

The State of Florida

Moderator: Julie Orange
August 6, 2012
3:00 p.m. ET

Julie Orange: Hello?

Elisa Calabrese: Hi, Julie.

Julie Orange: Yes?

Elisa Calabrese: Hi, it's Elisa. I'm sorry. I just rushed in.

Julie Orange: That's OK. I was trying to check with the operator to see if we're ready to begin.

Operator: Yes, ma'am. You're in the main conference.

Julie Orange: OK, great. We're going to go ahead and get started. This is the teacher and leader preparation implementation committee meeting.

Welcome, everyone. I just wanted to go down through the list of the folks that I'm aware that are on the phone. And if you don't hear your name and you're on the line, just speak up when I'm finished and we'll do some introductions here in the room.

I have Vivian Posey from Barry University, Elisa Calabrese from Broward County, Ana Blaine from Daytona State College, Valerie Storey from Lynn University, Tamara Perry from Marion County, (Debbie Cook) (Threshold Association), Megan Pankiewicz from Seminole County, Lance Tomei from

UCF, Jasmine Ulmer from Union County and Superintendent Joyner from St. Johns County. Are there others that joined?

Brian Branks: Brian is here.

Julie Orange: Brian Branks. Great. Thank you.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Gloria Pelaez.

Julie Orange: Hello, Gloria.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Hi.

Julie Orange: Any others? OK. Here in the room, myself.

I'm Julie Orange, and I'm the project coordinator for Educator Prep Programs for Race to the Top. We also have OLV joining us here in the room in the department. We have (Kaye Caster), Eileen McDaniel, Rebekah Harris, Kathy Hebda, (Jenny Jenkins) and Cathy Bishop.

Then, I have several presenters today, and we have all the materials on the website for those of you that are joining us from the media that are choosing to participate. You can download the materials from www.fldoe.org/committees/TLP.asp and I'll repeat that, www.fldoe.org/committees/TLP.asp. Otherwise, we have all of the committee members on the speaker line that will be able to speak throughout.

We do have a full agenda today, and I wanted to kind of orient you to the agenda and the materials, kind of refresh your memory of where we left off because this is a continuation from our last face-to-face meeting, which was the May 10th meeting in Miami. And you have – if you recall, the last day when we met in Miami, we split up into subgroups and we had three subgroups and we – within those groups, we reviewed that uniform core curriculum and field experience within the admission requirement and you went through an exercise where you determined whether or not you wanted to keep, remove, change – or change any of those areas. And if you noticed on

the agenda, as we go through today's exercise, we haven't arranged where we're starting with the uniform core curriculum and the field experiences.

And then, we're going to go back to a discussion about the ESE area because you did have some suggestions on some things that should be added in that particular area and we now since have been informed about a task force that is working on the ESE. And we'll have Cathy Bishop to share that with you. We also have Kathy Hebda joining us to go to the admission requirement section. And general knowledge test, we have Bureau Chief, Phil Canto from Postsecondary Assessment to share some specifics with you there regarding some of your suggestions about increasing the rigor of the general knowledge test.

And he's going to fill us in on where they're at in that area to Race to the Top. You also had some questions about a 10 percent waiver. So, we're going to have Rebekah Harris join us to give us some feedback in that area and then our chair is going to lead us in some consensus, and we'll talk about next steps and look at some calendar planning.

Now, what I wanted to make sure that everybody was clear as far as the goal of what we're trying to make sure that we get out of this meeting is want to make sure that you have recommendations about what a beginning teacher should know and be able to do. Those should definitely be shared during this call if you haven't already shared those, and we've addressed those within our information presented today. We took the feedback from the three subgroups and we compile that information into the handouts.

Now, you'll notice committee members, you receive the information and the handout from the meeting under the same subheading when they were addressed. Meaning, the other elements were laid out A through M. And I initially sent you that, so that you could see exactly the feedback that you shared during that committee meeting.

What you see today in our handout has the same information but it's grouped a little bit differently. So, I just want to orient you to that information, so that everybody is clear on what we're looking at here. Under the handout, under

the general comment, those were basically bloviate and what was shared in the notes from the free subgroups.

So, I made to that a list of those here for notes of mine. And within the first subheading criteria for ITPs, Eileen is going to go through some more detailed information on fees and texts because there seems to be a little bit of confusion there. But, otherwise, you notice that the rest of those and then the first subheading, everyone was in favor of keeping those and there wasn't any comment there.

If you see an area where there was full consensus or majority consensus within an area, that – there are other feedback that you have. We're not going to go back and address those individual areas. But, again, feel free to speak up if you have other things that you want to add there.

The second section of this first page of this handout, you'll notice this is grouped by all the elements that are already covered in the FEAPs or the reading competency and there was quite a bit of areas that you guys were concerned that there was too much duplication because it's already being covered. So, you will notice C, G, F, I, K and L were all areas that the committee has a majority. The subcommittees agreed that these were already covered in the FEAPs and then L, we got certification from (inaudible) Florida.

These would already be covered in the reading competency too. Under the next subgroup, other elements that committee requested to keep, this again is by majority that A, E, J and M should be kept. So, again, unless you have further feedback that you want to share in those areas, we're not going to focus on those today.

What we're going to spend our time focusing on, particularly are going to be the other elements that you requested to change, which is the very next section. We're at the bottom of page two of the handouts, which is D and H and also the other area. So, Eileen is going to dive in to those in detail and then Cathy Bishop is going to dive in to the uniform or, excuse me, the ESE recommendation and tell you about the taskforce that's been developed.

The page three, you will notice it's where it starts with the field experience and the admission requirement. And that information is going to be touched on regarding your thoughts of what you'd like to do as far as including information about our virtual setting. That was a comment that was included.

Again, if there's other things that have come to mind since we met last time, we'll bring those up and Kathy is going to walk us through the admission requirement section and we're also going to hear from Phil Canto at the end of that particular section. So, that just gives you an idea of where this information came from and why you're seeing two out of three, three out of three. And so, it makes a little bit of sense from when we met previously.

We're going to go ahead and I'm going to turn it over to Eileen, and she's going to be beginning with that same handout that we just looked at.

Eileen McDaniel: Thank you, Julie. Good afternoon, everybody and glad you could join us today. What I'm going to do is walk you through this.

Again, Julie went through it very quickly, but I'll just review it. This has been a few months since we've looked at and just dive deep – a little bit deeper into some of those areas. You have – still had questions about and give you an opportunity to add comments if needed.

So, in the first section as Julie mentioned, we had two general comments. And then, under the uniform core curriculum, the FEAPs, the PECs, subject area comps and so forth. So, let's look at all of those together at first.

You know that those first elements by law and rule are considered the uniform core curriculum. The Florida educator accomplished practices and the professional education competencies and skills. Before I talk about those general comments, I just want to make a comment about the the FEAPs and the PECs as we call those.

I know it's – your comments include can we integrate into a single set of standards from FEAPs and PECs. And I just want to remind you that we've informed all institutions this year and our district alternate certification

program that the FEAPs and the PECs, we were talking about the 2010 FEAPs and PECs that professional education competencies and skills, which are your competencies and skills that underlie or underpins the professional education test. They are completely aligned with each other when the professional education competencies and skills were worked on this past year.

They were aligned to the 2010 FEAPs. So, the one through six FEAPs and the one through six PECs are now completely aligned. And then, PEC number seven, which is aligned to the ESOL and PEC number eight to the – to the reading.

The only ones that need to – only programs that need to address now, PEC seven and eight are the EPI program test to address number seven because there is – there is no requirement currently that addresses ESOL for those programs in their preparation and for reading – and for the PEC number, which is a repeat, every program no matter which program is in the ITP, the EPI or the district alternate program must be addressed and a minimum recount to speak to and PEC number eight is aligning to at the very least with the PEC number eight. So, all of those are covered. There is – there is really isn't duplication that it's been one year.

It's resting all of the risk. You're going to also note that there was a general columnist that.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Excuse me, Eileen?

Eileen McDaniel: Yes?

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Could we remind people to mute their phones?

Eileen McDaniel: Yes. If everybody – thank you, Gloria. And we'll just take Gloria's suggestion here.

If you will mute your phone, please?

Julie Orange: And also, operator, I noticed that Mark Howse, he should be able to speak in the speaker line. If you could make sure that he's logged in to the speaker line, please?

Operator: OK, one moment, please.

Julie Orange: Thank you.

Eileen McDaniel: We'll give Mark a second to have us joined.

Operator: Mr. Howse, your line is open.

Mark Howse: Thank you very much, Julie. I have a question, but I'll wait until I get – until you get to a good transition point and start my question.

Eileen McDaniel: Thanks, Mark and I will be getting to that first because I'll be stopping in every sections to allow additional comments that people might have. So, on the general comment about all your C.P. elements should apply to ITP, EPI, DACP, I do want to remind everyone that each of our teacher preparation programs employed are quite unique. But here is that they'll all similar.

All programs must address the FEAP and appropriate PECs when needed and when they're not covered by other requirements. All programs meet ESOL requirements either by addressing all ESOL standards or the appropriately ESOL standards and competencies that go with their particular program or at the very least text number seven, which is what I just told you, the ETI probes and DACP less than a minimum, which rests that one. And then, all programs addressed at least the – at the reading competency too.

For ITP program, to each one, the judges had the very least competencies one and two for reading. For many programs, they have to address competencies one through four unless they are addressing the entire reading endorsement. So, as you – in this particular section, everyone appeared to agree that we are going to keep it.

If two out of three said to keep it, then we called that agreement the majority agreed. So, I'm going to open it now for any additional comments about any

of these very specific ones about the UCC. You may need to unmute your line if you have a comment.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Eileen?

Eileen McDaniel: Yes, Gloria?

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: OK, so, for a – in this teacher prep, when we have the ESOL endorsement and the reading endorsements, we can address that curricularly or just through PEC seven or eight, correct?

Eileen McDaniel: You're addressing it curricularly and you know that you're addressing all PECs when you're addressing the FEAPs.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Perfect. Thank you.

Mark Howse: Eileen, this is Mark Howse.

Eileen McDaniel: Go ahead.

Mark Howse: And I had asked the question on several meetings back about requiring instruction as it is outlined in legislation and you were going to take a look at the standard FPCE across the board to determine if we were addressing those or what our approach was because I have some concerns that their elements and the required instruction mandate that we are not covered and are not continued to preparation models.

Eileen McDaniel: Mark, can you be a little bit more specific because I'm not sure what you mean?

Mark Howse: I look – I had pointed out to the legislation that outlines what we should be talking in classrooms and there are some – there are some other elements outside of the core content that has to be, for example, the contributions of American Americans, Hispanics, women, alcohol abuse. I mean, there is a – there is a spectrum of things that's outlined there in law that are not aligned in our – in our teaching preparation guidelines.

And I can – I can – he hasn't hit that as I connect to the (inaudible) and maybe you can get to the next meeting.

Eileen McDaniel: Mark, what you – what statutes we are looking – what statute we are addressing right now currently is for 1004.04 and the 1004.85 and 101256 paragraph eight because all – the ones that are specific to keep your preparation program, I believe the ones that you're referring to statutes had – they referred to curricular requirements.

Mark Howse: Right.

Eileen McDaniel: And.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: K-12 goal.

Eileen McDaniel: Excuse me?

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Are those curricular requirements for K-12?

Kathy Hebda: Hey, Gloria and Mark, this is Kathy Hebda. Yes, Eileen was just reiterating the statutes that we do for these particular exercises, the ones that are subsequent teacher preparations. But you as the committee should feel unrestrained by what's in there right now.

If there are things that you think you would require instruction because they are the required instruction section of law for K-12 or you think there's something else and used to be and the uniform core curriculum are taken out the uniform core curriculum. The decisions you're making now is the conversation you're having. So, Eileen was just referring you to what we – what we have at the moment.

Mark Howse: Right.

Kathy Hebda: But may feel that there other things that should be included because there are some place else in the law or other regulations.

Mark Howse: Right, Kathy, and I want to read it at this point now because I actually raised there a couple of minutes back and we were going to take a look at it and

maybe visit it again. So, what I'll do is I will – I will pool what I'm – what I'm referring to again and then I'll share to the group and we'll discuss there at a later time.

Kathy Hebda: Sounds like a plan.

Eileen McDaniel: Any other comments? Thank you, Mark and we look forward to this. Anything else to do with the FEAPs, the PECs subject area comments, these ESOL requirements?

So, I will forward in the first section. OK, so, I'm going to move on to the next section. The next section that are part are – some of the elements that are part of what we call the other elements of the uniform core curriculum that the subgroups determine that they are also part of the FEAPs or the reading competencies referring here to technology appropriate to the grade, reading interpretation and so forth as teaching said, the needs of those to populations, professional ethics and where I can speak in a logical and a sustainable style.

And on the next page, recognize signs and seize difficulty with the reading computational performance. For all of these, you had determined that they're already in FEAPs and we've also just gone back and look at those as well and determine if they are a part of the FEAPs. Any questions or concerns about that one?

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: I have a comment.

Eileen McDaniel: Yes?

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: I think that the more streamline we make this, if something is already in the FEAPs or in the PECs, I believe we should remove it.

Eileen McDaniel: Did you wish to just say they've been indicated. Three out of three or two out of three, which is the majority of the subgroup to give that recommendation already.

What I was asking for here is, are there any additional comments beyond that?

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: No.

Lance Tomei: Hi, Eileen, this is Lance.

Eileen McDaniel: Hello, Lance.

Lance Tomei: Just one, I am in full agreement that we need to streamline and not duplicate but just an observation that some of these items are currently in statute. And we may – I know we're talking about not being bound by that. But we might want to make a note that in order to eliminate a couple of these explicit items, we would require a legislative relief, I think.

Eileen McDaniel: Definitely, and we're certainly keeping that in mind as we're making here notes.

Lance Tomei: Thanks.

Eileen McDaniel: Thank you. Any others? OK, so, we're going to go to what I call the third section, other elements committee requested to keep.

That includes, a, higher level mathematic concepts instruction for K-12 students, the information on the state system of school improvement accountability, educational law and foundations and history of education. Noting that the last one, m, foundations and history of education is currently in the Professional Education Competencies and Skills edition. But when we get to the 17th edition, which goes into January 1st 2013, it is no longer included in there.

Any comments about this section?

Megan Pankiewicz: Hi, this is Megan. I'm in favor of removing the foundation and the history of education.

Eileen McDaniel: Are you the one group that decides because there's one group that said that they wanted to remove it? Two out of the three groups wanted to keep it.

Megan Pankiewicz: I was in Miami. So, I wasn't – I guess, it was required of one of these groups. I think I exposed it on the survey to remove it.

But I wasn't only as the groups in Miami.

Eileen McDaniel: Other comments?

Valerie Storey: This Valerie. Could Megan explain why she was not in favor of keeping it?

Megan Pankiewicz: Yes. I had to teach this course in college and managing goes part of the minor at that time. My minor in education and it's sort of they're running joke, I think, between my future friends and myself that it's not applicable to the everyday custom of teacher.

There are so many more things that I wish we've spent our time learning about. And I think there are several ways to use it to try and then studying the foundations and the history of education.

Elisa Calabrese: I agree with Megan. This is Elisa. I agree with you.

It's so much to cover to seem as if it shouldn't be so prominent and in the focus.

Valerie Storey: This is Valerie, again, I would agree with Megan in respect that those are great deal to cope up. But I feel that this is foundational and it explains how the Americans cooling system developed. And I think it's something that new teachers should know about.

Time to face and teaching it.

Female: I would be – I would just be curious as to how or I guess more explanations to why that knowledge or how that knowledge would be valuable. Not that I don't think, you know, people could take the course that they wanted. But I don't – I just didn't be or don't be a reason why understanding, you know, when Harvard was created or the previous structures would help us with some teacher today.

Female: I think the reason I would suggest is that you see that. And so, a new teacher could own to some uniqueness of the education system used in the space and how they get us some of the countries and what the name focuses here. I think it is the association of the education system.

It isn't specified. I paid the points of about being an auction that could be chosen, but I'm just worried that because these curriculums transform now is going to get pushed out and not revisited.

Megan Pankiewicz: Great.

Elisa Calabrese: : I would definitely agree. And I actually think it has been more valuable for teachers to be able to take a course that focused on education systems that exist today around the world. I actually think that would be more beneficial than looking to the task.

Female: Megan, I'm – I'm sorry. Elisa just did some location. I have to agree with Megan whole-heartedly on this.

Elisa Calabrese: I do too.

Female: I think there's so much more that we need to look at that you go back and look at our – look at our history in this space.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: This is Gloria. I agree with Megan as well. I also believe that not requiring this does not exclude institutions for making a statement that it's going to be required that their institution, but I wouldn't believe that we should require the state level to give some more progressive institution the opportunity to do something different.

With all the information that we have the way teaching is happening in the 21st century, just revisiting history, it's really not the best use of our limited credits and time.

Lance Tomei: Yes, this is Lance. I'd like to offer a comment on this as well. I do tend to think that we – that we certainly over-emphasize this in current curriculum and most of the programs that I'm familiar with.

I'm not convinced that there's no value to having some foundations. But I do kind of thing that maybe the place for this is in the – one of the common prerequisite courses, the introduction to education as opposed to making it an accountability issue for the – you know, once the candidates actually get

admitted the programs. Let the programs focused on what really counts when the rubber hits the road.

And this to me is more of an introductory piece. So, we can probably retain a limited amount of this as part of the core curriculum in that introduction to education course. That's right now still a prerequisite for all teacher education programs.

So, that might be one way we could deal with this.

Female: I think that the compromise loans and I would cut the incline to go with that. But not likely link that history causing so much in relation to top policies and strategies that are being implemented now. For example, if we move to – sounded on how that's been implemented to core and what the outcome was in the past and how we're revisiting and changing that poses.

I just thought – I just think that it's important. So, I think I would always launch this suggestion that it became possible composure into those three classes. Thank you, Lance.

Eileen McDaniel: I think that idea is well-aligned.

Male: I.

Female: Yes, I think the only role with it.

Male: I agree with Lance, as well as Joe.

Eileen McDaniel: Elisa, are you there?

Elisa Calabrese: Yes?

Eileen McDaniel: You want to go ahead and do a formal vote on that?

Elisa Calabrese: All right. So, we agreed to – this is the change, right? We're talking about changing it.

Not to remove it, not to keep it but to change it.

Female: I think we're talking about removing it.

Elisa Calabrese: OK, we're talking about removing it as one.

Male: Removing it.

Elisa Calabrese: As one separate component but infusing it into an introductory.

Male: Right.

Elisa Calabrese: Type book, correct?

Female: Correct, yes.

Male: Lance, why don't you restate your recommendation?

Lance Tomei: Well, in terms of the context that we're looking at here, I'm suggesting that we remove it.

Elisa Calabrese: Thank you.

Lance Tomei: But I am saying that there is a way to still capture, you know, an appropriate amount of this in an introductory course. But then, it doesn't become a program accountability. A phase of the curriculum that a program has to deal with from an accountability perspective.

Elisa Calabrese: Correct.

Lance Tomei: Now, I have a fact to my program here and how much time we spent studying foundations and history when I went through some teacher prep courses here many years ago and then I think about my time in the classroom. And I got to tell you, I don't think I ever had to draw or found it useful to draw on that information to help me with the challenges of being in the classroom. It was other stuff that I learned that was far more valuable to me than knowing the history.

So, I just got to be on that side of the debate, I guess. But I don't think it has the same practical application in the 21st century that it may be once have.

Elisa Calabrese: OK, Julie, what ...

Julie Orange: I would probably help this that the class you received those in the 20th century and the class we would get in the 21st century would going be the different one. But that was my views.

Eileen McDaniel: Valerie?

Valerie Storey: Yes?

Eileen McDaniel: I'm having a really hard time hearing you.

Valerie Storey: All right. I'm sorry. I'm doing it my side.

So, it's probably the problem with that.

Eileen McDaniel: Thanks.

Elisa Calabrese: So, Julie, for the purposes of today, are we going to say that to remove it?

Male: That's what I'm proposing.

Elisa Calabrese: OK.

Male: For this context, what we're really talking about, what are we going to do in terms of program accountability, I'm saying remove it.

Female: I second that motion.

Elisa Calabrese: Agreed?

(Inaudible).

Elisa Calabrese: How many in favor?

Female: I agree.

Male: Aye.

Male: Aye.

Female: Aye.

Female: Aye.

Female: I agree.

Female: I agree.

Male: Aye.

Elisa Calabrese: Any disagree?

Female: Yes, I disagree.

Elisa Calabrese: Great. I think we are in favor of removing it.

Eileen McDaniel: All right. We have that and we have that noted about wanting some inclusion in this introduction course. All right.

So, I'm going to move on to the – to the next section. The last section in the worksheet as part of the uniform core curriculum and other elements include those elements in which the majority of the subgroups recommend the element be changed or removed. So, we have, b, which was math computational skills acquisition and measures to improve P-12 computational performance. One subgroups that do keep it to subgroups recommended changes to us.

The – it was suggested that the words understand the process of math computational skills acquisition and so forth be added to that particular one since this – each of these has their own comment. I'd like to open it up for comment for each one of these at this time. So, we're going to talk about math computational skills acquisition.

Two out of three people said they would like to change and that the – again, it says adding the words understanding the process of and also there is comment for some programs, elementary ed, PK ESE. Comments?

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: If we're going to keep it, I would like to request that we add understanding the process of math computational skills, etc.

Eileen McDaniel: Any comments to that other than what Gloria has just added, which is what's been stated right here? What about the comment for some programs elementary ed, pre K primary and ESE? Any comment about that and what that might mean?

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Honestly, I really don't know what the mean?

Female: Yes, I'm confused on that one.

Megan Pankiewicz: This is Megan. Would this element apply to all teachers? Maybe that sort of that comment was coming into play that would that element applied to teachers going through, you know, secondary English program?

Eileen McDaniel: Currently, it applied to all program.

Megan Pankiewicz: So, maybe that's why people suggested that it would only apply to certain programs?

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Oh, OK.

Vivian Posey: This is Vivian. I seemed to recall that discussion as well. And I think that's where the committee – the subcommittee was going with this.

That they felt that it was more important that this be applicable to future candidates and those programs that are identified here in this box and not so much in the subject area categories that Megan is referring to.

Megan Pankiewicz: Yes.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: I'm an English teacher. I am fully in favor of removing that element.

Eileen McDaniel: OK. I think we have two different issues. Can I – can I bring you back up to that one before because, remember, a, above – up above this, we hit because it – we got a and b.

A, higher level mathematic concepts instruction for K-12 students. Currently, that is only associated where – with some very specific programs, which are elementary education, ESE, pre K primary, math and all the mathematics – the mathematics, midgrade math and so forth. But the next one, b, currently that is for all problems.

So, there is a distinguish between the two. One, talking about higher-level mathematic concepts. This one is talking about that all of our candidates, all of our programs must address math computational skills, acquisition and measures.

There's something about the importance of no matter what you teach, there's an understanding of math computational concepts.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: So, Eileen, is this – does that mean that teachers themselves can add into track or that they need to know how to teach it?

(Tammy): Excuse me, this is (Tammy). When we were talking about this, I remember it vividly because I'm a math teacher. And what's not our middle school teachers, is where I work, they don't understand the purpose of and the background of some of the skills of the math that they're getting.

And when I teach or I try to teach, so they understand where it came from and a lot of times the teachers just teach the skills. This is that because this is it. And, say, the teachers themselves need to I have the understanding.

I know that they have to teach the understanding of where this math was coming from.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: But my – I understand that. But, for example, if I'm an English teacher, why do I need to know that?

Ana Blaine: This is Ana. What is this we taking care of? It were – if – like Megan's question, we're looking at can the teacher have the required skills with the G.K.

And if we're looking, I know we're going to look at later about raising the rigor of the G.K. or the cut scores. Wouldn't that take care of this?

Megan Pankiewicz: Yes, it should.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: I don't.

Lance Tomei: This is Lance. Let me jump in again because this is one of the items that's actually tied to a piece of Florida statute 1004.04. And it's linked to the five – what I call the warranty items.

So, let me just read what's in the statute. It talks about employer satisfaction shall be determined by an – the administered survey approved by the Department of Education that is a minimum or at a minimum. It must include employer satisfaction of the graduates' ability to do the following.

There's five items on that list. The second one is recognize science and students' difficult with reading and computational process and apply appropriate measures to improve students' reading and computational performance. So, you can see this item is derived from that.

It's one of those items that all programs are held accountable for. But from a practical perspective, I can imagine a school principal being concerned about someone who completed a program in English calling us to complain that they – that they don't recognize student's problems with computational skills. So, I don't know if this is – if this is a functional problem or if it's just something that's driven by statute in terms of accountability related to employer satisfaction, which is where it seems to be coming from.

And if that's the case, I think it will take care of itself if we remove it from accountability purposes because programs that should be held accountable still will be held accountable via the employer surveys if we keep that piece in the accountability system. So, there's a connection here to that part of the statute.

And I just wanted to make sure that everyone is aware of that. I think that's what's driving this particular item.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: So, we remove it, then we can work with the statute later?

Lance Tomei: I'm not even sure that – for this one that the statute would need to be changed because the statute talks about the employer satisfaction on these issues. It doesn't say that we have to teach it. I guess it implies that to some degree.

But from a practical perspective, do we need to teach these in programs where it doesn't make sense for this to be part of the curriculum.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Correct. Like music.

Lance Tomei: Right. So.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Like English.

Lance Tomei: And, again, since – in statute, it's tied to employers being concerned about complete their skills and I got to believe that the average principal will be concerned if this – if there's a deficiency in skills in which a person should logically have been prepared. And you wouldn't expect the music teacher to be highly proficient in math computational skills acquisition.

So is a principle ever going to call a preparation program and say you need to come out and teach those music teacher how to identify and remediate math problems. I just don't see that happening so I don't think there is a practical issue..

Female: OK, but would you take it out?

Female: OK, Lance, this is (inaudible) I just wanted to add one more thing, and it is also listed under uniform core curriculum in 1004.04 where it says and I am going to just pull out the part that is relevant, the rules to establish uniform core curricula for each state approved teacher preparation program, knowledge based (inaudible) and computational skills acquisition so it's in that section of the law as well, not just in the employer satisfaction.

Lance Tomei: OK, so it's coming from multiple places then?

Female: Right.

Female: Multiple places.

Elisa Calabrese: Yes, I think this is Elisa, Vivian, I think you had a point from the K to 12 perspective that with our change with the common course state standards and understanding the process as very important along with the content, I think that is where some were coming from when we were looking at that section about computational skills.

I don't think we were coming from the perspective of employer satisfaction.

Ana Blaine: This is Ana. I still don't think we should hold music teachers and media specialists accountable for math computational skills. So either – I think that is why I don't know if it was my group or another group talked about turning it more into A, whereas only specific programs that we want to make sure that you know, can do this or (inaudible) removing it?

Elisa Calabrese: I think, Ana, this is Elisa, I think – and this is my understanding when we were all together as a group, that we thought that some of the thought that was very important that these teachers – for these programs, elementary, PK, and ESE, some of these programs, it would be necessary for the teachers to be grounded in math computational skills acquisition process.

Because...

Female: So I think that is taken care of in A...

Female: I'm not sure that it's taken care of in A, I think that was our discussion back and forth.

Male: I think the reality is for all of those programs, computational skills are embedded in their subject area competencies.

Female: Is that why below and B that we qualify for programs elementary, PK, ESE.

Female: That is A.

Female: I think that was the recommendation to make it explicit that it was only going to be with those programs as specified under A to make it equal with B so that would take out of the equation, our music education program so media specialist or secondary English.

Debbie Cooke: Hi, this is Debbie, and as I'm listening to the conversation, I just have a fundamental question that I think this whole conversation begs and that is the degree to which all teachers have some fundamental responsibility for some basic literacy and basic numeracy skills.

And for me, that is what B is talking about, the notion that there would be across PK-12 programs, some fundamentals that we would – I mean we have had the same debate around literacy for a long time and we are talking a great deal now about every teacher's needs to have some obligations or some responsibility around some fundamental literacy and I think with the advent of common core and emphasis on mathematics and science and technology kinds of things that there is some fundamental accountability that teachers hold and for me, B talks about that fundamental accountability.

Female: Billy, this is (inaudible) and I'm just going to interject here a little bit and just ask if – do we have to make a decision on this one since we seem to be going around and around and is it something we have to do today and can we come back to it later on after we have a little more time to think and reflect?

Female: We can certainly come back to it in the Hope Street forum, and we can't push it off path, our – because after this call, we are going to be asking for a volunteer to start drafting the recommendations for the committee as far as the changes that you recommend the uniform core curriculum, so we can certainly have the discussion (inaudible) to Hope Street, but we can't push it to the next meeting, I guess, what I'm trying to say. But if you want to give it some more thoughts, then we can definitely – but it is just – of course, we would encourage or participate in on Hope Street to make sure that we have enough to actually get a vote on there as far as the new language these folks are coming up with new language for this particular area.

Female: OK. Thank you. I sense just a basic feeling of being conflicted with this because we don't want to send a wrong message as a committee, I know that we are all very committed to increasing the rigor of what we do in terms of preparing teachers but yet, I'm sensing that there is a lot of conflict too in how we feel about this one.

Female: What I can do is go back and pull the notes regarding the specific committees that came up with the specific language that is here, and maybe that committee, that sub group committee can work together to draft some preliminary language regarding this and put it on Hope Street for some feedback from the group. Would that be agreeable?

Or is there any opposition to that?

OK, hearing none, we will go ahead..

Female: We have the school safety for additional discussion, Eileen?

Eileen McDaniel: OK, school safety, it was a three way split. One group said to keep it, one group said to remove it and one group asked that we change it. What the comment that was added – framed within the context of bullying, alienation and violence, before we open it up for discussions, if we want to – if we want to change this one or to add language to this one, we certainly want to as we have done in the past and perhaps did not have the opportunity to do so at the May meeting to go back and look at the Florida Educator Accomplished practices and look at the language for them and we provide you a copy of those feats again, for you to look at today if you wish.

To make sure that that hasn't been addressed because this was certainly a topic that was addressed for quite some time in the discussion on the (FEAT).

We also want to be careful about what – and (inaudible) caution any time we are talking about any of these that any time we start adding additional words, such as bullying, and alienation and so forth, we just – be careful about any buzz words that we add to it, if we are making suggestions here, are we not covering it already somewhere else in a broader context perhaps.

So I'm going to step back and then open it up for comments on this one.

Megan Pankiewicz: Hi, this is Megan. And I'm sorry, again, I wasn't in Miami but school safety, is that all that it listed as in the core curriculum that this says school safety and that is it?

Eileen McDaniel: It's currently listed as school safety which is a very broad area, apparently, and can encompass quite a bit.

Megan Pankiewicz: Let me ask a question, when it comes to teacher programs, when it says school safety, and they are going to be addressed in teacher prep programs, is there any guidance on what that entails?

Eileen McDaniel: Not currently.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Nope.

However, if we look at (inaudible) 2 of the learning environment, it is really explicit with the 2010 (inaudible) to maintain a student center learning environment that is safe, organized, flexible, equitable, and inclusive, the indicator respect students, culture on linguistic family background, and maintains a climate of openness, inquiry, fairness and support...

Female: So Gloria, you are saying it's covered somewhere else?

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Yes, I'm saying it's covered in learning environment ...

Female: Then why are we mentioning it again?

I guess that is the question?

Female: I believe it's also somewhat covered in the code of ethics and in the section about you know, not (harming children).

Female: What?

Female: Sorry, I have a lot of background noise here, in the code of ethics, there is a also references to, you know, keeping children safe and not harming children intentionally.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Correct, I think it's covered in the FEAP under ethics and also under learning environment.

If we could remove it, that would be great.

Lance Tomei: Yes, this is Lance. I want to actually take Gloria's comment to an even higher plain. If you look up under the first other elements under A, higher level, there is that comment about eventually reside in the applicable subject area competencies.

And the reason is because it only applies to a selected programs and the reality is all these things that we are talking about now, that are add ons to the FEAP/PECs and subject area competencies, as far as I'm concerned, if they are uniform and they should apply to all programs, then we need to roll them either into the FEAPs or the PECs if they are specific to selected programs, they need to be rolled in to the competencies for those specific certification areas and if we really did this well and the final analysis in my mind, we would have the generic standards and I wish we didn't have the two sets, but we do, FEAPs and PECs and we would have the specific standards that are specific to each certification area and that would be it.

Why do we have to have this (inaudible) additional set of other things that either applies to all programs, so we got to roll it into the generic standards or it applies to specific programs, we got to reflect them in the subject area competencies.

Female: All right, so the discussion is should we remove...

Female: Yes.

Lance Tomei: Well, we may need to relocate, I guess, is what I am suggesting, but to me, in the final analysis, that is a more appropriate approach to what we are talking about, having these additional pieces of the uniform core curriculum. I just

don't see the value of having a set of generic standards and a set of programs for specific standards, and the a bunch of additional stuff that we got to sort out.

This is one of the things that leads to subjective decisions during program approval evaluations because you got these additional elements and then the one that we were just talking about, the mathematical computational processes, the – you put the bar at the same level for a math program as you do for a music program?

And the answer is probably not but there is not guidance on how to do it differently so now, it starts to get subjective and that is part of the problem and the challenge we face in the total accountability system in the state.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Correct.

I would like to make a motion to remove school safety as it's already addressed in ethics and is also addressed in learning environment and under FIT.

Female: I will second that motion.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: All in agreement?

Female: Aye.

Male: Aye.

Female: Aye.

Male: Aye.

Female: Aye.

Female: Aye.

Female: Aye.

Male: Aye.

Female: Aye.

Female: Aye.

Female: Aye.

Female: Aye.

Male: Aye.

Female: Aye.

Female: Aye.

Female: Aye.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Disagreement?

Female: Nay.

Female: Is that one?

Female: Is that one. The baby.

Female: ... disagreement?

Female: Is there one.

Female: OK.

Female: OK.

Female: So we have more in favor of removing it...

Female: OK, so the last one in this group is (UTC) other and what I'd like to do in that one, we talk of that one was a recommendation to talk about ESE competencies and skills and building them into teacher preparation programs. I would like to suggest that we lay that one aside for just right now, we will come back to that after we talk about field experiences.

So moving on to field experiences, and I'm just looking at my watch, we are right on time, I just need to get us through this one but I think you will see that under field experiences, all three sub-groups agreed to keep each and every one of those, we also supply to you additional field experience requirements that were in addition to what is listed on this word sheet, you probably got that, and there are field experience requirements for each and every one of the programs, not just for ITP as we want to make sure everybody was aware of that.

Our initial teacher preparation program, in the first box, there, they talked about field clinical experience sites that represent diverse cultures and various (exceptionalities) your additional work sheet that was sent to you talked about for ITP, ending in a culminating experience of no less than ten weeks and so forth.

And for – and then there are some additional requirements for ITP as far as (inaudible) faculty meeting (inaudible) requirements and about the requirements of the Florida School District personnel.

For EPI, in field services requirements that are currently in (inaudible) this program participant must participate in field experience that is appropriate to his or her educational plan is what currently is safe, and for district (alternative) certification program, as teacher records throughout their program, that is their field experience.

So there was a comment under ITPs, the – that field clinical experience sites should include or must include something in the virtual setting and is that language that you wish to add to the requirements and opening that up for comment right now.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: I do believe that we should require it and every child in Florida is going to have to have a virtual class and...

Ana Blaine: This is Ana. A technical question, will this virtual school be able to provide field experiences for every institution in Florida?

Male: (Inaudible).

Ana Blaine: Didn't UCS already do something with virtual school?

Male: Yes, we do internships with the Florida Virtual School.

Ana Blaine: OK, can you speak to that a little bit? I'm thinking sort of virtual school can explode if we make this a requirement?

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Remember, Florida virtual school is not the only virtual setting in Florida...

Female: Right.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Many districts have virtual offerings.

Elisa Calabrese: Yes.

This is Elisa in Broward, we have Broward Virtual School and we do have field experiences and internships with our Broward Virtual School.

Female: And at UM, we have a virtual - we are starting our virtual field experience requirement in (default) with UM's global academy which is a virtual high school – middle school. We are also looking to other (inaudible) county that is a virtual school so we are looking to them for elementary study.

Female: There is a difference to make it available and mandate it because if you are looking at you know, in our district, we have maybe about 7,000 placements a year. And then if we would add that component to it, that might be a problem.

Even though it is necessary...

Male: Yes, the students that do their student teaching for us at UCF, that do it through the Florida Virtual School, are candidates that are actually interested in teaching in that form and while every K-12 student may ultimately have to take at least one online course, that doesn't mean that every teacher in Florida is going to teach online.

So I'm not sure that it needs to be a common denominator in all programs, I think that is one aspect of technology but I would hate to mandate that across as being something required for every candidate in every program. I think the logistics of that would become an absolute nightmare.

Female: And then if he is – if we are going to have – are we looking at just ITP or are – we think programs are going to be...

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: I'm sure we are talking about all programs.

Female: So then that is going to be very hard for you know, people in districts and also the programs are in EPI...

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: I'm sorry, I thought we are talking about initial teacher preparation.

Female: We are only talking about IPP, OK?

Female: You know, is that going to be incorporated into diverse settings? Maybe we already have it listed?

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: But you have to keep in mind that for most of us in (IRT) diverse settings doesn't address virtual.

Female: So maybe we could use a qualifying statement that it could include virtual, you know...

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: That is a nice way of introducing it.

Julie Orange: This is Julie. I just wanted to jump in and remind folks that at the very beginning, under the general comment, we indicated from your notes from the last meeting that all of these elements are going to apply to each one ITP, EPI or DACP unless they indicate otherwise.

So as you're talking about this, if you're wanting it to be different for a certain group then we need to note that, so you can decide, you know, how you want it for everybody and then we can make a change for one or more of the groups.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: So Julie, on page 3 of the handout, I thought (inaudible) where it says, criteria for ITP, that should be for everybody?

Eileen McDaniel: So this Eileen, Gloria. You know, that's the criteria that are for ITP to currently in statutes and rules.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: OK, thank you.

Eileen McDaniel: That's why we provided the additional document today to show you what is required for it (inaudible) currently in field experiences in rule and statute for the other firms as well, but your recommendations are going to apply to all programs.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Thank you, OK.

Debbie Cooke: Julie, this is Debbie. I just have a clarifying question. The general comment that we made said all unified core curriculum elements should apply to all programs. So is field experience a – considered a uniform core curriculum element or is it separate?

Julie Orange: It is separate. It is not a uniform curriculum. That's the next section we're talking about.

Debbie Cooke: OK. That's what I thought because I thought the statement that we made, if you look at the top of sheet 1, it says, all unified core curriculum elements should be applied to all three. I didn't know we said that about field experiences or so.

Julie Orange: What is on the table today is also because it's brought up here and it's also brought up in your comments and when we talk about field experience, this will need to talk about field experiences for ITPs, field experience for EPIs, and field experience for our DACP.

Debbie Cooke: All right, thank you. One other comment and then I'll be quiet for a little while. My – and this is about virtual settings. I know that in the work that we're doing at a national level now, we're looking at the degree to – we're looking at how you deliver virtual staff and the skills that that takes. In other

words, in professional learning, we're looking at electronic professional learning delivery having some unique requirements that face-to-face ones don't have.

My only question, comment, concern, reflection for the group is if we start talking about teaching in a virtual setting, I'm not sure that all of those behaviors are necessarily going to be covered in and FEAPS and or (PEGS).

So I think if we're forward-thinking, we need to be thinking about how we're going to be capturing proficiency and delivering virtual learning as an element if we pull that into a field experience or anything else.

Julie Orange: Is there a recommendation on the table?

Female: Mainly just a comment. I didn't really have other than I just think it needs to be something we think about if we're going to include virtual experiences.

Julie Orange: What if we added in a variety of settings including virtual?

Female: But if we say that could include virtual, that doesn't make it a requirement.

Julie Orange: And you're talking about an absolute requirement.

Female: What I'm saying is when I read the first criteria for a field experience, that says, in a variety of settings including high (need) schools, to me, that needs that one of my field experiences has to be a high (need) school, but if I said, that may include a virtual setting, that's almost like choice for the institution.

Julie Orange: And you're not in favor of that, correct?

Female: Well, I'm favor. I thought we should require a virtual field.

Julie Orange: You're in favor of requiring a virtual setting?

Female: That's how I started but based on what I heard from everybody else, I think that we might want to start moving towards that by making it a possibility, but not a requirement.

Julie Orange: OK.

Jasmine Ulmer: This is Jasmine. And I just want to throw one more idea out there. And when I think about this issue, I wonder if instead of requiring a field experience for the virtual organization, is it possible to think of it in terms of a field experience or assimilation provided by the university?

Female: But it wouldn't have to be in the district setting.

Jasmine Ulmer: That's right. And the university could – maybe within a technology platform where people can practice the elements that would be required within practice teaching whether it's running discussion boards or uploading content or what it is. I'm just wondering if that could be accomplished within assimilation.

Julie Orange: Interesting thought ...

Gregory Adkins: Can I ask a question? Greg Adkins in Lee County.

Julie Orange: Go ahead, Greg.

Gregory Adkins: if you're talking about a virtual, you know, field experience or doing something in a virtual setting, I'll just express I guess a concern that I would have not so much in doing something in a virtual setting but if it were to take the place of or replace what we already have in place in terms of the field experience requirement.

And so, you know, overall, I think – and this is just my opinion but I think that on the job training that a student gets from field experiences have been valuable and the more that we do that, the better.

But I wouldn't want to take what we currently have and lessen the requirement of being actually out in the field during a real field experience to instead do a field – or do an experience in a virtual setting. Do you understand what I mean?

Another, just as a clarifying question, do we have – are we talking about any type of real minimum requirement for field experiences a way of rating these

– I know we're doing it but (inaudible) number one yet or amount of time. Is that something we're getting to or did I miss that?

Female: Really there is no particular timeframe other than a culminating experience – for ITPs, must be a minimum of 10 weeks thus far but that's in addition to the variety of field experiences that the person would have throughout their program. There is not an hour amount that is associated with that.

Joe Joyner: Gloria, can I ask a question? This is Joe Joyner. What problem are we trying to solve here?

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Joe, are you asking me?

Joe Joyner: Yes, I mean from the discussion with the online internship, what are we trying to fix?

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Truly, I'm not trying to fix anything, however, (inaudible) economy and the reality of summer jobs for teachers in Florida, many of our students are finding that they can substitute and teach in virtual setting. And yet, we're not providing them at least currently any training or any access or even in experiences in a virtual setting.

Joe Joyner: Yes, I wasn't being (flipped) it was a question.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: No, no, no.

Joe Joyner: I was trying to ask because, you know, we put on this requirement that students take a virtual course before the graduation as a graduation requirement. So we have many, many teachers involved in supervising online instruction during the school day, and also we have our own virtual school.

And the teachers have been able to pick up on the how-to. It has never been an issue. It's something that the districts can handle very easily. I've never had anyone express a concern that teaching teachers how to navigate through the online teaching system is at all difficult.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: OK. That's good to know because in our district, we're finding that there's a need to expose them more to a virtual setting, so I'm glad to hear that, Joe. Thank you.

Joe Joyner: Well, I don't disagree with exposing to a virtual online and instructional technology online I mean with the new digital textbook law coming onboard 2014. It's certainly not something we can ignore.

How do you instruct – how do you use, for instance, online textbooks in the maximum way? Those were all things that are absolutely coming and, of course, online courses are coming, it's just training the teachers to navigate through that system is – has not been difficult.

I think perhaps if you – if it becomes perhaps a learning piece of particular technology course because there are some strategies to teaching online. There are some things that teachers need to know just to do it well. I don't know that it's a whole course or a whole unit or a future requirement.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Good to know. Many of – at least, we don't have just a technology course but that's again up to institutions.

Joe Joyner: Well, I'm sort of amateur commenting on what's caught in teacher prep programs but I can tell you no one will get hired – no one gets hired in this district before they pass a test in their ability to use technology instructionally, and that's something in the hiring process.

So if we're missing the boat in our teacher prep program somewhere in the area of technology with – like I say, with the online textbooks, all the personal devices that are coming onboard, just the importance of being able to utilize technology to maximize the instruction is a humongous piece that cannot be missed I don't think by anybody.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Right, thank you.

Female: Joe, I agree with teachers teach the way they've been taught. And if those types of instructional strategies are not infused by the professors working with those prospective teachers then there is that disconnect.

Joe Joyner: Well, maybe as an individual institution issue, I can't imagine any institution not instructing – utilizing the latest technology and demonstrating that for their students.

Julie Orange: Are there any recommendations on the table to adjust any of the language that we currently have since we have on here the – all of the groups requested to keep each of these. We just had some comments and we've had a discussion here. Are there any – does anybody want to step up and make a motion as to how you want to propose to change this language or do you want to make a motion to keep it the way it is?

Female: Lance?

Lance Tomei: Actually I like it the way it is right now. I don't – this is an area where I don't see a need because I think you have the flexibility now to design field experiences that are appropriate for your setting at an individual teacher preparation program or Institute of Higher Ed.

So – and what I think I'm hearing is it sounds like the requirements are going to vary in different areas of the state. In some areas, it may be important to give candidates that virtual experience, and in other areas, it doesn't seem to be a requirement, that's workforce-driven.

Female: I agree with Lance.

Female: Yes.

Male: I would just say one thing, just overall, and again, this is just me expressing opinion. I think as a whole, it would benefit our profession if we increase the amount of field experiences that we offer students. I feel is the – a person who, you know, gets these individuals from colleges and put them into work that they're better prepared to more field experiences that they have.

Ana Blaine: This is Ana. The comment of possibility of up to one year for Institution of Higher Ed, are we talking about one year of a full-time internship?

Female: There wasn't any other context written beside that comment.

Ana Blaine: OK.

Female: So we put it on here to further explore.

Ana Blaine: OK. Maybe because I do agree with Joe, then more field experience, obviously the better prepared the teachers are going to be in and all the research show that. What I'm worried about is requiring a year of, you know, full field experience, so now, we're looking at increasing the number of credits in the program and then, of course, increasing tuition cost for students.

A lot of programs – sorry – a lot of programs are already doing – I mean I know that in our institution, our students are doing field experience from day one till they complete and they're...

Female: Correct.

Ana Blaine: ... internship but they're doing anywhere from 60 to 90 hours of semester of reading practicum and then a whole senior internship. So I don't know if we want to qualify it – sorry, quantify it in those terms or, you know, I don't know what – I know – I think there is even any rule now to number of hours or anything except for the senior internship, correct?

Female: That's correct.

Female: Correct.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: I would like to keep it the way it is, the first three.

Julie Orange: Gloria, is that a motion?

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Yes, it is.

Julie Orange: Can you repeat it?

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: I would like to keep the first three field experience process as they are.

Lance Tomei: I second.

Julie Orange: Lance, did you just second?

Lance Tomei: I did.

Julie Orange: All in favor?

Female: Aye.

Lance Tomei: Aye.

Female: Aye.

Female: Aye.

Male: Aye.

Julie Orange: Any not in favor?

Male: Aye.

Julie Orange: All right. It looks like we're going to keep this criteria for ITPs.

Female: OK. The only other thing that's in the batches field experience is the comment that was added to the specific timeframe be required for EPIs to demonstrate FEAPS.

Currently, the only requirement for EPI is the statute and rule. It was on your additional document which says, each problem participant must participate in field experiences appropriate to his or her educational plan. There is no timeframe involved. Any comment about that one?

Female: So Debbie (inaudible) participant doesn't have any field experience requirement?

Female: There is a field experience requirement but there is not – the quantity is not specified.

Female: And Gloria, I was just going to say that we – EPI programs do have to demonstrate all FEAPS in the field, so they have to have some type of field component in order to do that. So that’s already implied with the meaning of the two – of each indicator twice, once in the course and once in the field.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Thank you.

Vivian Posey: Eileen, this is Vivian. I just have a quick question. Can you help us to understand why the latitude was provided to the EPIs in this – with this element and it is not – it’s not specified as the length or any other criteria?

Eileen McDaniel: I’m looking at my boss right now as to why.

Female: I don’t know why they’re written the way they are. I really don’t have a lot of – much more to say about it than that. I mean EPI is their post-baccalaureate and they’re like (inaudible) also in the fact that they are still to cover professional preparation essentially, but other than that, I can’t tell you – I don’t know why it’s written that way.

Female: Kathy, whether it’s related to the practice. They do this in a very short, very intense period of time but it would seem to me that we might want to work towards some consistency in terms of field experience.

Kathy Hebda: Well, I think one of the things you have open to you now is that EPI has been around for a few years and those of you that have implemented EPIs or has worked with people who have then may have – now that we’ve been at it for a while, we have some lessons learned and you may want to comment on that or you may want it to stay way it is.

Debbie Cooke: Kathy...

Kathy Hebda: ... constrained by the statutes. You know, if there is something you think you want done, that’s what you want done. Leave it to somebody else to figure out whether it goes into law or rule or something.

Debbie Cooke: This is Debbie. I just have a question and I don’t know if Kathy or Eileen, either one of you has an idea. Do we have any idea of what the gamut is

between the shortest and the longest? I mean are we talking about some people with a three-week field experience against somebody that's got a 13 or 16 week? Do we have any idea what the range is?

Female: The range is very, very broad meaning a – perhaps 15 hours of – 15 literal hours to much more extensive.

Debbie Cooke: So that would – so 15 hours could possibly be at the low end. I had to go in and observe 15 total hours in a class that I had one semester.

Female: But remember the – this is a field experience to demonstrate the before an educator...

Debbie Cooke: OK, all right, OK.

Female: In fact, Debbie, it maybe even less. I can't – we'd have to look at each and every program. It could be less.

Debbie Cooke: OK, all right. I mean I don't know about everybody else but there is some concern about the degree to which this fluctuates. It almost seems that there – and I don't know, I don't live in the Institute of Higher Ed world but that there should be this much disparity. It's something perhaps the committee might want to consider trying to do something about – I don't know.

Female: And it brings some consistency.

Debbie Cooke: Yes.

Ana Blaine: Hi, guys, this is Ana again. Is (Rebecca Harris) still there, Julie?

Julie Orange: Yes, she is.

Ana Blaine: (Rebecca), I think it was you that asked for us – on a PowerPoint slide, you asked all EPI programs to provide you with the number of hours that they require and the number of teaching demonstration hours.

And correct me if I'm wrong but I thought at least 30 hours was the low end of what programs were doing and usually those are the programs that are still running under the initial EPI, you know, module-type courses.

But just so you, guys – I'll speak from my own personal experience with EPI. We at Daytona State rolled our EPI program into the bachelor's level courses which, of course, most institutions that offer EPIs cannot do this because they do not offer bachelor's program.

But as I've said earlier, with our field experiences, the courses that they take have a 15-hour demonstration component attached to the course where they're doing assignments that are FEAPS-based in the courses.

But now with our new FEAPS, because of the amount of indicators that we have now compared to what we have with the old FEAPS, we added an additional 30 hours of just a field experience component – sorry – to our EPIs in order to be able to demonstrate all of those indicators.

And I don't know what other institutions are going to be doing with the new FEAPS but I have a feeling that they're going to have to add something because in just two little lessons, there was no way to cover the 70-something indicators that we're now covering under the FEAPS.

Female:

The table that Ana is talking about I believe was in the November PowerPoint presentation and I can make sure that they get provided to you all again. I believe – I have to go back and look at it but I believe that 30 hours is the lowest amount that anyone indicated but again, that's just for memory, I'm not positive. Those EPIs that are at community colleges that use a collaborative model have two field experiences that require a 15 clock hours in a classroom in each of those field experience.

The other thing I would add is kind of the historical context of EPI was at the beginning, there were a lot of individuals who were in the classroom as they were completing EPIs but as, you know, the job market has tightened that is less and less true.

Lance Tomei: Yes, this is Lance. I want to echo some comments earlier about the importance of field experience. And I have a concern about the lack of rigor and the current requirements for EPIs.

And I think it is derived from the history, if you think about when EPIs first appeared on the scene, it was around the same time that all of the ITPs and the state collectively were producing about 6,000 new teachers a year and at that point in time, there was a year when the anticipated need for new teachers was 30,000. So EPIs were part of the supply and demand solution or one aspect of trying to gear up production.

And initially, we're not designed to lead the professional certification but we've heard in prior meetings that in fact, most if not all EPIs right now have added the SAE requirement and therefore those candidates are leaving and being professionally certified.

And if that's true then my concern about the lack of rigor and the field experience is exacerbated. I think we've got to do something to raise the bar. The national trend is clearly that educated preparation has to become more and more clinical in its nature.

And this is the least demanding of our three – the three paths we're talking about – the DACPs are in the classroom, ITPS have a fairly rigorous requirement and the EPI is not rigorous at all in my mind and I find that concerning.

Ana Blaine: This is Ana once again. I agree with Lance.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: I agree with Lance too. This is Gloria.

Gregory Adkins: Well, this is Greg, and you heard what I said earlier, I think more field experience is a good thing, and I've got real concerns when they're walking in the classroom with very few hours under their belt.

Julie Orange: OK. Do we want to make a motion to have some type of consistency with EPIs concerning hours of field experience? Do we want to move in that direction?

Female: I think we should.

Female: I think so.

Julie Orange: So what is it for traditional or initial teacher prep program? How many hours of field experience?

Female: They have to be continuous throughout the program of study with a culminating internship of at least 10 weeks. I would venture to say that very few of us still require 10 weeks. Are you one who we require 15 to 16 weeks depending on (inaudible)? And we require field experience in all courses in the core, so the two introductory courses.

Debbie Cooke: This is Debbie. In listening to what Ana was talking about, it maybe that what we want to do – because this one says, there is a specific thing at the end that is no less than 10 weeks.

There may be something that we want to consider for the courses before they've gotten some things that they've already – I mean I guess what I'm trying to say is perhaps we want to consider a cumulative number of hours and for institutions that don't provide that as one culminating thing, they at least can say, we've got three things that would equal that minimum.

Female: Debbie, that's a good suggestion. We're going to have to offer some type of recommendation either something like what Debbie just suggested where it's a certain number of hours so let's say – we say 300 hours and they have to satisfy it somehow within the program or do we want to recommend that EPIs must have a culminating field experience.

Male: Ana, can I ask you a question?

Ana Blaine: Yes.

Male: You said you've added 30 additional hours?

Ana Blaine: Correct, we added two single credit courses and it's – they have to have completed all their course work and then they're going to take these two

additional, you know, credits stand alone in order to do their demonstration of the FEAPS.

Male: OK, so you based that on assessment of what you thought it was going to take to cover – to comprehensively cover the new FEAPS with all of the descriptors that are part of that. What's your total hours now?

Ana Blaine: Seventy-five.

Male: OK. So that gives us a frame of reference of at least one institution that has already kind of done the study to try and figure out what they thought would be a minimum requirement to get the job done, so that's helpful, thank you.

Ana Blaine: Correct, now, again, it's getting the jobs done in the FEAPS. So let's go back to what Joe was saying and what some of you also agreed, the more experience that these candidates have, the better prepared they're going to be.

Elisa Calabrese: Right. In Broward, we have an all (CERT) program that really an EPI, so we require 120 hours.

Female: Can I just hump in one second? Operator, we have one of the committee members that's not able to speak. Her name is (Karen Harold). Can you please open up her line?

Operator: OK, one moment, please.

Female: Thank you. Go ahead and continue the discussion. I just want to make sure she had access to talk.

Megan Pankiewicz: This is Megan again. I – if people want to do ITP, they have to have 10 weeks. That would equal...

Female: I'm doing it offsite which we've already talked about that.

Megan Pankiewicz: OK, 560 hours. So if that helps to put anything in perspective, I think those candidates will have 560 hours minimum of field experience.

Female: And remember that 560 plus the field experiences they've had on top of that throughout their program.

Female: Yes.

Vivian Posey: This is Vivian. I just want to add one more point to the discussion. Can we talk about the number of hours as compared with the candidates that are in the ITP programs? There is a difference between hours and then the continuous working in a classroom day to day to day. I think there's a different quality in terms of field experiences.

And I think if we can do anything to prepare those folks coming out of EPI programs to get a better handle on what it takes, the skills that they need to do classroom teaching day after day after day, I like the suggestion of making that consistent as a minimum of 10 weeks as a way of increasing the skills and the abilities of people coming out of the EPI program.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Ana?

Ana Blaine: Yes. Go ahead, Gloria.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Ana, on (inaudible), do you think that's (feasible) to expect EPI to devote 10 weeks in field?

Ana Blaine: So that's the other thing. Remember like – I think it was Eileen said that they are, you know, they hold the bachelor's degree. A lot of these people and – you know, at the Daytona State, we already have the nontraditional students. But these are definitely your nontraditional students where you have people who are supporting their families and they cannot quit their job for an entire semester like some of our bachelor students have to do in order to complete the program. It is going to definitely deter individuals from seeking certification through EPI.

However, I am not in disagreement that a more qualified teacher is going to be one that was prepared with extensive field experiences. Is this maybe a way to filter people who are truly interested in becoming quality educators than

just somebody who's going to go get their certificates to have something to fall back on ...

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Yes.

Female: Yes.

Ana Blaine: So right now it's very easy to get your professional certificate through EPI.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: OK. Let's just have something else, TFA, Teach for America. Before they are placed in any district in the United States, they are required to do six weeks of field experiences.

Julie Orange: OK. This is Julie. I just wanted to jump in now and see if – I just wanted to see if we could possibly table this so that we can get through. We have other guests joining us from the department that have topics that we need to get to today as we've held their calendars, and we possibly will need to have a separate call maybe just to discuss this EPI field experience.

And we can schedule that towards the end of the call, but I just want to make sure that we do get access to the information from the other folks. So we will come back to it and encourage the conversation to continue on Hope Street, and then we'll again schedule another call. But I'm going to go ahead and move along on the agenda to the ESE Task Force with Cathy Bishop. She is the administrator here in the Bureau of Exceptional Ed and Student Services.

Cathy Bishop: Hi. Good afternoon, everybody. We have appreciate the opportunity to come and speak with you.

Some of you may be aware that the commissioner can lead a task force that was nearly related to the ESEA Flexibility Waiver that Florida applied for. And in the process of considering approvals for that waiver, we were required to make some changes in the accountability system with regard to students with disabilities and students who are English language learners, and specifically around how they would be included in the accountability system.

So, based on some of the concerns that were raised at the time and issues that came up through the working toward a waiver, the commissioner appointed a task force. There were three subcommittees – two dealing with students with disabilities and one dealing with students who are English language learners. There is an extensive amount of information on the department website, and I can send Julie that link and she can share that with you all.

The task force also made some additional recommendations that were really not directly related to the ESEA waiver and the accountability system.

One of those recommendations being with regard to Teacher and Leader Preparation Program, and a concern that there was not sufficient training for our teachers with regard to students with disabilities – excuse me. I think it's important to know that 70 percent of our students with disability spend 80 percent or more of their time in general education. So it is very critical that general education teachers need to have certainly some level of scale in terms of working with this population.

So we are just beginning. We were very excited to learn about your committee because we understand that one of your areas of interest is looking specifically at that as well and how teacher preparation programs need to be perhaps modified some to include more preparation with regard to students with disability.

So we think it's very timely. We are just beginning work as a staff on this, and we'll begin by looking at the literature and the FEAP and seeing what's already there in the FEAP that aligns with what the research is saying that teachers need to know and be able to do with regard to students with disability.

So, I guess, I would like to open it to any of your comments, any information from you on literature that you think that we should be familiar with, or any comments on how you have perhaps incorporated more experiences in this area in your programs. And I know that we are running late on time so we can probably not take too much time. But if you do have any comments, we would certainly appreciate hearing those and...

Joe Joyner: This is Joe Joyner in St. John's. Just a question.

The task force – on what basis did they make the premise that teachers were unprepared to instruct ESE children?

Cathy Bishop: Well, you know, that's a good question. The task force was composed of parents, advocates, some school district representation, some teachers.

Joe Joyner: But all of them had some sort of tie-in with and buy-in with ESE programs. So I just wonder, do they point to any data or...

Cathy Bishop: No.

Joe Joyner: ...any specific research study?

Cathy Bishop: No, they did not. And a lot of it was, into some extent, based on experiences – their own experiences, their knowledge of other experiences with regard to this. But no, there was not specific data provided.

Joe Joyner: Thanks.

Cathy Bishop: However, we have – we hear this from other entities as well and just last week had a meeting with an advocacy group related to students with specific learning disabilities, and that same concern was raised by that group. And again, when you look at our data on where students with disability are spending most of their time, it is in general education.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: And research of the national and international level does address the lack of knowledge for our generalists to deal with SPED children. And I can – Cathy, I'm Gloria Pelaez from the University of Miami. I will be happy to send you some of that data.

Cathy Bishop: Thank you.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Well, at U.M., we just integrated our – we just changed our whole curriculum so that our elementary ed majors are also special education majors.

Cathy Bishop: And you're able to do that within the 120 hours?

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: We're a private institution, so we do have, I believe, 126 hours.

Cathy Bishop: Thank you. We would be interested in having more information on that.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Perfect. I'll make sure you get it.

Joe Joyner: I'm not disagreeing with the need. I just wondered on what basis that they made that judgment rather than anecdotal. So someone's got research that our teachers are inadequately prepared.

When I look at the performance of our ESE students, specially the L.D. children, I think it's pretty phenomenal when you look at how high the standard, how high the bar is, and the fact that we expect children with learning disabilities to achieve at the same standard as regular ed kids, I think the work that's done is pretty astounding.

However, you know, I would – I would be dissuaded by looking at data. I just know, you know, if you put a bunch of football coaches in a room, they're going to say there's not enough football, time for football, or money for football. So I just – and I'm not (discouraging the) committee. I just want to know what's politically driven and what's data-driven when it comes to the outcomes of that group.

Julie Orange: And we appreciate your comment.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: And, Joe, may I say that your district does a magnificent job of addressing the need of SPED students. It's shown in your data as well as those with – who are receiving (e-health) services. Unfortunately, that's not the same as many other districts.

Debbie Cooke: Hi, this is Debbie. I think one of the things that we are going to be able to also count as support in this is if you look at the new teacher evaluation systems, both of the instructional framework sort of have been adopted by a majority of the districts as well as many of the hybrid and blended models seek to a teacher's ability to work with low expectancy – their terminology not

mine – students. And so I think that our evaluation system is pointing us in this direction as well.

Joe Joyner: And that – and that actually – I just got the email 30 minutes ago, so the VAM data is out, and so we're going to be able to answer that question.

I agree with you – whoever made that comment. We need to look at the data and see where it points.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Absolutely.

Female: Any other comments on this topic?

We really like to come back to the committee. We will work with Julie and Eileen in terms of what we find, and we'd like to return to you with any recommendation.

Julie Orange: OK. We're going to go ahead and move forward with the Admission Requirements section, and we're going to specifically look at the other area where you had some comments about or – excuse me – under the passing the general knowledge test area where you had recommendations on increasing the level of rigor. And we've asked Phil Canto, the bureau chief of Postsecondary Assessment to come and give us an update on where the state is in that particular area.

Phil?

Phil Canto: Great. Thanks for having me, Julie and committee.

This has been something that's been our agenda for some time. Under the Race to the Top mandate, our goals are to do a couple of things – one, to increase the rigor of all our certification examinations, to have elements of the Common Core, and also to align the Common Core to our (elimination), if applicable. The third part of this rigor fees is to establish a new cut score, if applicable.

So as the development process begin with development and alignment of (inaudible) skills, align to the Common Core, it will move through 1-1/2 to

two-year process, and that will culminate in a new passing score recommendation and approval of the new cut core by the State Board of Education.

So, starting next month, we're going to be taking a very close look at our current competency and skills. We're going to do that by way of four steering committees that we're calling. And each of those four committees for all four sections are subtests of the G.K., to provide us list and high-level recommendations on (inaudible) level of rigor and difficulty, as well as trying to help us to identify the gap that exists the current (inaudible) skills to the Common Core, and to provide us with the recommendations.

So if anyone has been involved on development process, you guys know it takes about two years to develop an assessment from start to finish.

Female: Correct.

Phil Canto: ... is definitely on our list to do that, as well as numerous committees, statewide surveys, and especially following the normal development process as we've always done.

Any questions or comments?

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: So there's no hope to go into practice, right, Phil?

Phil Canto: Well, at this point, no. We're having contracts through December 31st of 2015.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: ... right?

Phil Canto: Correct.

Female: Of the one – I think the one ...

Male: OK, yes. Let me see. (Inaudible) here.

Julie Orange: Anyone else have any comments or questions while we have Phil?

Male: We got that and then we...

Julie Orange: OK. Well, thank you.

I think we want to go ahead and move on to the information that Rebekah Harris has to share with you regarding the 10 percent waiver. There was the...

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Sorry. Julie?

Julie Orange: Yes?

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Can we do – can we address removing G.K. for graduate program?

Julie Orange: Oh, I'm sorry. Do you want to open that up for some discussion?

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: We're talking about master's degree and above. It seemed ridiculous. These people are taking GRE. They already completed a bachelor's degree. I just don't understand why we need to go back to an eighth grade level test.

Female: Are you talking about for admission requirements or for requirements for certification?

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: I'm talking for admission requirements.

Female: Right.

Julie Orange: Does anyone have a motion to make that a recommendation here or do we have further discussion to talk more about this?

Female: Makes sense, Gloria.

Joe Joyner: Yes, I'll jump in. I'm with Gloria on this one. We've – you know, we've had – long had an exception granted in the rule for graduate programs allowing us to use a combined GRE score of a thousand. Well, that's been overcome by the renormalizing of the GRE.

Female: No.

Joe Joyner: The 1,000 doesn't work anymore. But...

Female: Right.

Joe Joyner: ...I'm with Gloria. To me, we ought to replace that with a – with a permission to use – having been awarded a bachelor's degree from a regionally accredited institution as adequate evidence of general knowledge for program admission, which would solve a lot of problems for graduate programs that are trying to admit people especially now that we've got this GRE issue that we're trying to figure out how to deal with as well.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: And it becomes an economic issue because the tests are very expensive. So we're not talking about certification, we're talking about admission.

Joe Joyner: And it becomes a recruiting barrier for graduates.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Correct.

Female: So you guys are saying they're going to have to take them eventually anyway to get certified just for admission purposes to remove it.

Joe Joyner: Exactly.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Correct.

Joe Joyner: Replace it with holding a bachelor's degree for graduate programs, allow us to admit or to meet the general knowledge requirement for program admission just by having a bachelor's degree from an accredited institution.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Institution.

Female: I agree.

Female: That's already the way it is for EPIs.

Female: Yes, it makes sense.

Joe Joyner: I'll make that a formal motion.

Julie Orange: Second?

Debbie Cooke: So does that mean – this is Deb. I don't understand. So does that mean like if I had a bachelor's degree in special studies, then I would not have to take a general knowledge test for social studies or for anything.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: For anything because...

Joe Joyner: Potentially get the general knowledge test for social studies. General knowledge is a generic test that everybody takes no matter what program they're going into.

Debbie Cooke: OK.

Joe Joyner: So the answer is yes, because in your undergraduate program, you would have done a gen ed program and completed that as part of that undergraduate degree. So – and again, this is just to get them in the door.

Debbie Cooke: OK.

Joe Joyner: There are other admission requirements in addition to meeting the general knowledge requirement for admission, but it just seems crazy to hold students hostage over this test. They'll have to pass it to graduate anyway since it's one of the three components of the FTCE.

Debbie Cooke: OK.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Correct.

Debbie Cooke: All right.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: It's better if we could require it for completion of the program, but not for admission.

Joe Joyner: I'm not suggesting we make it go away for graduation. I'm just suggesting that...

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Right. And this...

Joe Joyner: ...we use them – a simple logical solution to allow them in the front door.

Female: If they already held a bachelor's degree and something.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Of course, yes.

Joe Joyner: Any bachelor's degree from an accredited institution.

Female: OK. All right.

Female: Right. They would have to to enter master's program.

Debbie Cooke: OK. Thank you.

Female: And that would help students who decide not to say in Florida and go to another state where they have to take the practice or another exam then they could just take their degree with them and then take their VAM in those states.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Unless they want the certification. Remember, (data proof) program, they have to take (FTC) completely to graduate.

Joe Joyner: Well, they have to take it to get the stamp that they completed the state-approved program. You can award...

Female: Correct.

Joe Joyner: ...the degree and not give them the stamp if they don't meet all the requirements, so there...

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Correct.

Joe Joyner: ...do that, yes.

Female: OK. So this is for admission requirements.

Joe Joyner: Exactly.

Female: We are saying the motion is to remove general knowledge requirement for graduate programs.

Joe Joyner: No, I'm saying that to allow possession of a bachelor's degree from an accredited institute to satisfy the general knowledge requirement for admission or into a graduate program.

Female: Bachelor's degree.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: From an accredited institution.

Female: Anyone seconding – second?

Female: Second.

Female: Anyone have a second to that?

Vivian Posey: This is Vivian. I will second it.

Female: All in favor?

Female: Aye.

Male: Aye.

Female: Aye.

Female: Aye.

Male: Aye.

Male: Aye.

Female: Any nays?

Julie Orange: OK, great.

Female: OK.

Julie Orange: And I want to let you know we did – we will go back to the discussion about the 2.5 GPA, and we have other recommendations for admission requirement when we – when we schedule the next call for the EPI.

We do want to round out the call with some information from Rebekah Harris that you requested – you specifically requested what institutions are using the 10 percent waiver, and she has some information to share with us. And then we'll wrap up and schedule the continuation on this call.

Rebekah Harris: So the statute allows a waiver of the admission requirements for up to 10 percent of the student being admitted in an academic year. And so I went back through what the institutions report as to what percentage of institutions indicate if they use the 10 percent waiver or not. And over 56 percent of institutions indicate that they use the waiver.

However, we don't have a specific admissions link defined anywhere in statute or rule. So those – some institutions indicate that they do not use the waiver, do indicate that they have something like provisional admission or delayed admission where they allow individuals additional time to meet requirements for state requirements for admission to the program.

So, take the 56 percent with a bit of grain of salt because different institutions kind of define the use of the 10 percent waiver differently because we do not have in statute or rule a specific point where admission determination needs to be made by an institution or by a program. So I don't know about you all, we're asking about the 10 percent waiver and I don't know if it was for consideration of continuing it or not, but that was the information that I had about it.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Thank you, Rebekah.

Rebekah Harris: You're welcome.

Male: Rebekah, there's one more issue of scale here that might be worth talking about for just a second. And that is of those institutions that use this, how close are they to maxing out the 10 percent that they're allowed? And I surface that only because we're among the institutions that occasionally admit

candidates on a waiver, but we admit well over 1,000 a year, and I can count on one hand in a typical year the number of candidates that we admit on a waiver. So we're way, way shy of 10 percent, so it's not – even though we would be a using institution, it's not such a magnitude that it's a make it or break it for me.

Julie Orange: Right. That's correct. I would say, obviously, for the smaller institutions because they're admitting a smaller number of people they more quickly approach their 10 percent waiver. But most institutions who indicated that they do use the 10 percent waiver, they are not going all the way up to the 10 percent waiver. They still are very carefully reviewing the individual students who are requesting the waiver and so that – so that they make sure that they don't approach or exceed the 10 percent waiver.

Male: OK. Thanks. That's helpful, too.

Female: Very helpful.

Julie Orange: Any other questions there?

OK. Basically what we need to do at this point is know that we can finish our discussions that we started here regarding the EPI, and also Mark said he has some additional information he wants to get out to the committee and we can respond to that on the next call as well, and then go back to the discussion about emission requirements, particularly the GPA because there are specifics that you want to discuss there.

So why don't we go ahead and see if we can schedule another call sooner than later. We know that school is about to pick up here in the district very quickly for the fall. So looking at calendars maybe the beginning of next week...

Female: Monday?

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: No, please.

Julie Orange: We're checking here too, sorry.

Female: ... remember it.

Julie Orange: ...Gloria? Gloria, (inaudible) hear that. Did you say Monday completely out.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Yes.

Julie Orange: OK. Tuesday, the 14th?

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: Tuesday, the 14th were (inaudible) for me any time before two o'clock.

Julie Orange: ... look on calendar for this 14th.

Male: I have a school board meeting in the morning the 14th.

Female: Yes, I have a school board meeting.

Female: I have a board meeting.

Karen Harold: I don't know if you can hear me, it's Karen.

Julie Orange: OK.

Lance Tomei: This is Lance. Tuesday morning does not work for me too. The afternoon is fine.

Julie Orange: OK. Tuesday sounds like it's conflict for multiple. Wednesday here is a conflict for us.

Thursday, what about 11 a.m. on Thursday the 16th?

Female: That works for me.

Lance Tomei: Works for me.

Debbie Cooke: This is Debbie. That's fine with me.

Ana Blaine: Works for me. This is Ana.

Julie Orange: Any conflicts for 11 a.m. on the 16th?

Female: Yes, I can't but that's OK.

Greg Adkins: I can't either. This is Greg, but that's fine too.

Female: What about if we did it earlier like we started it 8:30 or 9:00, that alleviates problems?

Greg Adkins: I got (a zone) meeting the whole day so I'm – I just can't do it that day.

Female: I could do it after 6 p.m.

Julie Orange: Jasmine, are you available that day in Elisa's absence either that 11?

Jasmine Ulmer: In the middle of the morning, probably from like 9 to 11, and then again after 1.

Julie Orange: Nine o'clock?

Jasmine Ulmer: Yes.

Gloria Artecona-Pelaez: That works for me too.

Male: Good for me.

Male: Good for me.

Julie Orange: OK. So let's do it for August 16th at 9 o'clock, and we'll send out the information prior to the meeting, and be in touch.

I appreciate all the feedback. I know we had a good discussion. Sorry to have to cut some of those short. But if, Mark, if you wouldn't mind sending that information that you referenced so that we can get some discussion started on Hope Street, and we will pick up on the 16th at nine.

Mark Howse: Yes. Julie, I've already emailed it, so it should be in your email box when you get a chance to look at it.

Julie Orange: OK, great.

Debbie Cooke: And, Julie, this is Debbie. How much time are we holding, 9 to 11?

Julie Orange: Let's hold that to be safe and then we can...

Debbie Cooke: OK.

Julie Orange: ...you know, if we don't take it all then, it would be a nice treat.

Debbie Cooke: OK, perfect. Thanks.

Julie Orange: Thank you so much, everyone.

Male: Right. Bye.

Female: Thank you.

Female: Bye-bye.

Female: Bye-bye.

Female: Bye-bye.

Male: Bye all.

Female: Bye.

Male: Bye-bye.

END