. And I'm going to go down the list of those that I know that are on the call. And then, once I'm finished, if I did not call your name and you're on the call as a committee member, if you can let me know.

So, that I have accurate record of team with us. I have Vivian Posey from Barry University, Elisa Calabrese from Broward County, (Suzanne McKeton) from Dade County, Ana Blaine from Daytona State College, Cathy Boehme from Escambia County, (Adrienna McKeck) from FIU, Gregory Adkins from Lake County, Valerie Storey from UCF, (Debbie Cook) representing Professional Association, Megan Pankiewicz from Seminole County, Lance

Tomei from UCF, Jasmine Ulmer from University of Florida. Are there many other committee members on the line?

OK, we'll go ahead and get started with an agenda review. Hopefully everyone received that information. If not, you can access that either through your e-mail and through that same website that I just gave you if you're a committee member.

What we're going to do throughout today's meeting is we're going to be wrapping up some of the recommendations that some of these you actually began discussions on regarding the performance metrics, anyway, last fall. So, it's been a long time coming, but this is really a milestone even for you because we're at the point now where you're able to finalize recommendations for our phase one of recommendations to the commissioner. So, very important time in your committee work.

We appreciate everyone's time communicating through Hope Street and making sure that everybody is clear on what all the various program expectations are and very good questions coming out of that. If you look down at our agenda, we are going to have an opportunity to go back and review the performance metrics that you have previously voted on and our chair is going to walk us through that. And this is basically just a refresher to remind you of what you decided on some time ago regarding the accountability system for teacher preparation programs and specifically what metrics you wanted to include.

And remember that we are not at the point where we set any targets at this point. And, right now, we're only going to be including the metrics and the definition that you've surrounded those metrics with within our recommendations – within your recommendations to the commissioner. So, Elisa is going to go through that and answer if you have any questions about what we've previously voted on.

And then, we're going to get in to the admission requirements, field experience and uniform core curriculum. Eileen is going to walk us through this. And in some cases, that's going to be a continuation from discussions

that you started even back when we met face-to-face in Miami back in May and continued on our call in August.

And then, our subcommittee chair, Lance Tomei is going to brief the committee on our subcommittee formation and their charge and what the result of their work has been. They have been working throughout the summer. They want to share their recommendations and there will be a time for the committee to decide if they want to accept those recommendations as is or if they like to modify those and then Jasmine is going to walk us through a committee consensus.

So, that everybody is clear on what the committee has decided as a whole and then I'll come back on and walk us through what our next steps are and looking at our next face-to-face meeting.

What we're going to do now is to start with our PowerPoint and what I want to draw your attention to, if you look at phases of the recommendations of this committee, I just want to make sure that everybody is clear that the recommendations that you're working on now, that after this meeting will be drafted up, making sure that all on the committee will have an opportunity to look at the draft language and provide changes and come to consensus that, yes, this is what we decided.

These recommendations will be used for the upcoming legislative agenda. So, in the areas that we're going to be referencing with the performance metrics, admission requirements, field experience as a new form core curriculum. Those high-level recommendations will be included with this phase of information provided to the commissioner.

The next phase of recommendations will be more of the specific points inside the target areas that are set for the performance metrics. Those will go and to help with rule changes. That will be in May or June of 2013.

Then, we will move in to the phase three of our recommendations and that will be looking more specifically at the program approval process and things that we'll need to be changed based on your recommendations. That just gives you an idea of kind of the stages that we're going to quite see then. And

if you look at the next slide, you'll see, again, basically the committee goals of those four areas and see to the top discussion topic areas we're going to be focusing on and I'm going to turn it over to Elisa next to start with performance metrics.

And, again, this is a review of where you made decision earlier in the screen. Elisa?

Elisa Calabrese: Yes? Thank you, Julie. We're going to be reviewing slide five through seven.

And please allow me to share that we have already had taken – this discussion had taken place beginning last November with various phone calls and the meeting in August. So, these are some of the things that we have already agreed upon. And I just want to orient those that are on the call today from slide five through seven, the performance metrics placement, retention, value-added model, teacher evaluation data, student performance by subgroups and critical teacher shortage.

That is the bonus area. And for the placement, it includes the percentage of completers who become employed in an instructional position in their first or second year following the program completion. So, that is something that we agreed upon for placement.

For retention, it would be included the percentage of completers who are continuously employed in an instructional position in a Florida public school the third year and fifth year marks. So, that would be for the retention. For the value-added model, we looked at average VAM scores of completers one year following the program.

We looked at data across three-year period and cohorts of completers and we looked at the use of in-program/in-field data when possible. Of course, we talked about the teacher evaluation data and that is not totally available to us at this time. We also discussed student performance by subgroups. Using this metric when a program has at least 10 completers and used the same eight subgroups identified for federal school performance reporting and we looked at the minimum number of subgroups for consideration would be three.

The bonus area is the critical teacher shortage and we were considering the increase or decrease in the production of teachers in this critical shortage area from one year – from one year to the next year. So, those are the performance metrics that we agreed upon.

Now, of course, as Julie stated, we have not set the targets for those performance metrics. That will be done at our next meeting in – at the end of November. I believe that's November 27th and 28th.

So, those would be set at that meeting. But, right now, this is the recommendation of the committee that those are the performance metrics.

Julie Orange: Anybody have any questions there? Comments? OK, we're going to go ahead and move on and Eileen is going to pick up with the presentation on slide eight.

Thank you, Elisa.

Eileen McDaniels: Thanks, Elisa.

Elisa Calabrese: You're welcome.

Eileen McDaniels: And thank you everybody for joining us or those that are able to join us on the phone call today. So, we're going to pick up our discussion from where we left off from our August meeting. But let me give you a little – provide a little foundational tiny bit of review of what we have done.

As always, we just want to continue to remind everybody about our guiding principles for all teacher preparation programs whether we're talking about our initial teacher preparation programs or educator preparation institute or our district alternative certification programs. If it's OK with everybody, from now on, I'll just refer them as ITPs, EPIs and DACPs. But as we discussed in many meetings in the past, our overarching question has been in regards to preparing teachers for today's classroom and that's going to continue to guide our discussion today is, what do first year teachers need to

know and be able to teach no matter what teacher preparation program they complete?

As we've done in the past, we'll need to keep in mind that as we continue our discussions about our state-approved teacher preparation programs that we do keep this in mind. So, guiding questions for us today and we'll – we will continue. I just want to remind you let's dig deeper than what our overarching question is but some guiding questions to get at the heart of what we're talking about are what you see on slide nine.

These three guiding questions we will continue to address. The first one, what do state-approved teacher preparation programs need to ensure individuals know and are able to do prior to completing the program? Number two, will the changes recommended by the TLPIC ensure that candidates demonstrate an impact on student learning before they finish a program? We have not been that – quite that explicit about that question. But it's something that we would certainly want to continue to ensure that we have that as part of our guiding question. And then, third, what is important for today's teacher?

So, keeping those in mind and I'm just going to tell you as we move the slide, for those who are may not be on the webinar but reviewing the slides by your telephone or next to you in the cars who are driving, I hope not.

But on slide 10, the last time we met, we were unable to address several areas that you wish to discuss and one of them was the program admission requirements. So, on this particular slide I'm reviewing or we're reviewing with you, what are the current program admission requirements for the three types of state-approved teacher preparation programs.

Per law, this slide shows you the minimum admission requirements for each type of program. So, for ITPs – for ITPs, they must have earned a GPA of 2.5 on a 4.0 scale. They must have mastery of General Knowledge by passing the Florida General Knowledge Test and the law provides an option programs to waive these requirements for up to 10 percent of admitted students. So, this is admission into an ITP program, minimum admission requirements. Individual

institutions and programs may have further requirements. But these are the minimum by law.

For EPI, per law, these programs also require the individuals have earned a 2.5 GPA on a 4.0 scale and that they hold a bachelor's or higher non-education degree from an accredited college or university.

And for DACPs, per statute, these individuals must hold a bachelor's or higher non-education degree with a GPA of 2.5 or higher. Participants in these programs, as you know, must hold a Florida Temporary Certificate and they must be the teacher of record in a Florida public school district. So, moving on to slide 11.

What the TLPIC has already discussed in this May meeting and you've already recommended was to remove the general knowledge requirement for graduate program admission and to allow a bachelor's degree from an accredited institution to satisfy admission requirements.

As a reminder, this – the G.K. requirement is still a certification requirement and would be needed for program completion purposes. I want to add here that one of our (U.T.) institutions have expressed a concern about the GPAs that have been discussed previously about the minimum GPA requirement.

They believe it is problematic. Their point is – I remember (U.T.) institutions are preparing STEM people for a career in teaching and their point is if we want to encourage them degree majors to go into teaching because of the difficulty level of the courses they take in their freshmen and sophomore years prior to full entering an education program. Meeting a 2.5 GPA minimum may be quite challenging for these STEM people.

So, I'm going to turn this over to Elisa for further discussion about admission requirements.

Elisa Calabrese: Is there anyone that would like to make a recommendation to the admission requirements? Other recommendations?

Lance Tomei: Elisa, this is Lance. Just a couple of comments. Just, I guess, a couple of nits on slides 10 and 11.

Slide 10, it actually – it has a qualifying date there for the class to be used for program admission. But that's really not accurate. That date applies only to using the class for graduation requirement.

Any class works for admission even if it's after that 1 July cutoff. Well, that's I know that's a fine point. But I thought that was worth clearing that up.

And on the – on slide 11, I think we need to be clear that we're talking about bachelor's that not used the term B.A. because it could be a B.S., it could be a BME, it could be another type bachelor's degree. B.A. has the – an implication there. I don't think we want to limit ourselves to Bachelor of Arts, which is what a lot of people will read.

Elisa Calabrese: OK. So, Eileen, are you aware of what Lance is speaking to for the July 1, 2002, for the program admissions requirements.

Eileen McDaniels: And he is correct because that slide – let's go back to that slide. Would you, Julie, please? The one before.

It talks about, well, or other acceptable general knowledge test and he is correct. There are – there are others that can be used for admission purposes and for certification purposes, which is for program completion requirements. Only those tests before that.

So, he is correct. That's correct. And then, the fact about the B.A. degree, yes, I didn't include that in my comments. I've said any bachelor's degree and it is more than a B.A. It could be a B.S. or any bachelor's degree. I believe that was what the recommendation was for any bachelor's degree.

Elisa Calabrese: Correct.

Julie Orange: That would be noted with those – with that recommendation.

Eileen McDaniels: Right.

Julie Orange: To take that from B.A. to any bachelor's. Thank you.

(Debbie Cook): Elisa, this is (Debbie). Is this the time to ask a question or to just express an opinion about the GPA requirement that Eileen discussed earlier or should I do that later?

Elisa Calabrese: Sure.

(Debbie Cook): OK.

Elisa Calabrese: No, you can right now.

(Debbie Cook): My only question. I mean I think we talked about considering an increase in the GPA and I still think that that's a good idea. What I'm wondering is with the use of that 10 percent waiver, that colleges and universities are allowed be of assistance to the people that are concerned that it might be too high because we do have that little caveat.

I mean, I still think that people going in to the field of education to be able to master that content enough so that they would have better than a 2.5 grade point average. And if they are still going to be able to have that 10 percent waiver policy in there might not that address the issue of the institution that has a concern. I don't know if that was a question.

Lance Tomei: Yes, this is Lance. Can I jump in again?

Elisa Calabrese: Sure.

Lance Tomei: The problem with the 10 percent waiver is that it's applied program by program, not for the overall institution. So, if we're looking at that as a possible solution to STEM, when you look at an individual STEM program like an undergraduate map-ed. That program is only going to be allowed to bring in 10 percent under the waiver.

It's not that program can use a 10 percent allocation given to the total unit.
So.

(Debbie Cook): OK.

Lance Tomei: It's still pretty restrictive.

(Debbie Cook): Right.

It is interesting that the STEM consideration is in the opposite direction of what the committee has discussed, which is to raise the bar on admission requirements. My recollection is that we ask for some hard data to see if we could get information on what the VAM data look like.

(Debbie Cook): Right.

Lance Tomei: And into correlation with.

(Debbie Cook): With an increased grade point average, right.

Lance Tomei: With increased GPA ...

(Debbie Cook): Yes.

Lance Tomei: ... at admission. And I don't recall ever seeing any data of that type presented to the committee.

(Debbie Cook): Right. I remember I was talking to (Rebecca) about that and I think maybe that's why we didn't come to a Harding test recommendation maybe because we were awaiting for that data. And if the data were to show that there was in fact the correlation, then I would still recommend we consider an increase.

Elisa Calabrese: Right.

Lance Tomei: Yes, and that's the bottom line. We don't want to make an increase on the assumption that that's going to improve quality.

(Debbie Cook): Correct.

Lance Tomei: We're hoping to see some data – performance-based data using VAM data that shows a correlation that gives us a solid reason to make a recommendation along those lines. That's database. That's not.

(Debbie Cook): Exact.

Lance Tomei: Yes.

(Debbie Cook): Exactly. And my only concern in not – in not doing it should we see a correlation for the STEM folks is because those courses are quite rigorous – I mean, not that they aren't. It seems to me that's the place that we would really want to ensure that the educators had a deep understanding of the content because unpacking that kind of content is admittedly rigorous.

Therefore, it seems to me we wouldn't want to slack in that particular content area.

Cathy Boehme: This is Cathy, and I'm the STEM person. And I absolutely agree with (Debbie). I just do not see a reason to lower standard.

When we're asking people to step it up in their classroom and make the course as more rigorous, I don't think that the teachers need to be less rigorous and they're fully accepted as applicants.

Elisa Calabrese: So, does anyone have a recommendation to the admission requirements concerning GPA?

(Debbie Cook): Well, I don't know if this is – my recommendation would be that the CDC – the committee see if it can review data that would do what we ask before. Show if there is indeed a correlation between teacher performance and the grade point averages going in to these programs and if there is evidence to show that there is a correlation that would make a difference that we would consider increasing the great point average requirement across the programs.

Eileen McDaniels: This is Eileen. (Rebecca) stated her very, very best, it probably drove her to California. She would be – she would be able to obtain this data. It is not certainly something very readily available, you would think that you might be able to get it through certification. It is not something that's actually captured. So, you know, on a database at this point, we're working through (bug and joy), but you got – you got so many other – you know, you can get the data from some programs but not necessary others.

Elisa Calabrese: Yes.

Eileen McDaniels: So, that has been the difficulty there and was not sure unless we – you know, unless we – you want to discontinue to pursue this, and it's something that certainly could be addressed for the future as we continue to try to obtain more data for you.

(Debbie Cook): Well, that's one of my questions. Can we sort of say we won't do anything right now? But when that data becomes available, we have the first right of refusal to go back and revisit the grade point average thing.

Eileen McDaniels: Oh, absolutely. I mean, you're going to make recommendations today and as more data becomes available because data always becomes available in a variety of ways and it will also help for us to lend forth. If we're not able to capture it easily, you know, I mean, that's another data element that we have to ask people to make sure they're reporting to us on a regular basis.

So, that's the – but in absolute, you can – you can do something today and we can come back to it later. But as far as recommendations forward to meet the legislative calendar, you will – you saw the timeline for phase one and being able to make recommendations to the commissioner, you would not.

(Debbie Cook): Right.

Eileen McDaniels: I do not believe.

(Debbie Cook): Right.

Eileen McDaniels: You have that data available to make those recommendations for at least this year's legislative calendar.

(Debbie Cook): OK.

Lance Tomei: Oh, this is Lance again. I'm really on-board with (Debbie) on this one. I'm very reluctant to make any kind of recommendation here on intuition.

That's not supported by data. And the fact that we live the GPA requirement alone or don't make a recommendation doesn't prevent an institution or individual programs from raising their admission requirements. They can't go lower than the state mandate, but they can certainly go higher if they choose to do that at an individual basis.

So, nobody would be prohibited from raising the bar if they feel that that's the right thing to do for their program or at their institution.

Eileen McDaniels: That is correct, Lance, and that's what I refer to as that – here the minimum requirements for the institution or even a program can increase those at the local level.

(Adrienna McKeck): So, this is (Adrienna). I agree with what everyone has said. I would not support lowering the minimum admission requirements to lessen a 2.5 GPA and really I think I would support increasing it just as like that.

But if that's going to cost some hardship for institutions, then my recommendation would be to leave it as it is at the 2.5 for right now until we can get some further data that would help us to address this issue in a more informed way.

Eileen McDaniels: OK.

Vivian Posey: Eileen, this is Vivian. Just to follow up, do we have any way of knowing if there are any institutions that do have a GPA admission requirement that would be at the 2.75 level? And if so, is there any way to track perhaps the performance of their completers?

Eileen McDaniels: I'll have to look in to that Vivian. My resident expert moved to California.

Vivian Posey: That's right.

Eileen McDaniels: I (gave her) my word for quite a while.

Vivian Posey: I do remember the subcommittee that was discussing this and how strongly we felt that if we are going to raise teacher quality that we do want the best

candidates going forward and going from a 2.5 to a 2.75 seemed to be a general consensus among the groups that was speaking that day.

Eileen McDaniels: Absolutely. And as we all have agreed to, we don't want to make recommendations unless we had data to back up those recommendations.

Elisa Calabrese: OK. So, the recommendation is not to make a recommendation at this time concerning GPA until we have additional data.

(Debbie Cook): I would agree.

Eileen McDaniels: Yes.

Elisa Calabrese: OK. All right. So, if I may – so, I'm capturing this correctly, on slide 11, we want to state for graduate program admission bachelor's rather than B.A.

We want to change that word to bachelor's degree from an accredited institution. That's for – that's our change on slide 11.

Eileen McDaniels: All right. Great. Thank you.

Elisa Calabrese: OK.

(Adrienna McKeck): I have a question. This is (Adrienna) again. I have a question with respect to that removing the G.K. requirements for admissions that does not – that just not preclude it from being a graduation requirement.

Eileen McDaniels: No, it's a certification requirement.

(Adrienna McKeck): So ...

Eileen McDaniels: It's not a graduation requirement. It's a program completion requirement which would be (inaudible) ...

(Adrienna McKeck): Exactly, yes. Yes, I think in terms of graduation here.

Eileen McDaniels: Right.

(Adrienna McKeck): But ...

Eileen McDaniels: No, I have to know that. I get my hands slashed some times ...

(Adrienna McKeck): Yes, yes. I mean, our students would still have to pass all sections of the G.K.

Eileen McDaniels: That's correct.

(Adrienna McKeck): At the end if not at the beginning.

Eileen McDaniels: That's correct.

(Adrienna McKeck): OK.

Elisa Calabrese: OK. So, are we clear? Everyone is in agreement to change it to bachelors?

(Debbie Cook): Yes.

Elisa Calabrese: OK.

(Adrienna McKeck): Yes.

Elisa Calabrese: Does further clarification need to be written concerning slide 10?

Eileen McDaniels: No. I don't believe so because we would – what's currently in law – what is currently in law is actually written there.

Elisa Calabrese: OK. All right.

Vivian Posey: Elisa?

Elisa Calabrese: Yes?

Vivian Posey: This is Vivian. I have a question. We're using just a terminology accredited college or university in these slides. Do we need to further qualify that or just leave accrediting a loan and just without qualifying it as regionally accredited or I'm not an expert in that area. So, I'm just throwing that out there for the group.

Eileen McDaniels: Elisa, can I add that?

Elisa Calabrese: Yes, I wanted you to add that.

Eileen McDaniels: Thank you. The law already specifies exactly what that means.

Elisa Calabrese: Yes.

Eileen McDaniels: So, it is much broader than, you know, to talk about regionally and other approved given situations blah, blah, blah. So, the law specifies that it's rather broad.

Elisa Calabrese: OK. Thank you.

Julie Orange: OK. We're going to go ahead and move on to field experience requirement. We're on – we're moving to slide 12.

Elisa Calabrese: OK. So, on slide 12, we're going to talk about field experience requirements and what they currently are to the three types of teacher preparation program. So, per section 1004.044, the statute for ITPs.

Programs must provide field experiences in K-12 classroom settings throughout the program, including a culminating experience of no less than 10 weeks in duration. This is quite specific and the field experience sites must represent the full spectrum of school communities but not limited to schools located in urban settings. So, it's rather specific there.

And per EPI, in their particular statute 1004.85, that field experiences are as stated on the slide. It says each program participant must participate in field experiences as appropriate to his or her educational plan. There are no other specifications within the law.

And for district alternative certification programs, there is no specification in the law for field experiences but that's certainly understandable since they are the teacher of record throughout the program and are having daily field experiences throughout the year and throughout their program.

So, moving on to slide 13. So, that leads through our discussion about field experiences in light of the realities of today's classrooms, are changes recommended for field experiences?

We've placed this topic on the Hope Street website for all the continuous discussions about field experiences and their issues after the last TLPIC meeting in August. There is a conference call meeting where we had a number of EPI coordinators participating by listening to the meeting. Several expressed concern about the field experience discussion and pointed out the unique nature of the EPI programs and their participants.

We included the feedback from these individuals on the Hope Street sites, so all of you were aware on the TLPIC of the issues that face EPIs and to further understand their perspective about the issues of field experiences as they expressed in their comments back after that particular conference call. We've had several individuals on the TLPIC who have direct experience with the EPIs as well and I just want to assure those who are listening to today's call who are representing EPIs that are not part of the TLPIC.

There are representatives on the TLPIC that have direct and Ana Blaine is one of them from Dayton State College, who has direct experience of that. So, I hope you feel that you are being represented. And I'm going to – I'd like to go on to slide 14 for a second and just talk a little bit about the Hope Street recommendation for EPI that are out there.

So, from the Hope Street website where you've been discussing the issue of field experience now for the past month, several of you have posted comments or suggestions for possible (tasks) for the field experiences for EPIs. For instance, five weeks of classroom teaching combined with the intense professional development, which is the (teach) for America model. Another suggestion was at least 200 hours to allow the future teacher to plan, practice, receive feedback and practice some more.

Require full responsibility for all instructional duties for no less than two weeks and another suggestion was setting a minimum number of hours may not be the best way to allow candidates to participate in meaningful

comprehensive field experiences to meet the program standards. Apparently, this is a – will be a hot topic for today and for discussion.

So, now, I'd like to go on to – let's see – yes, let me go – let me go on to the next slide.

Just to pose those questions, for a second if that's all right, Julie?

Yes. Let me go on to slide 15. Just because I think that's – no, it's for ITPs, yes, but it's for everybody.

Is there a need for more specificity regarding the minimum amount of field experience for the culminating experience for ITPs? That's part of that discussion for today too. I just want to put it all in the table at the same time. Because you may be talking about EPIs but eventually you need to get to ITPs as well? So, we'll go back to the ITP one in a while, but if we could focus now on the discussion particularly about the EPIs because that was brought up and I'm going to turn it over to Elisa.

Elisa Calabrese: OK. So, let me ask the committee. Are there recommendations concerning slide 14? Is there a motion or a vote or any other type of recommendation to what has been mentioned on Hope Street for EPI? We like to choose one of those or a combination of those.

Ana Blaine: Hello, Elisa. This is Ana. I'm going to go ahead and jump right in.

Elisa Calabrese: Go right ahead, Ana.

Ana Blaine: I'm going to be – I just want to talk about some of the feedback that's been going back and forth on the Hope Street side, as well as the e-mail that we received from Julie. Julie, I believe that was recommendations or comments made by non-members, correct?

Elisa Calabrese: Yes.

Julie Orange: Correct. That was the feedback submitted after the August 6th call from EPI coordinators across the state that had some concerns about the discussion wanting to make sure that EPI was represented and the committee fully

understood the intent of EPI programs and specific population that they represent.

Ana Blaine: OK. So, I've made some notes if you guys can bear with me for the next five-ish minute. And in – and they're in response to some of the comments that were made.

So, I said in the e-mail to the committee members, so, I've decided in our face-to-face meeting when we discussed EPI, mainly because I wanted others, to give others the opportunity to speak, you know, EPI is sort of the, you know, well, the bad child and educator preparation in Florida and for some people, it would be completely gone as an alternative pathway.

And then, during our subcommittee meetings, I've been a little bit more vocal representing EPI programs. And, now that this – you know, these our, you know, conversations have been challenged, I wanted to express my opinion. And just so everybody knows, I've been involved with EPI since (inaudible), coordinator now as the director. And I've also assisted the state, for example, with APEC review and some things like that. So, I've had my hands in EPI for a while.

So, the first thing I want to talk about is in regards to the different pathways comparing ITPs, master's program, you know, to EPI. I think we can all safely say that no matter the pathway research shows that the most effective method for providing or producing highly qualified teachers is clinical experiences. The hands-on experience. You know, the bottom line is the more the experience, the better. The longer the experience, the better.

So, just having three services teachers observed, you know, 40 to 60 hours does not compare to taking over a class and doing all those things that a teacher does creating lessons, you know, participating in parent meeting, attending faculty meetings, you know, managing classroom behaviors and I know that a lot of programs and us included have associated tasks that may, you know, look at some of these assets like we may require them to attend the parent meeting or a faculty meeting. But it just doesn't compare to being the

teacher, you know, like some of the Hope Street recommendations for at least a minimum of two weeks fully taking over the class.

In regards to, you know, looking all our math and science teachers, you know, our EPI computers (more) with a complete math and science and then do EPI and become teachers are compared to other teachers in math and science. You know, I do agree that we have seen some scholar teacher come out of EPI. You know, let's say through those content areas.

And in the beginning when EPI-4 started, the goal was to recruit teachers in the secondary math and science classrooms where there was a critical need. However, the reality today is that because of the way the certification works, for example, of somebody who has a degree in criminal justice can go and take their subject area exam and, for example, elementary education complete the EPI program and now that person with a bachelor's degree from the criminal justice has a professional certificate in Florida for elementary education. And may be having never worked with children. Only having concluded a few hours that EPI requires.

At least with an internship, we as EPI program can justify that we've spent an entire semester – teachers' have spent an entire semester or teaching the content. So, that teacher with a criminal justice degree is now taught the content for a specific amount of time and we can do a comfortable saying that, OK, now, that only do they know the content because obviously they know that they pass the test. But they can also deliver and teach student and impact them.

In regards to full-time teachers also enrolled in EPI, this came up a couple of times, I think. First of all, I'm not sure that we still have more than half of our EPI candidates for full-time positions.

I think this was true when EPI first started. I think the number is down to something like 10 percent, Eileen, am I right in saying that.

Eileen McDaniels: I don't know what the numbers are, but I know they are significantly less than 50 percent now.

Ana Blaine: I know that for us it's very small. It's in the 2 percent range. You know, but we're going to have to discuss this as a committee. But I would never expect the EPI candidate who is teaching full-time under a temporary certificate to be removed from their positions and then do an internship. I think that it will be supervised by an administrator or part or probably part of mentorship type programs that their (inaudible) and it's how we do it now.

Our students that we save in classrooms through the district, you know, are the students who aren't (available) in the classroom if they are teaching and/or a temporary certificate in a school when they do their "hours" and all of the tasks assigned with their assignments with their own students.

So, you know, obviously, allowing them to (speed) all the requirements in their classroom. And then, there was a comment about, you know, the students and the – you know, the traditional versus nontraditional, you know, can the students, you know, sacrifice something some things in order to, you know, obtain their professional certificate. I believe I'm the one who made a comment about candidate making a sacrifice if they really want to each.

And these arguments stems from what Vivian brought up through e-mail that we had today. That, you know, the pre-service teachers and our ITP programs are the opposite of traditional and in kind of state, I can say that in our ITP programs, we do not have traditional students. So, our IET students and our ITT students are very similar.

And that as teachers would – sorry, candidates with full-time job. They are married, they have children. They are the breadwinners. And they're doing a bachelor's program or they're doing our EPI program. I just – you know, our ITP students are well aware before they enroll in the programs that they will have to complete an internship. That they are going to have to, you know, save money, you know, quit their job or put their job on hold part-time to complete an internship.

And I think that this is a state requirement that EPIs have some form of internship and they know this before enrolling in to the program. They're already coming in with the idea that I'm going to have to make that sacrifice,

which you think is the word I use in order to complete this program to get my certificate.

The other thing is our EPI computers are not being employed as they were back in 2004, 2005 and 2006. You know, and they'd even had computers come back and tell us that they interviewed for a job, everything went well and they were passed up for somebody who came from a traditional ITP program, you know. So, even though, we may be producing highly qualified teachers, sometimes that plays a role especially we see it a lot with our elementary education, you know, what they call majors that are – you know, are EPI students who are seeking a certificate in elementary education.

Another issue that I've seen that – and, obviously I've pondered this. So, I think this is more five minutes. Another that the students have ...

Eileen McDaniels: That's our girl.

Ana Blaine: Another issue that I – we've heard about that the students have shared with us is when it comes to reciprocity with other state. I'm constantly filling out state certification forms where I have to verify that they completed a state-approved program in Florida. We have (advances to meet this form) with the professional certificate.

You know, I've seen the forms were asked, (inaudible) complete a full-time internship. And I have to say, no. And the students – a couple of them have come to me and told me that their professional certificate. They have a Florida professional certificate was not fully accepted in that state because they lack some internship. (Inaudible) ...

Eileen McDaniels: Correct.

Ana Blaine: So, the validity of our program like, you know, we have a stronger leg to stand on if we give them something equivalent to an internship that we want to call an internship and they can take that with their professional certificates, you know, to their job interviews in Florida and outside of the state.

You know, so, we also have to remember who we're serving. Yes, we're preparing these service teachers, but ultimately we are serving our K-12 students. And in this reform that we are involved in, the whole purpose of this is to improve education and ultimately, you know, provide an equal education for all.

So, EPI program should be held through the same standard and accountability that we are holding our ITP programs with and our teachers and the schools with and everything like we talked about this with the admission requirements. If everything else is going up, why are we staying the same?

You know, EPI has produced some excellent teachers. However, it's also produced some not-so-great teachers and we get this feedback from our principal survey rather they complete a 10 to 15 full internship like our ITP students knew or if we want to look at a six-week mini internship or a number of hours. I guess that's something, you know, us as the committee we're going to have to discuss. And I'm sure that I'm going to be ostracized for all of the comments that I've made (inaudible) to the EPI peers.

But really this is – you know, this is how I feel and the more I read about alternative certification and the more I see all of those national reports that come out about alternative certification, we're booed at a lot and the – one of the biggest boos is they do not spend enough time with the students in the classroom to truly become an effective educator. You know, one more thing. This is the last one.

I promise. The flip side is, you know, inevitably are numbers as a program are going to down in EPI. Because a lot of people who will not be able to make that sacrifice of taking some six weeks' off or 12 weeks' off of work in order to do EPI.

But I've spoken to my department about it at my institution, I can only speak for my institution and everyone was in agreement that it would improve our overall EPI candidate and completers. Those are my thoughts, rebuttal anyone?

(Debbie Cook): No. But, Ana, this is (Debbie) and first of all I want to applaud you for articulating so eloquently the reasons that giving some kind of this field experience makes sense. The other thing that kept ringing through my brain as you were talking is you're also improving the quality of the experience for the candidate. So, we're doing this so that kids will benefit ultimately and I believe you're doing a better service to your candidates because they actually walk in to the schools then and having had an opportunity to be the lead teacher.

So, I think that that's a piece you didn't really speak to, but I think that's a benefit as well.

Megan Pankiewicz: This is Megan. I actually e-mailed Julie like late last night with a question about retention. And I don't know if Ana knows this or not. But speaking about, you know, better preparing the candidates for their own sake. I'm not sure for the retention rate of an EPI completer versus, you know, computer who goes to traditional program.

Julie Orange: Megan, did you see the slides that Julie sent us. It was back from an old meeting. (Rebecca) has been (inaudible). Did you get to see them?

Megan Pankiewicz: I don't think so. I reviewed the PowerPoint that we're looking at today. But I don't remember those slides.

Julie Orange: I skimmed over them again, but the retention rate in EPI, I believe, was lower than both ITPs and the district alternate programs. So.

Megan Pankiewicz: OK. So, I think ...

Julie Orange: She sent – at 10:30 or 10-ish this morning, she sent the slides from the old slide to you, Megan.

Megan Pankiewicz: Oh, all right. OK. I missed that.

So, you know, I think that probably speaks to (Debbie's) point about, you know, doing a service to our EPI completers, you know, giving them that customer experience that would provide some guide and support that they

wouldn't get when they're walking to a classroom as the sole responsible teacher because I think a lot of those mistakes that people make in the beginning are the very same that speaks, which I do not at the classroom.

Eileen McDaniels: This Eileen. Just in the stance of what was sent out in defense of EPIs, they did not have significantly less retention rate than the other two programs. It was a little bit less, but it wasn't significantly less.

(Suzanne McKeton): Elisa, this is (Suzanne McKeton). Being an elementary school administrator for the past 13 years, I got to wholeheartedly agree with the field experience. It's real difficult and I'm going to be honest, I – in the past, five and six years ago, I did hire non-traditionally trained teachers.

But now that I have an opening and I'd received over 100 e-mails and things for this opening and I'm sifting through 100 candidates right now for our kindergarten position, it really is a disadvantage if they're coming in without any classroom internship field experience where they actually were the person in charge.

Elisa Calabrese: So, do we have a recommendation that we'd like to make concerning field experience, some type of internship for EPIs, for two reasons? One, because it seems to be good practice improving the quality of program – of the program.

And for the other that Ana mentioned because I run into this as well. Having that reciprocity with other states and that would also help our candidates that do graduate from an EPI program, that their certificate is valid in other states.

Lance Tomei: This is Lance. I got – I like to go back to something that Ana said very early in her conversation and that was that really she alluded to the fact that EPIs have morph into something that they weren't initially intended to be. When this first came on the scene, they were designed to lead only the professional certification – to the professional component of certification.

I've got to be careful about the semantics here because they did not – that would not grant a completer a professional certificate. A completer in the initial scope and vision for an EPI would have gotten a temporary certificate

and then would have much stronger mentoring in the school district during the first year or two of teaching. That was all that was designed to do.

That was how it was envisioned and that's how the field experience requirements were established. But when the certification rules change and these individuals could meet the subject area requirement by simply taking and passing an SAE and we're now in a position where virtually all EPI graduates are getting a professional certificate that significantly changed the scope of this route in ways that are – that are huge and have huge implications. I'll tell you that I understand this population may be different than what some people would call a traditional student and an ITP.

But I would argue that we have a lot of graduate level ITP programs out there; MATs and similar types of master's level programs that serve a virtually identical population to the EPI population. They're nontraditional people. Often career changers. Often in mid-career point. Leaving a higher paying job. All of the same types of descriptors that we saw and some of the comments that came in for EPIs are through a lot of the MAT candidates that we have.

But they have to go through all of the rigor of a normal ITP program including the field experience, the full student teaching. We do have an on-the-job version of that for those that are already in a classroom, which is often the case where they get hired in the middle of the program because districts are still looking for teachers and filling spots that they can't fill sometimes. So, these – like EPI candidates, these people already have a bachelor's degree.

So, they can't be hired to go in to a classroom even while they are still in training. So, I'm not sure that the distinction is here. What's markedly different is now the EPI people are also getting a professional certificate. And I think that's what's led to the – to the logical disconnect in the field experience requirements, the problems with reciprocity from state-to-state and the whole line yards.

So, I guess what I'm suggesting is there may be a bigger issue here and the bigger issue is should EPI graduates who just taken, pass an SAE be granted a

professional certificate or for production purposes should it be – should it be returned to its original scope and not result in a professional certificate. So, that that mentoring during the first year or two is still an assured thing. And I – this is something that EPI institutes probably ought to discuss what those who are working or have these programs in place and operational. What makes more sense for them?

My position is, if they're going to continue to get a professional certificate, then we absolutely need to raise a bar on the clinical components of the EPIs. But that may not be the only option is what I'm suggesting. There may be a different look at how we certify our people coming out of EPIs. That may be an alternative to raising the bar in clinical and just food for thought.

(Suzanne McKeton): And I agree – it's (Suzanne) again. I agree with you, Lance. My only concern with that is and back – you know, when back in the day when I was beginning teacher or mentor or support person, all of those programs were funded by the state to the districts for us to provide these beginning teacher programs, to provide this support for our new teachers, to provide the mentoring, to pay the mentor teachers.

I'm really nervous about that funding not being there and not being an additional burden being placed on the districts and the schools.

Lance Tomei: OK. Well, that's another real world consideration. So, I'm just suggesting that this is – this is not a trivial issue. I think there are more things coming in to play here than just the clinical component of EPI and isolation. I think there are other factors that are – that are playing in to this.

If the original vision of an EPI is no longer logistically or fiscally executable at the district level and then we have to ensure that the training is rigorous, so that they are hitting the districts and not in need of that extensive mentoring, then, I think absolutely we have to raise the bar on the clinical requirements for EPIs.

I'm very bothered by the fact that our MAT grads who are a very similar population have to go through a far more rigorous – well, I'm not – I mean, I'm getting those in the wrong direction. I'm not concerned that they have to

go through a far more rigorous preparation program. I am concerned that their counterparts and EPIs are going through a far less rigorous preparation program and what the implication of that is for how well we're serving the P-12 student population.

Vivian Posey: Julie, this is Vivian.

Julie Orange: Yes.

Vivian Posey: I have a – I have a recommendation. Would we at this point in the interest of time and because some of these issues seemed to be quite daunting, is there a possibility of going to the subcommittee route to just explore these issues a little further similar to what we've done with the site visit group or is it something we need to absolutely make a recommendation on today.

Eileen McDaniels: I'll have to jump in for Julie if you don't mind. I want to make a couple of comments about the EPIs. Number one, the EPIs came about back in around 2004 or so, 2003, 2004 to answer a need for teachers in the state and the – these laws 1004.85 was put in to place with a very – variety of options for educator preparation institute.

The third option that these institutions could allow was alternative certification that would lead to a professional certificate. So, if you're thinking that initially it was not intended for these completers to meet requirements for a professional certificate, the law was very specific that it would. What may have happened may be as Ana had described that the target audience was to be math and science or other post or other secondary subjects that we have critical need for teachers in those particular areas.

But as she described, there may be people from other fields that looked around for a subject area test they could sign. I wouldn't say that was a common practice. But it may have happened in some cases.

But the passing of a subject area exam as a way to meet master your subject area – of subject area came will before EPIs were on the board. They were back in 2002. So, to answer your question about, can we delay this, not as far

as making legislative recommendations to the commissioner that they need to be taken to the state board in October is no.

Again, we're looking for your recommendations and we'll look for recommend – I'm sure recommendation will come from other avenues other than TLPIC for teacher preparation programs including those who oversee educator preparation institute through the division of Florida colleges. You know, 200 general public will have some ideas.

I'm sure our EPI coordinators will have more ideas and we want to contribute towards what that legislative package will look like. But we do need your recommendations at this point of what you believe field experience is maybe whatever that might be.

Julie Orange: Operator, – I'm sorry, this is Julie. Could you unmute the line for Gloria Pelaez? She has been trying to be able to speak.

Operator: OK. One moment.

Julie Orange: Thank you.

Vivian Posey: Thank you, Eileen. I appreciate that.

Elisa Calabrese: Gloria, are you on?

(Adrienna McKeck): You know, while we wait for Gloria, this is (Adrienna), what I hear is that it seems like all of us would agree that there has to be field for EPI. The question is how intense is that field. Are we going to require EPIs to have the same requirements as ITPs or is the – are the field hours going to be less than what is currently required for our ITPs?

So, I think that's probably one of the biggest questions we have to hash out is what exactly – because I think all of us agree that they should have experienced before they, you know, get out there and actually practice. So, they should be in the classrooms.

Elisa Calabrese: Yes.

(Adrienna McKeck): The question is, for how long? How many hours? And are we going to hold them to the same level of intensity that is required per our field in the ITP program?

Elisa Calabrese: Yes.

Ana Blaine: I have a quick question. This is Ana. The rule for field experience for ITPs, that's for both the bachelor's level and the master's level (perks)?

Eileen McDaniels: That's correct.

Elisa Calabrese: Yes.

Ana Blaine: OK. I just want to quantify what a master's level is required to do. It's the same for both?

Eileen McDaniels: If it's their initial teacher preparation program, yes.

Elisa Calabrese: Yes, with our MATs, they also do a complete student teaching. The only latitude we get to those students as Lance said, if there are already out there practicing, we will allow them to complete those hours in their classrooms under supervision. But they still have to complete a full semester internship and also have all the field hours required with the courses prior to student teaching.

(Adrienna McKeck): I have a question. What does that mean under supervision?

Elisa Calabrese: Well, that they're being supervised by someone in the district like a cooperating teacher and they're also being supervised and observed on a regular basis by one of our faculty supervisors.

Eileen McDaniels: Yes, (Adrienna), that's what we do now with our EPI students that are employed.

(Adrienna McKeck): Yes.

Eileen McDaniels: In type of observations with them.

(Adrienna McKeck): Yes.

Eileen McDaniels: You know, when the faculty go out to their classroom, we just don't make them go to a different placement.

(Adrienna McKeck): Right.

Julie Orange: Eileen, I think where we're struggling here is that we really haven't sat down and discussed, I guess, what these – what the requirement would be. I don't know how we want to – I mean, I don't know how any of us can sit down and say it should be 200 hours, it should be a six-week or a 15-week internship. I think that's what everybody kind of wants to, you know, (maul) this over a little bit. But I know that we are ruining short on time.

Eileen McDaniels: And your recommendation maybe that you want to increase the hours or to maybe even just to examine this. I mean, this a long process, anyway, in order to say that here's what the law may need to say. But you may be able to address this in the rule as well. You understand?

So, you – maybe today you're saying or today you're going to come to a conclusion that you are wanting to make a recommendation that is it the length of time or you're talking about the substance of what is in that field experience that that needs to be agreed upon as well because it is – is it about the length of time?

Elisa Calabrese: No.

Eileen McDaniels: Or is it about what is in within that field experience or what kind of field experience that you are anticipating.

(Debbie Cook): I think that – and this is (Debbie). I think it's also about having some kind of standard across the state. I mean, right now, there is nothing that's standard about any of it. And, for me, as I'm listening to folks, it's about a more standardized process if our ITPs have a standard across the state.

I'm thinking that our recommendation is that we have a way to at least standardize a minimum expectation for field experiences in those programs.

Jasmine Ulmer: This is Jasmine. (Debbie), I agree with you. I think that's exactly it. I think this is perhaps an opportunity to standardize.

Julie Orange: This is (inaudible) consistency.

(Debbie Cook): I'm going to go ahead and make a recommendation. What we add a common meeting internship to EPI. What it looks like, I don't know yet. But I think that that's where – that's what's most powerful was that it happens at presentation of (inaudible) and that.

Elisa Calabrese: Are we talking about prior to employment?

(Debbie Cook): For those who are not employed. Correct. And it – you know, Elisa, the way I'm looking at it, let's say, you know, this becomes a six-credit course in our EPI program.

Sorry, I have children yelling in the background. Six-credit course that the students take, that they must complete all of the other courses just like we do with ITP. If they have to complete all their courses, we require that they complete all of their exams prior to internship and that this is a culminating experience where they take over the class.

What that looks like the hours whether we want to do a six-week or, you know – or I have it looked just like the ITPs were all it says as they culminating 10 to 15. So, if we call it a culminating six weeks, then each EPI program will, you know, design their own internship.

Elisa Calabrese: Well, that's a whole other issue, I guess. So, that is – that's your recommendation. Have a culminating internship to the EPI prior to completing the program.

(Debbie Cook): Yes or culminating field experience I think is what language is for ITP.

Eileen McDaniels: OK. But – for ITPs, it says that's culminating experience no less than 10 weeks in duration.

(Debbie Cook): Right. That's what I'm talking about when you noticed at that time.

Eileen McDaniels: I know. I know. But, I mean, if we want equality across this program, then it was logical to say that they also would need a culminating experience with no less than 26 weeks duration.

So, that's another recommendation of culminating experience?

Female: I'm sorry. Hi, guys. Can somebody repeat the last thing that hey said?

Eileen McDaniels: Have a culminating field experience through the EPI. And then, the second recommendation was add a culminating field experience to an EPI that would be not less than 10 weeks.

Female: OK. I agree.

Vivian Posey: This is Vivian. I'd like to just add I've been – I was very struck by Ana's discussion about the difficulty that the EPI can certainly have at expense of others when they go out and seek employment. And representing the university I – from the college point of view, I wonder if we have a moral obligation not only to the children in the classroom but also to the students that we educate and turn out into (inaudible).

So, for preparing them to become teachers, we're actually not providing – to be able for them to become employers, I don't feel that we're accepting diversity in our college students that are going through EPI programs very well and I would suggest that we not just make it – leave it very vague that it'd be consistent, that it stayed within the law, that is currently there, that that 10 weeks should be the minimum and it should be – EPI program should be consistent across the states. So, we know what products we have and what we're turning out.

Eileen McDaniels: OK.

Gloria Pelaez: Can I say something? This is Gloria. I think it's – I agree with that 100 percent.

I want to congratulate Ana because I couldn't talk before. I was almost having a heart attack. You know how hard it is for me to be silent. So.

Eileen McDaniels: We're finding out who we need to pay for that, Gloria.

Gloria Pelaez: Oh my good. Oh, bad one. OK.

Eileen McDaniels: Just kidding.

Gloria Pelaez: I know. But I also think it's important when we do this and obviously I'm going to – I'm going to ask Eileen to help me understand this better. But one of the things that were said that concerns me and it's been on my priority of concerns is we're diluting the Florida brand of certification because more and more states are questioning the validity of our certificate.

So, if we do this and make sure that the EPI has at least a 10-week student teaching experience, then we can say that they did complete a state-approved program and that they did have an internship which would then fair well for certification.

Eileen McDaniels: Right. That's what Ana is trying to say.

Gloria Pelaez: Right.

Eileen McDaniels: I just like to – I just like to give perspective and I am a strong advocate of (inaudible). However, I do believe there needs to be that hands-on clinical experience as senior from a district perspective. And I think if we focus on the kids, whether you're through traditional prep or need or any type of alt cert, you're focused on the kids. The preparation to work with those children is critical.

Gloria Pelaez: Absolutely.

Eileen McDaniels: And hands-on component is critical. So, if we focused on the kids, there might be various programs, different types of programs, differentiate a programs but the kids, those are – that's the consistent theme here. Those kids in the classroom.

Gloria Pelaez: Right.

Eileen McDaniels: And that's why the prep program has to meet the needs of those children.

Gloria Pelaez: I think we're all in agreement there.

Female: Yes.

Eileen McDaniels: Yes. OK. So, we have a recommendation for EPI that we should add a culminating field experience of no less than 10 weeks to the program correct?

Gloria Pelaez: Yes. Second.

Eileen McDaniels: I guess someone should make that motion then, Gloria.

Gloria Pelaez: OK. I move.

Eileen McDaniels: Anyone disagree or further comments?

(Debbie Cook): I'm with you 100 percent, Gloria. This is (Debbie).

Eileen McDaniels: Me too.

Gloria Pelaez: Thank you.

Eileen McDaniels: OK. That's the recommendation we have for field experience for EPIs.

Female: That's absolutely OK to me.

Eileen McDaniels: Now, I think that the more important question would be, I think we're on page – slide 15 is that, what should the field experience look like? Are we – are we going to state that it looks very similar or similar exactly the way it is – it is worked out with the traditional initial teacher prep program? Is that we're trying to do?

Gloria Pelaez: Well, it depends because sometimes you have – is there a case where an EPI steward in such and probably teaching while completing an EPI?

Eileen McDaniels: Yes. Yes, Gloria, we talked about that. They tend to (inaudible) ...

Gloria Pelaez: (Inaudible).

Eileen McDaniels:... their “internship in their own classroom,” OK?

Gloria Pelaez: OK. So, are we saying that we would not allow that?

Eileen McDaniels:No.

Female: We should allow it.

Vivian Posey: Yes. This is Vivian. I think we should allow it, but I think it should be allowed (inaudible). (It’s the representation).

We need – we know – those students need to be supervised with a (cooperating) teacher and they need to be observed for our faculty. (Inaudible) ...

Gloria Pelaez: I agree. I agree with that.

Vivian Posey: Seminars. Yes.

Gloria Pelaez: I agree with that 100 percent.

Elisa Calabrese: OK.

Gloria Pelaez: I just want – I would not like to see us go that they could not be teaching. But the first 10 weeks, they need to be supervised with formal observations like a fifth week after formal observation and the whole nine yards, absolutely.

Elisa Calabrese: Right. Which is getting into the following slides, which is good. But we – do we – we do need to go back to slide 15, which is addressing ITPs specifically.

Ana Blaine: OK.

Elisa Calabrese: We need – is there any need for more specificity regarding the minimum amount of field experience prior to the culminating experience for ITPs. Is there anything?

Ana Blaine: No. Elisa, this is what you were asking. The way – the way that the language leads.

Elisa Calabrese: Yes.

Ana Blaine: The only thing ITPs are required to do is a culminating experience of at least 10 weeks. It does not say, you know, what – how many hours they have to do prior to that. So, if they have to do a junior internship that some programs have, nothing else.

So, the way that we just work an (ended) language for EPI completely matches ITP and I guess that Eileen is saying is the next question is that we now had to go ITPs.

Elisa Calabrese: No. The next – OK, can you repeat that, Ana?

Eileen McDaniels: Ana, can I just make this a little bit simpler for us to make sure that we all understand what the slide is really saying.

Elisa Calabrese: Yes.

Eileen McDaniels: It's talking about we're now switching over back over to ITPs.

Elisa Calabrese: Yes.

Eileen McDaniels: Right now, there is no specificity in the law or rule about what those field experiences are relaying for them or what they are about prior to that 10-week experience, that final culminating experience. Does the committee feel there is a need to specify that in previous discussions and previous meetings? There has been talk about because it's all over the place of each institution, each program, we have varying requirement for those three final culminating experience.

Do you – does the committee want to make any recommendations about that type of field experience? And if they don't, that's fine. But that's worked on the table at this point.

Gloria Pelaez: Eileen, what is the variance between institutions when it comes to field experience? For example, is everybody doing this minimum suggestive 15-hour per method course?

Eileen McDaniels: No, not necessarily because there is no specification or a rule that everybody needs to do that.

You are talking about the pre-experience for this, that is correct?

Gloria Pelaez: Yes, I'm talking pre-experience but for example, for (ISO) you need 15 hours.

Eileen McDaniels: Yes, and then there is just not a – there is no specificity there for all the course study, it will vary across program sometimes ...

Gloria Pelaez: Right, no, I understand that, I have done enough (folio) reviews and site visits ...

Eileen McDaniels: Right.

Gloria Pelaez: But for example, in every place that I have worked, including (Barry), (FAU), Miami Dade and UM, field experience are usually at least 15 hours per method course. And they have to be continued and they have to be in diverse setting for us in Miami, that would be suburban and urban, I mean high needs schools or (deans) school.

All our methods courses have 15 hours required.

Eileen McDaniels: And those are – again, local decisions ...

Gloria Pelaez: Correct.

Eileen McDaniels: And what we are, again, saying here is do you want the law, we should get to the rule later, do you want the law to be specific about that? Or do you want to remain silent as it certainly is.

(Debbie Lucas): Eileen, this is (Debbie), I'm just wondering if there is a reason that we would need to standardize something, if the language says that field experiences need to happen and then there is a culminating internship, if it ain't broke, don't try to fix it. It is kind of sort of what I'm wondering because it seems to me that could take us down an entirely new path that would take us, again, a lot of discussion, and I don't know, not that I mind that but I'm just wondering if we are more concerned that there is a quality internship or as an internship

experience at the end of the program, maybe that could be sufficient for now.
I don't know.

Eileen McDaniels: And the only reason that is on the table today is it was – in your little mini meetings that we had ...

(Debbie Lucas): Right.

Eileen McDaniels: (Inaudible) meetings, this came up which was more of a backup on the table I guess ...

(Debbie Lucas): OK, got it.

Eileen McDaniels: For the talk about field experiences.

(Debbie Lucas): Right, got it. Thank you.

Gloria Pelaez: Well, I would like to suggest, this is Gloria that we keep it like it says now. And I do believe the current language of the rule provides enough guidance to the institution. And let us be honest, most of us are culminating experience is a whole semester, it's not 10 weeks.

Eileen McDaniels: Right.

Female: And let me ...

Female: (Inaudible).

Female: (Inaudible).

Gloria Pelaez: Our internship, our student teaching semester is 16 weeks.

Female: You know, at some point in the future, as a group of folks who watch the data, I mean once we get this work done, if we continue to see over time, that there seems to be data that shows that those with some specific characteristics and a field experience do better than others. We may want to revisit the language at that point when we have actually got data to show us that it might not be a bad idea.

Gloria Pelaez: Right.

Female: In the interim, maybe that as we do our reviews, the quality and caliber of field experiences maybe some of the things that kick a university into a higher commendation, I don't know.

Gloria Pelaez: OK, the only thing I would say is to make field experience align with the course content. In other words, that are meaningful.

(Adrienna McKeck): Well, I think that is all right, this is (Adrienna), I think that is already occurring. My only concern with these field experiences, and our here at FIU, they run the – our students must go out easily over 200 hours and since I'm remembering the numbers, 225 numbers to field prior to student teaching.

Gloria Pelaez: Yes.

(Adrienna McKeck): And they go from observation which is in that (inaudible) ed class, OK, to higher levels of mastery in terms of responsibility, working with students or even teaching a group of students and collecting data on those students, primarily to show impact also and then in the message courses, to demonstrate what the content is that they are learning and that they can teach it so I wouldn't want institutions to have field experience and all the students do is go out there and stand in the back of the classroom and observe.

Gloria Pelaez: Agree, thank you. That is exactly what I meant. Thank you, (Adrienna).

(Adrienna McKeck): So I don't know if that is something we want to add to this that, you know, they should be progressive in terms of the requirement for the students and that they should definitely be aligned with the content on the course.

Gloria Pelaez: Right, our (inaudible) to observe in the first – in the (Inter to Ed).

(Adrienna McKeck): Right.

Gloria Pelaez: And then from then on, their guided field experiences link to the course assignments and then they have to do one on one with the student and then a small group until they take over the class and the student teaching semester.

(Adrienna McKeck): Right.

Gloria Pelaez: So it's very – you know, it's very developmentally appropriate for our pre-service teachers.

(Adrienna McKeck): And that is how – and my opinion, that is how it should be, development progressed in terms of field development.

Lance Tomei: This is Lance and I – can I jump in over the comments too?

Female: Hey, Lance.

Lance Tomei: I agree with Gloria's basic statements that we have got enough guidance right now, the current requirement for ITP is a minimum of three field experiences including the final student teaching in varied school settings. And that has been the current continued program approval standards.

So we got – we know what the minimum expectation is now. I think that the entire profession is moving in the direction of enhanced clinical experiences, is where we need to go and I think the fact that everybody is going to try and move in that direction is you can almost count on that. So I don't know that we need to do anything to incentivize that.

I am concerned that if we get too prescriptive about how those field experiences need to be structured, that we may restrict innovative approaches to educate the preparation and I think we may be better served by allowing sufficient flexibility in terms of the design of the (clinical) experience as long as we set the minimum parameters and kind of like what we have now. Let different programs try different things. Let us find out what works best and share that as a profession so that we can learn what really works and I don't want to tie people's hands as to how they go about.

Female: Right.

Lance Tomei: We are doing innovative things at UCF, and we use our teach live simulator to do virtual clinical experience as in some of our courses, we do Skype observations, we do placements at Florida Virtual School, there are a lot of

things going on and we are not the only one that is doing innovative things in the clinical arena. I don't want to do something that would prevent people from trying to be innovative in expanding our ability to incorporate clinical experiences into the educator preparation.

So I'm just hoping we won't be overly prescriptive here.

Female: Thank you ...

Female: (Inaudible).

Female: Great.

Female: That is – I agree, I definitely agree. I don't think that the filed experience need further regulations, I think that we have enough regulation as it is and I think we would just not be recognizing the value of our university personnel and really, how much they do work to align the clinical experiences with the courses at this time.

So I agree, let us leave that one alone.

Elisa Calabrese: OK, so everyone is in agreement to leave the field experience alone for ITP?

Eileen McDaniels: Correct.

Elisa Calabrese: OK.

Eileen McDaniels: All right I'm going to move on to slide 16 and we are going to now get in to faculty qualifications and field experience requirements for logistics personnel requirements on slide 16 and 17, and on these slides, on slide 16, the lost (inaudible) faculty qualifications for those who supervise fields and clinical experiences.

So for ITPs, the law is (inaudible) the program faculty meet state mandated requirements for supervision of field clinical experiences as is states on this slide and they must have one of the following clinical supervision training or a valid Florida professional teaching certificate or at least three years of successful PK-12 teaching experience.

And the (ETIs) in their law, the program faculty must have a minimum of a master's degree in education or a related field and document PK-12 teaching experience in order to be with – that faculty qualification. And that is in order to teach their assigned courses and then for (GACTs), there are no requirements and statutes to rules, all training conducted (inaudible) a school district personnel.

So I now am going to move on to slide 17, so we can talk about both of these together and this slide, we are addressing now what are the requirements for school district personnel who are supervising people who are in or – candidates who are in field experiences or their clinical experiences for ITPs and (ETIs) and the law requires school district personnel meet state mandated requirements for supervision of field clinical experiences.

Then it goes on to stay what those requirements are, they must have – they must be – most of these requirements, they must have evidence of what are called clinical educators training and the second one is they must successfully demonstrate the effective classroom management strategies that consistently result in improved student performance.

For (GACT), there – the law requires that a program must include experienced peer mentors that work with these teachers and these teachers are the teacher of records but they must have a mentor that is assigned to them that is working with – and then each district, their mentors must have a clinical educator training.

Gloria Pelaez: Eileen, do the mentors then in the DCP have clin ed?

Eileen McDaniels: Yes, they do.

Gloria Pelaez: OK, great. Thank you.

Female: Why isn't the ITP and (EPI) the same for the faculty qualifications? I don't see clin ed training for the (EPI). Do they have to have the clin ed too, Eileen?

Eileen McDaniels: No – the faculty qualifications, and just tell you what is required that is – are you talking about faculty?

Female: Yes, talking about the faculty.

Eileen McDaniels: In the law, in the current law, it only specified what their faculty qualifications are for teaching the courses, it doesn't talk about their faculty qualification for supervising the field experiences. Remember, when we talked about the (inaudible) there was ...

Female: Right, right, right ...

Eileen McDaniels: (Inaudible) in the law, a very brief statement about ...

Female: Yes.

Eileen McDaniels: (Inaudible) ...

Female: Yes, I see.

Female: (Inaudible) getting into those qualifications.

Female: Yes, got it. Got it.

Gloria Pelaez: But don't you think if the recommendation or required (EPI) go for 10 weeks, then whoever supervises those ten weeks needs to at least clin ed train?

Eileen McDaniels: I agree, Gloria.

Gloria Pelaez: OK. I just think we need to keep that in the back burner. If we are going to increase our requirements for (EPI), then whatever goes hand in hand with the faculty qualifications need to be parallel.

Female: Yes, I agree. And I would make (inaudible) effect.

Elisa Calabrese: So there is a recommendation.

Female: Yes.

Elisa Calabrese: OK.

Female: Yes.

Elisa Calabrese: That supervisors in EPI need to have clinical ed training..

Gloria Pelaez: Or let us use the same language.

Female: The same language.

Elisa Calabrese: OK.

Gloria Pelaez: That program faculty meets state mandated requirements for supervision of field clinical experiences. That is exactly what it says on slide 16.

Elisa Calabrese: OK.

Eileen McDaniels: Which means that there would be one of those three requirements, what you are saying.

Female: Yes.

Gloria Pelaez: Yes.

Female: You mean you (inaudible) ...

Female: (Inaudible) enough.

Female: And what does this mean for EPI program faculty are qualified to teach their assigned courses but I'm not sure what that means, that it doesn't have that in ITP. Right. That is what we are saying, is that their EPI – the language should be exactly the same as for ITP for the faculty qualifications. Because that is very vague and (inaudible) the faculty are qualified to teach (inaudible) we all have to be (inaudible).

Female: (Inaudible).

Female: We all have to be ...

Female: We all have to have the credentials to (inaudible).

Gloria Pelaez: One of the problems with the EPI, I can tell you is, and Ana, please feel free to comment here. When we are talking about faculty qualifications that accrediting body that really looks at this facts ...

Female: All right.

Gloria Pelaez: Right? Since we are all accredited in Florida by (STACKS) and one of the problems that some of the communities before the community colleges were facing that they might have had faculty that were qualified to teach a course but they didn't meet the (STACK) criteria which is taking credit in a (inaudible) unless you have a terminal degree.

Ana Blaine: So I think the difference here is that I believe and I could be wrong, when it comes to the (NAC GPIs) that are under the non-institutional credit model, (inaudible).

Gloria Pelaez: OK, got it.

Ana Blaine: However, we need to (inaudible) level with there is a requirement for EPI faculty that is not under (inaudible) that is difficult for our faculty and (inaudible) on faculty (inaudible) ...

Eileen McDaniels: Ana, you are breaking up.

Ana Blaine: There is a procurement for EPI and the faculty must have a teaching experience.

Gloria Pelaez: And Ana, there is – hold on, I'm on my phone cellphone.

Ana Blaine: They have to have documented (inaudible) faculty for (inaudible) ...

Eileen McDaniels: You are breaking up, Ana.

Ana Blaine: Sorry.

All right, I will try this way. EPI faculty qualifications require documented teaching experience and we have gone back and forth with the state on what this means and ...

Eileen McDaniels:I was told it meant K-12.

Ana Blaine: Right, so they told us and had to be you know, like a one year in K12 teaching, we have faculty ...

Gloria Pelaez: One year?

Ana Blaine: A minimum. Wait, Gloria, we have faculty and there are faculty in ITP programs that have never talked, they got their masters in education, they got their PhD in education and they started teaching at their institution right away, and that is OK for the ITP program but it is not for an EPI program.

So I'm also, are – you also struggle with the different language between ITP faculty and EPI faculty, I would like all of its (match) and we come up with what it is and what a qualified educator you know, faculty looks like.

Gloria Pelaez: Well, that is why we like that – at least in my institution, we like the way that it is – clinical ed, valid teaching certificate or three years successful PK12 because I do have colleagues at U.M. that teach a method course and they never taught but ...

Ana Blaine: Correct.

Gloria Pelaez: But the clin ed course, is a three credit course, I mean, it is a big deal at U.M. and so it is taken care of. Plus the two people that are thinking about – are in school all day because that is where the research is, in the classroom. So they might have not taught but they are there and now with the clin ed, and they found it very valuable.

Ana Blaine: Yes, I don't know if that works. And then we have – the (recency) requirement for ITP but not for EPI. Am I correct, Eileen, there is no (recency) requirements for EPI?

Eileen McDaniels:That is correct.

Ana Blaine: So there is a lot of ...

Gloria Pelaez: Remember, guys, you need to look at the history, OK? The EPI was a very special deal.

Ana Blaine: Right.

Female: OK.

Gloria Pelaez: A very, very special deal. And we don't have the time to go into the history and the policy.

Female: Right.

Female: It is beautiful.

Female: (Inaudible).

Female: (Inaudible) ITPs.

Elisa Calabrese: Right, what I'm hearing is that – Ana, you are stating, and I believe Gloria is saying this but it should be the same faculty qualifications for an ITP and for an EPI.

Ana Blaine: Yes, and I don't think that that will hurt EPIs at all. Because like I said, there is one extra requirement for faculty for EPI that makes it harder which is that we don't have the (or) choice that the ITP programs have.

Female: Right, well maybe they should have the (or) choice.

Female: (Inaudible), something really big.

Female: (Inaudible).

Gloria Pelaez: If we don't – excuse me, if we don't have the (or) choice, we all have to close.

Elisa Calabrese: Yes. OK.

Gloria Pelaez: OK, hello.

Elisa Calabrese: (Inaudible) and you know, that is very important if you are going to be trained as a physician, you certainly don't want someone who is only had the theory and never had to work in an emergency room.

Gloria Pelaez: Girl, I taught for 17 years in Dade County public schools, you are preaching to the choir.

Elisa Calabrese: OK.

Lance Tomei: Hey, Elisa?

Elisa Calabrese: Yes.

Lance Tomei: This is Lance and Gloria hit the nail on the head when she said that the basic faculty qualifications I don't think needs to be part of our conversation because regional accrediting agency has set the bar very high and it is the same across the board. So I don't think that we have to worry about that.

If you look at slide 16, the caption says field experience requirements but that is not really what is listed there under EPI. That is basic faculty qualifications and I'm not sure we need to go there. So ...

Gloria Pelaez: I don't either, I think we should take that out.

Lance Tomei: Yes, the recommendation that we heard earlier that we just say that the current requirements for ITP programs also be applied to EPI for field experience requirements, for clinical faculty, I think that is where the dust ought to settle on this.

Elisa Calabrese: Yes. All right, do we have an agreement?

Gloria Pelaez: Yes.

Eileen McDaniels: Yes.

Elisa Calabrese: Any naysayers?

Gloria Pelaez: I love this committee.

Eileen McDaniels: Gloria, you just like that we love these talks ...

Elisa Calabrese: All right, so the field experience requirement for the clinical faculty qualifications will be the same for ITP and EPI. Correct?

Gloria Pelaez: Yes.

Female: Yes.

Lance Tomei: Correct.

Elisa Calabrese: I have a comment about DACP. I know there are no requirements but I think that if there is – and actually, I am jumping ahead. I'm talking about school district, forgive me. All right. I won't go there now.

All right so for the faculty, it is going to be the same for ITP and EPI. And there is no faculty for DACP.

Gloria Pelaez: No.

Lance Tomei: Correct.

Elisa Calabrese: OK.

Gloria Pelaez: Excuse me, I will make sure, we are going to use the language that is currently being used for ITP.

Female: Yes.

Elisa Calabrese: Yes. And we are probably going to apply that to EPI.

Gloria Pelaez: Right.

Elisa Calabrese: OK.

All right, field experience requirements, school district personnel. Slide 17.

I have a comment ...

Lance Tomei: I do have a question on this for DOE.

Elisa Calabrese: Yes?

Lance Tomei: I'm concerned about the second bullet under the requirements for ITP and EPI only because they are so subjective and vague to me ...

Eileen McDaniels: Yes.

Lance Tomei: I'm demonstrating effective classroom management, what exactly does that mean?

Eileen McDaniels: It is usually ...

Lance Tomei: Result in improved student performance, what metric is going to be used to – as evidence ...

Gloria Pelaez: Number one, we can pick that ...

Lance Tomei: Here is ...

Gloria Pelaez: We can pick that from the school districts.

Lance Tomei: Here is my suggestion here. If we can – if we have access to faculty evaluations, can we not simplify this by saying that these school district personnel and we could apply these to the peer mentors, where DACPs must have the most recent and I don't know – whether we say one year or two years evaluation is they must have been rated as effective or highly effective.

Would that not solve the problem and make it much more objective and clear?

Elisa Calabrese: It all ...

Gloria Pelaez: (Inaudible) ...

Elisa Calabrese: You know, it all depends what district is used for the DACP, I know in our district, we use retired teacher mentors. Thus, they would not have that recent evaluation data.

Gloria Pelaez: And also, in my district, and I mean the district that we serve, that data is private and confidential by union rules.

Elisa Calabrese: And for one year.

Gloria Pelaez: (Inaudible).

Elisa Calabrese: I believe after one year, that it becomes a part of public record.

Gloria Pelaez: Right.

Elisa Calabrese: And I'm not exactly ...

Female: And the other issue that we have is that ...

Gloria Pelaez: (Inaudible).

Female: (Inaudible).

Gloria Pelaez: (Inaudible) that information in Miami, OK.

Female: (Inaudible) is that we don't place our students, the district places them for us.

Female: Correct.

Elisa Calabrese: Right.

Female: We give them the information of what we would require but there is really no way for us to verify if those requirements are correct.

(Adrienna McKeck): No, but in the contract, this is (Adrienna), in the contract, this is (Adrienna), in the contract that is signed by the principal or the assistant principal, it is – at least our contract could be (inaudible) that they must successfully demonstrate effective classroom management strategy so the

school leader of – in those schools, have to certify that the teacher, the cooperating teacher does meet that requirement.

Female: Right.

Female: We have you know, articulation agreements with our universities, colleges, and ...

Eileen McDaniels: You're right, you're right. We do.

(Adrienna McKeck): We have, you know, articulation agreements with our universities ...

Female: Right.

(Adrienna McKeck): Colleges ...

Female: You're right, you're right.

(Adrienna McKeck): ... has that statement in there.

Female: Yes, we do too.

(Adrienna McKeck): Yes.

Female: Whether they abide by them, I'm not sure.

(Adrienna McKeck): No, I know, but I think (inaudible) ...

Female: I think ...

Female: We can hold them professionally accountable.

Elisa Calabrese: They are held accountable. Now the other thing with the requirements I would say, why do none of these teachers have to have any experience, I mean, could they be placed with a first year teacher? No. I mean, I think that there should be at least three years of experience – teaching experience possibly required here ...

Female: Doesn't it say clin ed training?

Elisa Calabrese: It says clin ed training.

Female: But remember, when clin ed was started ...

Female: Three years, right.

Gloria Pelaez: You would have to have three years so that is no longer true and the trouble with our district is clin ed is no longer being offered.

Female: Well and (inaudible) ...

Gloria Pelaez: Eileen, didn't that rule change? It used to be you have to be teaching for three years before you could (inaudible) clin ed training?

Female: Yes.

Female: Yes.

Gloria Pelaez: And that rule has changed?

Eileen McDaniels: If there is no rule or law that says specifically that they have to have three years of teaching experience in order to complete clinical educator training, that was a recommendation by the state but the district could override that in say less than that.

Gloria Pelaez: OK, we are having a crisis in (inaudible) that a lot of districts are not offering clin ed ...

Ana Blaine: I know, we are having that too. So if that is the issue, what is the ...

Elisa Calabrese: Well, we are – we are going to do an online as well component – a blended component and so ...

Ana Blaine: Why don't we (inaudible) experience then if we are having – I don't know, or add the experience part to it, is the – if we can't guarantee three years if they are clinic ed trained.

Eileen McDaniels: Yes. That would be my recommendation is to add at least three years successful PK-12 teaching experience for the district by ...

Gloria Pelaez: Or clin ed, can we put or ...

Eileen McDaniels: (Inaudible) 12.

Ana Blaine: I would like an or. We are having ...

Female: I think And.

Ana Blaine: ... we are struggling with our clin ed.

Female: I mean I would say an And but if we – and I'm OK with the or.

Gloria Pelaez: I would love to put the or.

Eileen McDaniels: Remember the purpose for clin ed training though is provide them beyond being a successful classroom teachers, whether the additional skills needed to oversee the supervision of a person in the classroom.

Ana Blaine: Eileen, can you clarify something, this is something that we have – I know we have discussed in the past.

We are saying that any student that goes into a classroom and is being supervised by a classroom teacher whether it be for a 15-hour method course of for their culminating experience, they have to have clin ed training.

Eileen McDaniels: Yes.

Female: They are supposed to but it is very difficult to always get for field ...

Female: That is what I'm saying ...

Female: Yes, yes.

Ana Blaine: I'm going to be – I'm going to be flat out honest, I can guarantee that our 75 plus students that go out each semester to do their 75 plus hours are not being placed with clin ed trained teacher.

Gloria Pelaez: They don't have enough, they died off.

Female: They don't have enough off ...

Gloria Pelaez: You don't know how (close) the training is.

Female: (Inaudible).

Ana Blaine: And the teachers are begging for training and the district cannot afford to have it ...

Elisa Calabrese: All right, (inaudible) ...

Gloria Pelaez: The training is outdated.

Female: Right.

Elisa Calabrese: Are we distinguishing between field experience and the internship?

Ana Blaine: No. Any ...

Gloria Pelaez: No. It is the rule.

Female: (Inaudible) ...

Female: (Inaudible).

Female: In the rule ...

Female: Yes.

Female: ... any field which is impossible to comply with.

Female: Yes. Now with students teaching, you know, yes, we do but with fields, very difficult.

Lance Tomei: If we go back and look at slide 16 for a second, and look at the second bullet under ITP, we could do a slight modification to those criteria that might be appropriate for supervising teachers.

And I would suggest that would be clinical supervision or a valid professional teaching certificate with at least three years of successful PK-12 teaching experience.

Eileen McDaniels: I agree.

Female: Yes.

Gloria Pelaez: Let's do it.

Lance Tomei: Find those (inaudible) ...

Female: Yes.

Female: Can you repeat that, Lance?

Female: Yes ...

Lance Tomei: I'm saying clinical supervision training or a valid professional teaching certificate would at least with your successful PK-12 teaching experience.

Female: Right.

Female: (Inaudible).

Female: (Inaudible).

Female: Yes.

Female: OK. (Inaudible).

Female: (Inaudible).

Female: (Inaudible) or and then an and after the comma instead of an or.

Gloria Pelaez: Correct.

Female: (Inaudible).

Elisa Calabrese: Yes, I think if we are talking about all fields, I think we would start to put that or in there.

Gloria Pelaez: Absolutely.

Female: You know, and I mean, and when it comes to our – you know, our (easel) component, they have to have (easel) endorsement or a reading endorsement if we are looking at the reading component so it gets real sticky in there when we get – if they have to have clinical training.

Eileen McDaniels: This is for the school district personnel.

Female: Correct.

Female: Yes.

Lance Tomei: That's correct, and the reason in want to combine those last two criterion for the school faculty is so that you don't get someone that straight out of school with a professional teaching certificate ...

Female: (Inaudible).

Lance Tomei: ... supervising. So they would have to have either clinical supervisor training or the professional certificate would at least three years. So there is only two options here, not three options ...

Gloria Pelaez: The people in higher ed, can I ask you a question. Do you provide any orientation for your supervisors in the field as to our forms, et cetera?

Lance Tomei: Yes.

Female: Yes.

Lance Tomei: Yes.

Female: Yes.

Gloria Pelaez: Because that I think is something important that we share with the state and with the people in our group, who are we with districts because we all do this

and it is also a way of teaching how we want our students to be observed and (inaudible) feedback is (valid) and so I think that is important that we share that. Because we all do it.

Vivian Posey: Yes, we – this is Vivian, can I just jump in with just a thought about this clinical training. Just as many of you have found these challenges with clinical, I have had that challenge as well with locating enough teachers who are ready to supervise who have the clinical training and there a variety of reasons why it is not as prevalent as it once was and easily accessible.

However, I think if we just put a clinical – a clinical supervision training or – and the rest of that, we may be diluting the importance of the clinical training and sending a message to the state that we don't see the value to it when indeed, there are skills in that clinical training that the supervising teacher absolutely does need to be an effective observer and supervisor of these teaching intern.

So it is preferable to have the clinical training but again, like you, I don't want to tie our hands to that but I do think we should not just be so readily letting that go. That is a very important component of what an effective observer and supervisor does.

Gloria Pelaez: However, Vivian, I think we agreed but we also need to understand that the current materials that are available are very outdated and there is a lot more research out there about you know, directed feedback and the reflective loop that is missing in the trainee. So I think we need it but we also need to be flexible.

Vivian Posey: Let us make that a recommendation and I still agree with you that, yes, the whole process of (inaudible) and providing feedback has definitely changed and improved but then we are not – if we are putting our interns into those situations where – they are with people that don't have those skills, then we may not be doing the best job that we can for the teaching interns that we want to be ready to go so maybe our recommendation is to take a look at clinical and really try to lobby that we get a stronger clinical component and something that is more research based and more current.

Female: Vivian, we have made those recommendations several times at (inaudible) day and this is (more) years and we are not talking about our interns, I will say that we do not place any of our interns with any district personnel that have not gone to the clin ed, we are really more talking about the (inaudible), you know, the 10 hours here, the 15 hours here that (inaudible) ...

Female: Correct.

Female: That it is impossible to always get teachers that have gone through that clin ed to work with our field students or students that are out in the field.

(Debbie Lucas): Hi, this is (Debbie) and I just want to say that I thought that is what we are talking about when we were talking about the sort of less restrictive thing, I thought you were limiting that to your field experiences and we ...

Female: (Inaudible).

(Debbie Lucas): With your internships, you were going – we were going to be making the recommendation that we continue to have a little bit more stringent policy there with that teacher needing clin educating, clin ed training. That is what I was under the impression.

Gloria Pelaez: Well, (Debbie), I think where we are all under that impression. They are – if only for field experience, not for the culminating internship.

(Debbie Lucas): Right.

Gloria Pelaez: OK, good.

(Debbie Lucas): That is what I would like to see. I also know that we are working or not we, the imperial we, I know that FDOE is working very diligently to unroll in the not too distant future, an improved clin ed process that will, I think, address some of the things that the committees worry about.

Female: We have been waiting for it for quite some time.

(Debbie Lucas): Be patient.

Female: I am very patient ...

Elisa Calabrese: Can I ask a question, Eileen, this is just for field experience requirements for faculty that are involved in this clinical experience? That's it?

Eileen McDaniels: Yes.

Gloria Pelaez: This is (inaudible) for school district personnel ...

Elisa Calabrese: OK, but let me go back to (slide 16). This is only for slide 16, this is for the requirement for those involved in field experience or any type of clinical that will exist – field/clinical experience and so that includes field and internship and so I mean we may want to change the language here.

Female: I think we need to.

Eileen McDaniels: Let me tell you what the law says. The law specifically says all school district personnel and (instructional) personnel who supervise or direct teacher preparation during field experience courses or in (inaudible) must have evidence of – must have evidence of – OK.

Female: So we – so are we recommending to change that to say that only the culminating field experience has the clinical requirements and all other field experiences have clinical or a professional certificate with three years teaching experience.

Gloria Pelaez: Correct.

Elisa Calabrese: Anyone in disagreement?

Eileen McDaniels: OK, are we ready to move on?

Elisa Calabrese: I think so.

Female: Yes.

Elisa Calabrese: (Inaudible) are you there?

Female: I am.

Elisa Calabrese: OK.

Eileen McDaniels: OK, so we are off to – getting us (inaudible) the (box) now and so I'm just going to quickly go through the rest of these slides and the next section that we are talking about are – the discussions that the committee had about what are called the other elements of the uniform core curriculum and what you are likely to keep.

You are likely to keep much of what was some of us there and some of us there and some of it you said was repetitive because it is already included in the Florida educator accomplished practices.

So looking at the slide 18, you had said previously that A, higher level mathematic concept and instruction for K-12 students, which is only required for some programs as listed on this slide. That and the committee also – they wanted to keep E, information on the state system of school improvement and accountability, and J, educational law.

We will stop to talk about these (after), let me just go through them so we know where we are at. The next slide, slide 19 goes over C, D, F, G, H, I and K, and stated in our meetings that all of these elements are already covered in the 2010 piece and therefore, no longer need to be listed separately that their repetitious of what is already in the fleet.

So I'm not going to read those out to you, and then on slide 20, you look at I which is recognizing signs of students difficulty with their reading and computational performance, you ask that we look at and confer with Just Read, Florida where as to whether that is already covered and reading competency, since reading competency two is one competency that is common to all three programs, all three programs must cover it and that is what we inquired of Just Read, Florida, they said that just that reading competency two does cover that particular other element so that one has been taken care of as well.

Slide 21, we get to – it does ...

Female: (Inaudible).

Eileen McDaniels: Excuse me?

OK, so we are now on to slide 21, M, the TLPIC voted to remove foundation of history and education that is the last one, when you – the last of the elements – other elements are listed but wanted to ensure it is included in the introductory course. This particular requirement is not in law, nor is it a rule specifically, it was in the Professional Education Competencies and Skills and as of January 1st, 2013 on the 17th edition of the professional education competencies, the skills go into effect, this one is no longer there.

However, the committee want their – the committee members want to ensure that this was still being covered in the info course and I wanted to assure all of you that the foundations of history and education course which is the introduction to education course that is our prerequisite for our teacher preparation programs in Florida will continue to remain there unless the articulating coordinating council amends the pre-requisites.

So it is still there, it is still being covered in our course work, and it is just the – your recommendation would be as I understand it, is no longer one of the other elements.

And moving on to slide 22, and then we will stop we get on to B with is (inaudible) skills acquisition and measures to improve PK-12 computation performance, the committee recommended that with the additional words of understanding the process of – to be added to this particular requirement and that the recommendation was that it would not at this particular other element, would not needed for all programs that are currently (state) but for some specific programs such as elementary ed and (PK) primary, and EFE.

And then finally the other recommendation of GLPIC was that there was a need for all teacher preparation programs to include ESE or exceptional student education competencies and skills and to include specifically training and MTSS which is multi-tiered system of support that will be used – that uses data to identify and support the behavioral and academic needs of students.

So I will turn it over to Elisa.

Jasmine Ulmer: Thank you ...

Eileen McDaniels: Jasmine, I'm sorry.

Jasmine Ulmer: So there are two points on the table right now. Would anyone like to make a motion on either of them?

Female: She is referencing slide 22 for B and also for the ESE area.

Cathy Boehme: It is Cathy, could I ask you to go back two slides for just a minute? I have a question.

Female: Yes, OK, which slides?

Cathy Boehme: The very first one.

Eileen McDaniels: OK.

Cathy Boehme: And since I am looking at only the one I can see, that one right there.

Let me ask you about the middle grades integrated curriculum at the end of A.

Eileen McDaniels: Right.

Cathy Boehme: Hasn't that certification gone away?

Eileen McDaniels: That certification is – if the certification has not gone away, the opportunity for individuals to add through certificate will go away as of – what's the date, (Tanya), January, well, it's 2014 and I can't remember the specific date of August – no, it is August. It was three years from the date – October 26th, 2014 is when it goes away, I just remembered it because anybody that has a statement that says (inaudible) eligibility for middle grades integrated curriculum could continue to take the test during that period of time.

But we have no state approved per programs in Florida with middle grades integrated curriculum and we have no preparation programs in that particular

area and it is problematic for those unless they are already teaching in those areas, we are teaching it because the course code catalog severely limits on how that certification can be used.

Cathy Boehme: That was – thank you, that clarifies the ...

Eileen McDaniels: Good. So Jasmine?

Jasmine Ulmer: OK.

So that brings us back to the mass computational skill, adding the words understanding the process of and making that more specific for some program and also, using EFE or talking about EFE competencies and skills and using data to identify and support the behavioral and academic needs of students on slide 22.

Is there any discussion or thoughts on these issues?

Are we comfortable moving forward with them or no?

Female: Yes, I am fine with them. This is (Adrienna).

Vivian Posey: This is Vivian, yes.

Lance Tomei: This is Lance, I'm fine with the content of these and I do want to share one of the recommendations of the subcommittee I guess, we may not get to all of those today but the subcommittees has a broad recommendation that all requirements at the earliest opportunity, be reflected either in the FEAPs and PECs if they apply to all programs or in the applicable subject area of competencies if they are specific to one or a number of certification areas so that we don't continue to have this additional tack on laundry list of uniform core curriculum items that aren't reflected in the two sets of standards.

It seems like if you got a set of standards that applies to all programs and then standards that are specific to individual programs, everything ought to fit in to there somewhere, it shouldn't have to have a separate list.

Jasmine Ulmer: Should we skip ahead then to this part of the discussion if it would preclude ...

Lance Tomei: Well, I think my recommendation would be to support these as desired elements of the "uniform core curriculum" but also that keeping in mind that there is – there will probably be a subsequent recommendation or hopefully, will be that all curricula requirements will at the earliest opportunity, be incorporated into the appropriate set of standards, either the FEAP/PECs or the (SACS).

And I think that is just something that there may always be a lag – you know, the legislature may add something in the law that may take a time to get them moved into where they belong in the standards but historically, we have not really made an effort to do that necessarily. We keep just tacking on more and more things and it gets really burdensome for programs and for program approval teams and the whole nine yards and I just think we need to build a system that gets us to a more sensible place or a more efficient way of dealing with these curricular components.

Jasmine Ulmer: OK. So going back to slide 22, Lance, what I hear you saying is that these things are not necessarily incompatible in terms of slide 22 for now. And then thinking about slide 24 as I think as you were saying building in the future system, is there any further defense on slide 22 in terms of mass computational skill and ESE competency skills at this point?

Lance Tomei: Correct.

Jasmine Ulmer: All right. Hearing none, Eileen, if it is OK, I'm going to suggest we move forward.

Eileen McDaniels: Fine with me.

Jasmine Ulmer: OK.

Female: So Lance, you already alluded to slide 24 and the initial recommendation from the committee as far as regarding the uniform core curriculum, do you want to – do you have anything else you want to share about slide 24 or do you want

to move on to 25? Or I guess, we need to see, within slide 24, to see if the entire group is in agreement with what the subcommittee recommends moving forward, eventually to move those into the appropriate location.

Lance Tomei: Yes, and there are a couple of items. There is a little bit of a discrepancy between what the subcommittee is suggesting here because we said all of the items 11FA through M and if you think back a couple of slides, there were a couple of items that were singled out by the big committee as needing to continue to stand alone because they don't map very well right now and that was the school law and school improvement and accountability but my thinking is a little bit of minor resculpting of FEAP/PEC6 could get us there fairly easily so there is again, there is a temporary situation but I think there is also a strategic solution to that if that FEAP incorporates educational law and accountability along with the Ethics, then I think that we would be able to roll those two additional items under that FEAP and PEC at some point in the future.

Eileen McDaniels: Yes, and this is Eileen, and if so what I'm understanding, temporarily, they may stand alone as other elements until such time that we are able to revise the rule and go through rule development again on those to incorporate that more specifically into FEAPs.

Lance Tomei: I would think so, because I don't think that those two items correlate extremely well to that current standard and I think that is the logical place for them to reside but when you read the standard, and the descriptor, well, there are no descriptors for that particular FEAP. And so – but even if you look at the indicators under the PEC, it is not a good correlation yet but I think the topics certainly fit in that broad umbrella. We just have to make it more explicit, I think, in the FEAPs and the PEC.

Eileen McDaniels: Good, OK.

Jasmine Ulmer: So do we want to see if there is consensus on management's point?

Female: (Inaudible).

Female: (Inaudible).

Female: Yes.

Jasmine Ulmer: Any opposition?

OK. And I don't – (Mark) or have you joined us on the call?

(Mark): Yes, I'm here.

Jasmine Ulmer: OK. And Lance, did you want to move on to slide 25?

Lance Tomei: Yes, 25 was – addresses standard 11D which is knowledge and understanding of next generation Sunshine State Standards. The two things that drove our recommendation here, one is that the standards are changing, we are going to common core standards and what we really want is a more generic statement that will not be subject to change as readily as the way this has been worded in the past.

And also, there are additional P12 curricular mandates out there outside the Sunshine State Standards of some of which are interdisciplinary in nature and some of which talk to some of the – the equity issues that we have talked about and social justice issues, and so we try to write a standard here that would incorporate – comprehensively incorporate that and remain viable even though some of these requirements may change over time or the specific names of the P12 standards may change.

So that is what you see here. Knowledge and understanding of the state's applicable P12 standards and other applicable P12 curricular mandates. We think this one will have some longevity and it will remain valid despite the fact that this tends to be a fluid field.

Female: Nice, good thinking on that committee part, putting that in there.

Jasmine Ulmer: Are we comfortable with this wording? Is there a defense – other comments – OK, hearing none, we are all in agreement?

Female: Yes.

Female: Yes.

Male: Yes.

Female: Yes.

Jasmine Ulmer: OK.

Julie Orange: OK, great. I just – I know we've kept you late at this point and I think what we need to do at this point is we can do the committee consensus through email and on Hope Street so that you can see these in writing and so I will work the chair and co-chair to make sure that it gets written up so that you can review those, so we won't continue to keep people past the time but I did want to get to the next slide to make sure that you are all aware that we are having to postpone our next face to face meeting.

The data will not be available, the data that we are going to need start looking at cut points is not going to be required from the districts until the 19th of October and so obviously, we are not going to be ready by the October 22nd. And so we have – November 27th and 28th is a post date at this point and what I would like to do is find out from you if there are things that you cannot move on your calendars at this point.

We will not be able to meet in Lake County of all the dates, that is actually the one time that Superintendent Mosley could not host us because she has a prior commitment so we are looking for any volunteers in the central part of the state that would be willing to host our fabulous committee and if you can send me an email, if you are interested in doing that, again, centrally located would be better for those, you know, we have Cathy coming all the way from (Inaudible) and we understand this is the week after Thanksgiving and obviously, with everybody's schedules trying to coordinate – it is obviously difficult but we feel like we need to do this before it gets closer into December so that we can look at these performance targets and begin setting those and then start our next task at looking at the school principal preparation program and getting those off the ground.

And so at this point, due to time, I will just ask that you email me if you cannot change anything on your calendar and be available on the 27th and 28th and then if you can host – if you could also send me an email within the next week, that would be great so we can get these dates on calendar.

And I appreciate everybody's time, again, we apologize for going over, very good discussions, and I will work with Elisa and Jasmine to make sure that we get your language put into a format that you can review.

And basically, what we are going to do from here after you have a chance to review the language, there will also be – the recommendation would be written up formally but also a cover letter that Elisa and Jasmine are going to work on to the commissioner and we will make sure that the entire committee gets a chance to look at that (by) recommendations to make any changes to that as you see fit and we will move forward with providing those – that commissioner during the next several weeks. So we will be putting a deadline on you know, how much time you will have to review it and make changes but we would just encourage your feedback to make sure we capture it appropriately and hear everybody's voice.

And so again, we appreciate everybody's time and we look forward to seeing you face to face in the near future.

Lance Tomei: Julie?

Julie Orange: Yes.

Lance Tomei: This is Lance. The primary purpose of our subcommittee was to come up with a recommendation for the site visit protocol, we haven't talked about that. Are we going to deal with that at the November face to face?

Julie Orange: Yes, the reason that we left that one off here is because it wouldn't be included in our – in this phase of our recommendations for the legislative agenda, so yes, that will be – you will have an opportunity to present that at the next face to face.

Lance Tomei: OK, great. Thank you.

Julie Orange: Sorry, we didn't have much time to get to the subcommittee, the formation and discussion there but will definitely allow for that when we meet next time.

Good discussion, everyone. Thank you.

Eileen McDaniels: Thanks, everybody.

Female: Thank you.

Female: Thank you.

Female: Bye, Julie.

Female: Bye-bye.

Operator: Thank you for your participation. That does conclude today's conference call. You may now disconnect.

END