



2009 FACTE Fall Conference
University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida
UCF Academy for Teaching, Learning, and Leadership
Room 117

Thursday, October 15, 2009

8:30 am Registration, coffee and refreshments

9:00 am *Welcome, Introductions, and Program Overview*

- Dr. Jennifer Platt, Executive Associate Dean, University of Central Florida, FACTE President
- Dr. Terry Hickey, Provost, University of Central Florida

Presentation and Discussion

Jennifer Platt welcomed the group and introduced Dr. Terry Hickey who provided an update on UCF:

- UCF has over 53,500 students and is the largest university in the State of Florida and the third largest university in the U.S.
- The average UCF SAT is 1225, and the average UCF Honor's College SAT is 1373; UCF ranks second in Florida in the number of National Merit Scholars (55).

Dr. Hickey noted that UCF provides access to students throughout Florida. He referred to the increasing respect for education in Florida, as well as changes in the UCF student body and changes in P-12 education. He encouraged the participants to continue to help all students and thanked them for doing a good job with the current financial challenges.

Over 100 participants from the following institutions and groups introduced themselves:

- Barry University
- Bethune Cookman
- Central Florida Community College
- Chipola College
- Clearwater Christian College
- Daytona State College
- Edward Waters College
- Flagler College – Tallahassee
- Florida Association of District School Superintendents (FADSS) (CEO)
- Florida Atlantic University
- Florida Board of Governors
- Florida Department of Education
- Florida Division of Community Colleges, Florida Department of Education (Chancellor and staff)
- Florida Division of K-12 Public Schools, Florida Department of Education (Chancellor and staff)
- Florida Education Association (Legislative Liaison)
- Florida Governor's Office
- Florida Gulf Coast University
- Florida International University
- Florida Memorial University
- Florida School Boards Association (FSBA) (Executive Director)
- Florida State University
- Hillsborough Community College
- Jacksonville University
- Lake City Community College
- Lynn University
- Nova Southeastern University
- Palm Beach Atlantic University
- Rollins College
- Saint Leo University
- St. Petersburg College
- Southeastern University
- University of Central Florida
- University of Florida
- University of Miami
- University of North Florida
- University of South Florida
- University of South Florida Sarasota Manatee
- University of South Florida – St. Petersburg
- University of Tampa
- University of West Florida
- Warner University

Jennifer noted there were 103 registered members, with 32 institutions represented. She provided an overview of the agenda. Materials from the Wednesday presentations are posted at FACTE.info at:

- Best Practices Used during Preservice Programs to Link Teacher Preparation and P-12 Student Learning



(Presented October 14, 2009, by Dr. Hilda Rosselli, Dean, College of Education, Western Oregon University, rossellh@wou.edu)

Part 1 - <http://facte.info/FACTE1.ppt>; Part 2 - <http://facte.info/FACTE2.ppt>

- Impact on Student Learning (Kathy Hebda, October 14, 2009)
<http://facte.info/Impact%20on%20Student%20Learning.ppt>

9:30 am Topic: Florida Department of Education Update

- Kathy Hebda, Deputy Chancellor for Educator Quality, Florida Department of Education
- Genae Crump, Program Director for Educator Preparation, Bureau of Educator Recruitment, Development and Retention, Florida Department of Education

Presentation and Discussion

Genae Crump and Rebecca Pfeiffer provided an update (http://facte.info/FL_DOE.php) on the following:

- **Matrices update** – These were submitted last August, and they are being given priority review, based on upcoming site visits. The matrices will be reviewed by the end of the fall 2009 semester, before winter break.
- **Folio review update** – Submission dates are still February 1, June 1, and September 1. Because there are fewer reviewers available during the summer, the June 1 submission date is reserved for resubmitted folios. The next review session will be an electronic review in mid-November. This will be the third electronic review, which is reducing folio review costs (e.g., it costs about \$15,000 to fly reviewers into Tallahassee). The review is facilitated by Tonya Brown Jones, who provides a training webinar at the beginning of the review process and follow-up conference calls. The review teams can meet through conference calls, but reviewers also work independently, as they have always done prior to an on-site review. The January 2009 and summer 2009 trainings prepared a 150 reviewers for electronic reviews. The spring 2010 focus will be on the EPIs. Some participants have expressed problems with the electronic review (e.g., distractions and printing). If needed, the DOE will print the folios for reviewers. The fall 2009 review season will cover 12 institutions, 23 programs, and 13 resubmits for the folio review. Participants were reminded to stamp the transcript endorsement statements with the same language that is provided on the approval letter. Under the new standards, approximately 60 programs have been approved, of which about 20 are reading endorsements (standalone and infused).
- Institutions that are currently seeking approval include the following:
 - American College of Education (Educational Leadership)
 - Daytona Beach State College
 - Duval District-Shultz Center (modified Educational Leadership)
 - Edison State College
 - Indian River State College
 - National Louis University (Educational Leadership)
 - Northwest State College (OWCC)
- **Educator Preparation Institutes (EPIs)** – There are EPIs in 23 community/state colleges and seven senior institutions. Two institutions have suspended their program reviews since fall 2008. Technical assistance training was provided to the EPIs in November 2008. A new training will be held in July 2010 since the institutions will be preparing for site visits. The EPIs will also complete an IPEP (i.e., APAP, annual program evaluation program). EPIs at senior institutions will also be reviewed during the next three years in conjunction with the on-site visits.
- **Educational Leadership** – During the upcoming reviews, the DOE will **not** look at the Educational Leadership programs since they have not had time to implement all processes, i.e., they need three years of submitting information to the DOE. Even though there is no state review for Educational Leadership, NCATE will review Educational Leadership programs as they always have. The DOE believes that it will be more meaningful to review Educational Leadership after they have three years of data. If the program was approved in 2008, it will be reviewed on-site for 2011, beginning spring 2011, and thereafter. The number of approved Educational Leadership programs has increased (currently 11 public institutions, 9 independent institutions, and one school district). Two reviews are in process. If the institution has a modified program, it can be at the M.S. or Ed.S. level. If also using the M.S. for a specialist degree, submit an additional folio. If there are candidates who are moving out of state, the receiving DOEs will not understand the modified program. NSU has approval at the M.S. and Ed.S. levels. **There will be no EDL IPEP submission to the Doe for fall 2009.** The implementation of the new standards was in 2008, but programs have not received complete information. The DOE is waiting for the EDL IPEP until there are more data to make the review more meaningful. The DOE is also in the process of convening a work group to develop a standard



satisfaction survey process for institutions for Educational Leadership. (Ten public and five private institutions have this process established.)

- **NCATE update** – The partnership agreement is still in process. NCATE has two review options, and an institution is piloting the continuous improvement option with the DOE for spring 2010.
- **FTCE update** – Donna Utakis is the institutional contact for Pearson (413-256-2722, DonnaUtakis@nesinc.com, <http://www.fl.nesinc.com/>). Refer to the two emails that Genae sent this past week on the FTCE CBT issue and the test that was cancelled on December 5, 2009. There is a plan on how to address this testing need. Mike Jones is no longer the Bureau Chief for Postsecondary Assessment; Phil Canto is the new contact (850-245-0513, Phil.Canto@fldoe.org). If an institution has placed “gates” in the testing process, the institution decides how the tests are completed. The DOE does not determine how this is done. The DOE only wants the tests to be completed prior to completing” the degree program.
- **IPEP reporting** – The Florida State Board Rule states that the IPEPs have to be completed annually. The last time that IPEPs were completed was in 2004. There will be no IPEP submission for fall 2009. Though this was to have been implemented by fall 2008, institutions with site visits scheduled for spring 2011 or fall 2011 will be the first institutions to submit the IPEP to the DOE. IPEP submissions will be based on the site visit (i.e., the IPEP will be submitted at least two years prior to the site visit so that there are two years of data). This will include Title II completer information. Standard requirements will be sent to all institutions in the fall before the winter break. We will still have summary reports. The data will include candidate admission data, FTCE pass rate data, and demonstration of teaching competencies included in the uniform core curricula.
- **Electronic IPEP** – The DOE is still working with the original piloting institutions, and they will develop a pilot for the system. Revisions will be made to the program approval Web site. Materials can also be posted at The Teach in Florida Web site (<http://www.teachinflorida.gov>), e.g., materials for the fall 2009 electronic folio review (mid-November 2009 with the goal of completing by the winter break) and revisions to English Language Learners document. This has been completed, and the guidebook is being approved at this time, based on the requirements of the consent decree. Senior institutions with EPIs will submit an **APEP** (not an IPEP) for the EPI. The EPI visits will be different, because they follow separate standards. When the eIPEPs/eAPAPs are posted, the reviewers will be able to look at these prior to the on-site review.
- **Training** – Folio and site review training sessions were held in January 2009 (initial folio) and July 2009 (continued site approval). EPI review training will be in the spring and summer of 2010.
- **Guideline requirements** – These were finalized in July 2009 for the initial and continued program approval standards for initial preparation programs and e-mailed to institutions by Chancellor Haithcock. With those guidelines, the expectation is that, from this point forward (i.e., September 2009 and thereafter), these guidelines will be used for folio submission and site visit guidelines (for continued program approval). These guidelines are posted at the DOE Web site, and they outline the acceptable (minimal) level. The guideline memo is posted at <http://info.fldoe.org/docushare/dsweb/Get/Document-5448/dps-2009-134.pdf> (memo) along with the continued and initial guidelines (<http://www.fldoe.org/profdev/pdf/2008sidebyside.pdf>).
- **Beginning teacher satisfaction surveys** – This is the third year of the combined report from the DOE ITPs, EPIs, and DAC (district alternative certification). Institutions may use the actual survey that the DOE distributes. Rebecca will send the data file to each institution. The final report is sent to (institutions) and posted on the Teach in Florida Web site (<http://www.teachinflorida.com/>) each year in January. (The 2009 report of the 2007 survey is posted at <http://www.teachinflorida.com/Portals/0/Beginning%20Teachers%20in%20Florida%2012-20-08%20-%20Final%20Report.pdf>.) Regarding the completion rate, some principals have problems with completing these surveys for multiple institutions. The DOE used a survey committee with representatives from all types of institutions and would like institutions to use the same survey. The institutions can also meet the requirement by using the DOE data results. If desired, institutions can add questions to the existing survey.
- **ESOL standards** – These have been changed and are in the process of being approved.
- **Title II reporting** – Rebecca and John Hansen described the new process. The Title II report will be on a Sharepoint data site.
 - **Timeline** – Congress reauthorized Title II (August 14, 2008), held public meetings (September – October 2008), first drafted the requirements (Fall 2008), held a working group meeting (December 11-12, 2008), requested feedback from states and IHEs (January – February 2009), sent forms to the Office of Management and Budget (February/March 2009), requested public comments (spring 2009), and the final forms have just been received.
 - **Two interim reports** – One is due from the IHEs (April 2010) and one is due from the DOEs (October 2010). The full report will be submitted through the system (IHE – April 2011). The states will submit their report in October 2011.
 - **Three form formats** (IHE, IHE alternative certification, and district alternative certification) – EPIs are alternative certification pathways, and they are reported separately. The DOE will create a centralized data collection system. Some of the data (e.g., pass rates, scaled scores, etc.) can be provided by the DOE, e.g., for the SUSs, the DOE will use the Teacher



Education File, the CCTCMIS will be used for community colleges, and the ICUF institutions will use the electronic IPEP. The DOE has information on the number of students certified or licensed in the data warehouse, and they will provide this.

- **New item** – There are institutional (not program) admission requirements. The admission date will be when the candidates are formally admitted into the program. The Rule of 10 will be observed.
- **Enrollment reporting requirements** – Enrolled students will be reported by gender, ethnicity, and race.
- **Annual goals** – These need to be set by shortage areas for completers (math, science, special education, instruction of English Language Learners, other). Title II has had punitive measures for years and has never implemented these. The institution evaluates the goal (e.g., goal met description of the strategies used to achieve goal, description of students to approve performance...). Additional clarification will be provided during Friday's (October 16, 2009) Title II presentation.
- **Assurances** – Most of these are in the standards for approved programs.
- **Pass rates** – John and Rebecca will provide these rates. They will be organized as follows:
 - Number taking test, average scaled score, number passing, percentage, statewide pass rate, etc. This will be for all students who completed in 2009-2010. This does not include interns. Additional categories will include other enrolled students 2009-2010 (including interns), all completers 2009-2010, all completers 2008-2009, and all completers 2007-2008. This will be prior to student teaching and prior to the practicum for the SUSs and community colleges. Rebecca will continue communicating with the Board of Governors on this.
 - There has been a problem with the Florida DOE on the reporting of scaled (not cut) scores, but this is being addressed by John and Rebecca with the US DOE. They will ask Westat about this tomorrow.
 - These requirements were set for all states, of which many do not have data collection processes at the state DOE level.
- There are some misalignments with the reporting requirements for the US DOE and the requirements that we have for our teacher education programs.
- **Changes in data collection** – Average scale score by assessment, statewide average scale scores, pass rates, and statewide average pass rates will be reported for each assessment, ABCTE scores, ETS, Pearson/ES, state, etc.
- **Low performing schools** – The results for some on-site reviews have resulted in all programs being conditionally approved. This does not apply to folio reviews.
- Several other areas are required in our standards.
- **Timeline**
 - **January 2010** – Pilot system
 - **March 2010** – System in place
- John Hansen will verify the data.
- **Other DOE activities** – Kathy Hebda announced that she has vacated her position as Bureau Chief, which has been filled by Ms. Eileen McDaniel, who has been a K-12 teacher and guidance counselor and with certification (director of the policy and communication unit [toll free line]), and with alternative certification for districts. The DOE received a letter from the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) that there was not a cut score on each of the components and that you could not pass a section of the test and still pass. She referred to problems that could have happened if we had established cut scores for these sections, i.e., if a 40% requirement had been set for each of the components on the K-6 test, she said that it would have been the same outcome on the test; 50% would have weeded out some people; a 70% cut score for each section would have resulted in a 14% pass rate for 2008. The DOE will make a decision on this before January 2010, but it has been reviewed by competency data. Kathy encouraged the group to look at the testing information systematically, since the State Board will make a decision on what to do on the cut scores of all tests. The elementary test will be reviewed first before the math test. Commissioner Smith discussed this issue with the deans in June 2009 and asked them to share the data with faculty. Are there data in the field that show that high test scores correlate to the performance of teachers? Kathy referred to the fact that those who don't pass don't teach. There is a cut score on the DOE FTCE, but this test wasn't designed for this, i.e., candidates can score poorly and still pass a test. She stressed that it is important to address teacher performance on tests because of the public's perception on the preparation of teacher education.
- **Funding** – The Title I and IDEA money has almost doubled since 2008. The Race to the Top Grant has not been released yet. Application is by state for a group (i.e., DOE, universities, and districts, etc.). The official form will be released in November, delaying it from October, due to the large number of responses from the public. The Commissioner is meeting with FEA about the grant. It centers on (1) standards and assessments, (2) longitudinal data, (3) teachers and leaders, and (4) struggling schools. There are 19 criteria to which a state must respond. The first part addresses whether the state has addressed failing schools. The second half addresses how the applicants will use the money received (i.e., how will you tie these four assurance areas together). Florida received assistance from Parthenon (Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation) for organizing the grant application information. Kathy is the leader for the Great Teachers and Leaders section. Districts and institutions are already developing proposals. Half of the money that the state would get would go to the state to provide support, and half goes to the districts, but the applications are submitted together. Kathy asked participants to think of the



kinds of collaborative efforts that are in place. Florida's award will be modified in March or April. Implementation must occur "on ground" in schools. The DOE will work with districts and institutions that will be "bold, but prudent" and different. Under Great Teachers and Leaders, the first area to pilot will be a better measure of teacher effectiveness. As a measure of teacher effectiveness, how will placement, differentiated performance, and individualized and timely professional development impact recruitment? How will these areas work in teacher preparation and how are they used for teacher effectiveness? What is a good way to provide evidence of teacher, student, and school performance that is multi-faceted? These data will be used to develop an assessment system. The goal is to develop a strategy to increase teacher- and leader-effectiveness and would include evaluating teachers and those who are selected for alternative certification. Basic criteria are needed and will be listed with choices within the applications. How do these areas impact student performance? How do the districts make teacher placements, and what kind of support systems are in place? Career management and teacher compensation would probably not change, based on these developments. These changes can be piloted in low-performing schools. All of the data for the grant are not yet available. Survey data are needed for different areas, e.g., retention, evaluation, and professional development. FACTE participants need to send memoranda of understanding to the DOE. The DOE will process these, based on the request for input, and there will be an official selection process. Participants were asked to e-mail Kathy's assistant (Sharon.Lenzo@fldoe.org) or Eileen McDaniel, and their names will be added to the conference call list.

11:30 am Break

11:45 am Topic: Education in Florida: Challenges and Opportunities

- Eric Smith, Florida Commissioner of Education

Presentation

Jennifer welcomed Dr. Eric Smith, who is a UCF graduate (M.S. in Administration) and a USF graduate (Ed.D.). Dr. Smith began his education career as a math and science teacher in Winter Park at Union Park Junior High School over 37 years ago. He has worked in different states (Maryland, North Carolina, Virginia), but his most recent work was with the College Board as a Senior Vice President for College Readiness. His work with the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation is now being implemented in five districts (two in Florida). He referred to this critical time in education and education's role in the country's future and viability and the movement from accountability to responsibility. Overall, he doesn't see that education is much different from the days when he began his teaching career, even though the technology has changed.

Dr. Smith recently attended an international meeting on teacher quality in Finland with representatives from Sweden, Singapore (webcast), Hong Kong, and with other world leaders in education in Pisa. He described the principal teachers in Finland as being responsible for "nation-building" with their purpose being for "delivering to the nation." Though teachers acknowledged their responsibility, for the most part, he did not sense this same sense of responsibility for the low-performing schools. He did not sense that same level of responsibility for the teachers in America yet, due to the quality of the workforce in the classroom and the replacements for Florida teachers, due to retirement. He described the rigors of testing of pre-service teachers and the competition among teachers.

Issues that will be addressed in America and Florida include teacher certification, induction, tenure, exiting of teachers, salaries, etc. These issues will become more public during the winter holiday and as we prepare to apply for the Race to the Top grant and will involve those who prepare teachers. He acknowledged a critical mass in America that understands that we are not going to be a competitive player in the world unless we radically change the pool of talent that is coming out of schools and universities, and that they are prepared at a higher level, academically, in creativity, ability to adapt, problem-solving, etc., as opposed to outsourcing services (e.g., legal services). Dr. Smith suggested that we listen carefully to Arne Duncan's comments on teacher preparation programs and that we look at the challenge, the problem, and how we are going to be part of the solution to get it fixed. Among Dr. Smith's worries are that 77% of the African-American graduates with high school diplomas go to community colleges and require math remediation or reading remediation before they continue. He described the ENLACE Report (<http://collegegoalsundayflorida.org/wordpress/?p=142>) that points to the failure rate in math. Another problem is the feeder system problem of the institutions with a result that many students will drop out due to dissatisfaction. He also referred to the NAEP results as being flat nationally for math (<http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2009/10/14/08naep.h29.html?tkn=YNRFbdkdYkhEUQHKNexOL6Wmo%2FoP0tj%2BtEMA>), and the PISA Study and TIMSS Report (*Comparing NAEP, TIMSS, and PISA in Mathematics and Science*, http://nces.ed.gov/timss/pdf/naep_timss_pisa_comp.pdf) that illustrate the urgency to address these areas in the Race to the Top proposal. In response to his question on how rapidly Florida can move up, Dr. Smith pointed to how this solution can be



developed through partnerships that focus on rapidly upgrading the talent that goes into the classrooms that will have the capacity to make these changes. He also described the level of instruction and expectation as being low for some of the 2.7 million children in Florida schools. Dr. Smith would like all students to be engaged with quality instruction, just as students are in Singapore. As commissioner, he will find people who can do this, e.g., by pulling in people from the outside through ABCTE or recruiting, or through enforcement. He mentioned the work of teachers who are going through alternative certification is surpassing that of other teachers, and we need to find out why. Some of these issues will be worked out through the Race to the Top proposal that will be developed in the next 60-90 days. Dr. Smith recommended that the institutions look at the data that were received June 2009 and the data that will be sent next week. Institutions can assist him by making recommendations on how we can correct these issues.

Discussion

Dr. Larry Daniel noted how the DOE-approved programs have met and exceeded these standards, based on numerous indicators of quality, and asked Dr. Smith whether he thought this work was irrelevant. Dr. Smith responded that it is time to plan and reflect and begin anew. He also stated that the work of the institutions is relevant and that the PISA study shows that our work is better. However, he indicated that the way we certify is not effective and needs to be changed. Regarding the NAEP results, he summarized that in math for Grade 4, every subgroup in Florida surpasses the national average on NAEP. He again stated the urgent need to change things quickly.

Regarding teacher retention, Dr. Bob Shockley described how the teacher candidates are excited and eager, but, in five years, half of them would have left education. He also described the demoralizing of the teachers and the lack of support for them in their schools. Bob asked Dr. Smith how he could change this paradigm and what can we do about this problem? Dr. Smith referred to designing better lessons to "elevate the business." Another concern is leadership training, i.e., the number one reason that teachers leave is because of the leaders. Dr. Smith expressed an interest in returning to meet with a smaller FACTE group and to visit some of our best students in the field. This could develop into a lesson study for institutions.

Dr. Catherine Emihovich (UF) asked about raising the GPA for teachers to 3.0, since she thinks the bar of 2.5 is too low and that the GPA is a good predictor of performance. When the GPA was raised at UF, the number applicants increased, and there were more applicants of color. Dr. Smith responded positively to looking at the qualifications of incoming students and graduates and to the need to have strong diversity in the classroom. Regarding Florida's low number of superintendents and what Dr. Smith is doing in his work with the superintendents, he described work on district leadership and superintendents through Race to the Top. He stated that "Schools don't fail; districts fail" and that there is a responsibility in supervision. Dr. Smith closed by expressing his willingness to meet with FACTE to discuss teacher certification, feedback on cut scores, etc., or speak after he gets the guidelines for Race to the Top, the priority.

Jennifer volunteered the expertise of FACTE members and asked if Dr. Smith could meet with the group in March 2010, if not before.

12:45 pm Lunch (Rooms 130 and 117)

2:00 pm **Topic: *The Changing Landscape of Higher Education: Does Florida Have a Plan?***

- Will Holcombe, Chancellor, Division of Florida Colleges
- Dottie Minear, Senior Associate, Vice Chancellor, Board of Governors
- Ed H. Moore, President, Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida (ICUF)
- William L. Proctor, Florida House of Representatives (District 20) and Chancellor, Flagler College

Presentation

After introductions, Jennifer thanked LiveText for the contribution to FACTE. The LiveText representative, Ms. Ramel Riley was available to provide a demonstration of the system.

Dr. Bob Shockley moderated the panel and provided an overview for the discussion. FACTE is the umbrella organization that represents Florida teacher preparation programs, including state, independent, emerging state colleges, and community colleges. Because of the interest in the level at which institutions function, and an unprecedented budget crisis, how will the institutions handle this crisis and where are we going to get funding? How can we plan for higher education? Are the governing boards



talking to each other? Bob described the joint meeting (November 12) at Scripps with the Florida Board of Governors and the Florida State Board of Education and how FACTE can play a role in gathering key players from institutions, the Board of Governors, and the legislature, to begin a dialog on how to address the crisis. In 1981, Florida adopted the first plan for higher education. In 1998, a massive restructuring of the higher education system was made to provide K-20 oversight. The Postsecondary Education Planning Commission (PEPC) was dissolved and replaced by **SEPT** with the intent of K-20, which has never been funded and which does not exist. With this background, Bob welcomed the panelists, who have been previous speakers at FACTE, and who have worked with, and provided support for, FACTE.

- **Dr. Dottie Minear** works with the Board of Governors and their strategic planning committee. She provided input on how to move forward with cross-sector planning for higher education and recommended the Chamber and Council 100 Web site (<http://fastforwardflorida.com>) which addresses the link between future prosperity in Florida with education today. She noted that we will have to have a world-class higher education system that fosters innovation and creativity and give students the knowledge, skills, and state of mind to reach these goals. Also needed is a shared vision for higher education in Florida. This will require working together across public and private sectors with government, business partners, and the community. There will have to be adequate and predictable public and private funding to support this. Also needed is a shared understanding and demonstration of the responsibility piece of the public and personal benefit of education. She referred to conversations with Chancellor Frank Brogan about getting this predictable and sustainable funding, and she indicated that the Board of Governors has focused on the alignment of this issue at multiple levels and identified a need for regional analysis, which is the core of the question. The Board of Governors has also developed a state plan with four key goals:

1. Degrees
2. State and regional needs
3. Individual community needs and
4. Unique responsibilities of each institution (What are institutions going to do to contribute to this?)

The discussion of the alignment is beginning with discussions with individual institutions and how their plans align with the state needs. Next they are working on a performance monitoring system, a communication device, and the funding and progress (e.g., how each institution has performed, their goals, their progress, and the use of data to analyze this). She referred to a “dashboard on basic needs,” but also to the capabilities to look at different student groups and levels. How many students leave in good academic standing? We need to use data to answer this and to support continuous improvement at the institutional level. The use of data for evaluation will be part of the workplan process that will occur annually in May or June, along with the goals, opportunities, fiscal implications, etc. This information will facilitate better budget requests, accountability reports, workplans, strategic plans, etc. However, these elements fall short of a state plan. Are the goals being met by the Gates Foundation or the Obama administration? What is the percentage of the current credentials being produced that are being produced in Florida? How many more teachers do we need to produce? These questions provide a starting point. The Board of Governors is receiving good information from the business partners on the kinds of programs they need, but these groups need to help define some state goals and then determine who does what and what each institution offers. Dr. Minear asked, “What will be your major issue? How much of this needs to take place at the state level and how much needs to happen at the regional level? What input do you provide for the Board of Governors on how they can best position themselves to maximize the resources? How innovative and creative can you get with the funds that are available?”

- **Dr. Will Holcombe** provided an overview of *Teacher Preparation in the Florida College System October 2009* and two primary issues: (1) how we prepare more students to be college-ready before they leave K-12, and (2) how we get more students to, and through, K-12 and into the college system. Until we solve these two issues, we will not be more successful in Florida. He emphasized that the postsecondary institutions comprise one system that need to be more effective and efficient. There are 28 colleges in the Florida College System (FCS) with baccalaureate programs in education, health science, and applied technology. The baccalaureate programs constitute 1% of what these institutions do within their three roles:

1. **2+2 transfer to the SUS and to the ICUFs** – More data are needed on these students. In 2007-08, 53% of education graduates of state colleges were community college transfer students.
2. **EPIs (Education Preparation Institutes)** – These had 1,151 students enrolled in 2005-2006 and 4,746 students in 2008-2009. Funding for the EPIs was lost in 2008, and now the institutions are supporting these programs. The lower division enrollment is up 11%, and it will be difficult to maintain the EPI enrollment. These programs look different, i.e., they have a higher percentage of male students (28%) than traditional teacher preparation programs (20%) and have a 98% pass rate on



the FTCE. There were 710 completers in 2007-2008 who taught in Fall Term 2008. Over half of these completers teach at the secondary level.

3. **Programs** – Institutions include Broward College, Chipola, Daytona State College, Edison State College, Florida State College at Jacksonville, Indian River State College, Miami Dade College, Northwest Florida State College, and St. Petersburg College. These institutions have not been able to get funding for many of these programs. In 2008-2009, the student headcount was 2,021 in these programs, and a total of 259 degrees were awarded. Dr. Holcombe predicts these programs will grow slowly over the years. The student population is older (2/3 are 26 and older; more than 1/3 of the students are over 35), which reflects the age of the general population at the lower division, because these students come from the workforce and want to teach. These students are almost 40% minority.
- **Mr. Ed Moore** – Mr. Moore began his talk by saying that teacher preparation programs do not get enough praise for their work in Florida. He stated that Florida does not have a plan; Florida is not ready to compete. Is Florida ready to prepare workers? No. We don't know where we are now, or where we want to be. We lack a comprehensive view. What are our assets? How can we use what we have to meet this? He mentioned Arne Duncan's recent speech at the University of Virginia, which was critical of colleges of education. What was Mr. Duncan's purpose for his statements: to focus the need? We don't know what works and what doesn't work in teacher preparation programs. Mr. Moore also mentioned issues that included alternative certification, retirements, etc., that are impacting teacher education. There are 3.2 million teacher positions that are predicted to return to classrooms in four years, but how are we going to supply them? He thinks that the exodus of teachers will begin next year (2010-2011) with 100,000 educators retiring. According to SREB, 49% of Florida teachers are over 50. He believes that changes in how we teach, train, and compensate will help, and he wants to include the schools of education in any new discussion of how we use teachers. Regarding the state experiments with many models for teacher preparation, he mentioned that we never stopped to determine which was more effective in the preparation process and that we never evaluated the outcome benefits of these. He questioned, "Wouldn't we be better off if we could determine who is doing a better job of outputs to share best practice models?" and pointed out that we are all building new models with little focus on studying the outputs. He emphasized that we need to take time to measure the quality of the programs, provide suggestions on how to measure this, and build the model. Because more babies were born in 2007 than in any other year in American history, we have to start focusing on these evaluative issues. Since teacher education is economic development, the colleges of education must bring these issues to the attention of the legislature. Otherwise, legislators will make assumptions and rely on the advice of others.

Ed Moore monitors state and national events and sees that new funding processes are being tried because of HEA, e.g., Teacher Quality Grants and a new federal project (Kansas and Missouri) to which they intend to add teacher education (policy and intent). He pointed at the possibility of applying these processes in Florida and the need to pursue partnerships since all of these grants involve partnerships. Some of the examples that ICUF institutions have participated in include "how to untie your brain," democracies laboratories, and the ERAU/Manatee County/NSU partnership. These projects have shown that the intent is for collaborative teams to work to make existing teachers better, i.e., these teachers were identified as needing support through the results of their students' 2006 FCAT science test scores. He also suggested that we look at the Curry School of Education's (University of Virginia) five-year model program (http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/custom/portlets/recordDetails/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=ED307264&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=ED307264).

In closing, Mr. Moore urged FACTE to respond quickly to request new sources of funding, let our knowledge be used, develop a platform, take issues that are important to education, and make the issues known by giving legislators information and requesting funding and service with a uniform voice.

- **Representative Bill Proctor** compared information on the state budget for 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 as follows:

Florida State Budget		
Category	2008-2009 (\$73.8 billion)	2009-2010 (\$66.5 billion)
Human services	35%	39%
Education	32%	32%
Public safety	8%	7%
Rest of government	25%	22%



He is concerned about the loss of some revenues (e.g., 5.1% in stimulus money which will end, 1 billion in tobacco money, and 1 billion in drivers' license funds). This will reduce the budget to \$59.4 billion, thus the decrease in the state budget from \$73.8 to \$59.4 billion. He recommended that participants review the Pappas Report (<http://www.flbog.org/about/doc/fbd/StructureReport.pdf>), which he considered to be the best recent budget analysis. He pointed to "Florida's mission leap" and planning problem (i.e., this mission leap cannot happen when you have a plan, e.g., Dr. Proctor could not remember a time when a plan was developed and implemented other than the community college plan). He mentioned that though the legislature plans to achieve access and to foster quality, it ends up funding growth. Because we have transitioned from the Board of Governors to the state board to the Board of Governors and to a singleton board that oversees community colleges and state institutions, Allison Pappas states, "One of the reasons that we don't have a plan is we don't have foundations."

Regarding community colleges, he referred to the original focus on the 2+2 model. Issues such as low tuition and the Bright Futures scholarships impacted legislative action. However, state finances forced the legislators to increase tuition. Nevertheless, Representative Proctor pointed to this type of action as demonstrating that "They implement without planning and plan without implementing." This issue has carried over to the community-college-to-state-college movement in that legislators will support state colleges in their districts. This movement began with the plan to convert three state colleges to provide local service, but it has resulted in the conversion of 28 state colleges. He then detailed the potential outcomes of the funding of critical needs and potential budget shortfalls and predicted that the economic recovery will be very slow.

Representative Proctor noted that an increase in a sales or service (the largest part of industry) tax would only prolong and deepen the recession. An income or intangible tax (not enough to fill a \$5 billion dollar gap) would not solve the problem. Off-shore drilling would be a political struggle with environmentalists, but this will be studied since it is predicted that 53% of Floridians will vote for this now and, as the recession deepens, 59% will vote for it in the future. It is predicted that if we don't pursue off-shore drilling, other nations (China and Cuba) will.

Discussion

Dr. Larry Daniel referred to a memo to the institution presidents from Chancellor Holcombe stating that they are developing programs in the state colleges. Since, in some of those instances, this memo was the first notification of those plans, how can these changes be communicated better? Dr. Holcombe explained that the planning process will provide coordination of this. He also described the process as beginning with a letter of intent from the institution before a proposal is developed. The institutions proceed to discuss the programs. Dr. Holcombe also noted that he receives more letters of intent than full proposals (e.g., FCCJ submitted letters of intent, but they withdrew the proposal after the discussion of the plan). The state colleges have an unlimited time during which they can develop proposals, but Dr. Holcombe has to respond in 100 days. The proposals are all in Allied Health, Teacher Education, or Applied Sciences. The areas of duplication are in Teacher Education.

When asked about the plan that the legislature might take and the role of FACTE, Representative Proctor responded that the legislature rushed in to the state college program without adequate planning. He agrees with the Pappas Report that there should have been full-fledged state colleges and that they needed to replace the community college function. Even though this may have been a great idea, he emphasized that it came without a plan. At some point, the legislature will have to constrain this development. What type of planning has to take place? The requirement has to emerge through the legislature. In the House, the Speaker has to complete the type of planning that the state needs at a reasonable level of equality. Some of the plans are not well developed, i.e., "They will be two miles wide and about a half inch deep." Representative Proctor believes that these changes will occur within three to five years.

3:30 pm Break

3:45 pm *Topic: Recommendations for Improving Efficiency and Cost Savings in Florida's Teacher Education Program Approval Process*

- Bob Shockley, FACTE Executive, Director

Presentation and Discussion

Because the FACTE Executive Committee members have received complaints about the program approval process and related communication and backlog issues, recommendations were developed and distributed for improving the efficiency of our program



approval process. These recommendations will be discussed further at the business meeting tomorrow. Bob described the positive working relationship that FACTE has had for many years with Barbara Harrell, Betty Blue, Genae Crump, Kathy Hebda, Rebecca Pfeiffer, and Tonya Brown. However, miscommunications have occurred on rubrics, indicators, and feedback on folios. Added to this are the staffing challenges that impact institutions and the DOE in that staff positions have not been filled or they have been cut, leaving everyone with less support to complete the program approval requirements that have increased for programs of higher education. Everyone has been asked to do more with less.

Program approval is determined by Florida Statute 1004.04 (http://www.flsenate.gov/Statutes/index.cfm?App_mode=Display_Statute&Search_String=&URL=Ch1004/SEC04.HTM&Title=%3E2002-%3ECh1004-%3ESection%2004). As provided by the Education Standards Commission in 1994-1995, the original intent of the statute was to simplify the current process. However, the level of detail in the process is not supporting this intent. Florida State Board Rule 6A-5.066 also applies to the program approval process and includes Educational Leadership programs (<https://www.flrules.org/gateway/readFile.asp?sid=0&tid=1060130&type=1&file=6A-5.066.doc>). FACTE supports quality programs and program approval. Areas of concern that affect this quality include the following:

1. Management issues

- Response time for folio submissions
- IPEP delays
- New folio submission process suspension for summer
- No process in place for endorsements
- Lack of feedback on curriculum maps

2. Budgetary demands on institutions and DOE

- Increased reporting
- Travel
- Cutbacks
- Need for more efficient systems

3. Need for communication tools

- Reduce meetings and travel
- Time lag

4. Streamline reporting requirements

- Duplicated reports

5. Revisit FTCE as a result of a severe increase in fees

Recommendations

1. **SPA Standards** – Offer the NCATE program review process as an option to the DOE program review process. About 29 states recognize the NCATE SPA process, which is a quick and efficient process with timely feedback). This would create an option for the institutions. The use of the national standards, over the Florida *Competencies and Skills*, would create a huge cost savings for the state.
2. **Recognize and Use Nationally-Validated Tests for Licensure** – This reduces costs to the state. Some data show that it costs about \$16.5 million to support the FTCE. There will be a problem with the scaled scores of the FTCE for the Title II reporting. However, because the Commissioner has stated that the DOE wants to align with the national standards, this would support that process since there have already been NCTM reviews of the math standards for alignment. USF-Tampa had the contract for testing through the Institute and now they have contracted with Pearson, which operates out of Massachusetts. Until 2000, institutions had a choice of whether to use the FTCE or the Praxis. The Praxis will not impose a cost on the state of Florida, and candidates can take the test at a lower cost. Some of the problems that have been reported with the FTCE are that the candidates have to go to Tallahassee to review areas of weakness on the test, there are response and report issues with Pearson, and the current score retrieval process presents confidentiality issues for candidate information.
3. **Improve the Use of DOE Web Site to Provide Current Documents** – Institutions that are not represented at meetings may miss information on the latest report since information is not available online.
4. **Streamline Existing Reporting Structures** – It is recommended that FACTE take the lead in assembling the group to discuss how to make the process consistent.

The intent is to present some recommendations for the membership to review. If this proposal is approved tomorrow, it will affect what we do this year. The discussion will continue tomorrow.



- 4:30 pm** **Topic: *Inter-University Collaboration: Learning and Leading in Literacy Acquisition and Instruction***
- University of Central Florida Showcase

Presentation and Discussion

The *Inter-University Collaboration: Learning and Leading in Literacy Acquisition and Instruction* (Florida Literacy and Reading Excellence Center [FLaRE]) was presented by Vicky I. Zygouris-Coe, Susan J. Wegmann, Enrique A. Puig, and Charlotte Boling. The organization is a literacy faculty group of one university member from 10 of the SUSs. This group has worked on grants, publications, and projects (FLaRE Faculty Fellows). In order to get faculty to look at a common goal with a common outcome, the group has had success with professional dialogue since 1999. They have worked with Just Read, Florida! to develop the reading endorsement and competencies. As teams, they developed a common language for literacy in Florida. They offer booktalks, language updates, research updates, district policy issues, state policy issues, and solution-seeking investigative cycles. The group regularly meets in September, January, March, and May. Because their research follows policy as well as practice, topics of research have included the five areas of scientific reading, Content Area Reading – Professional Development (CAR-PD), literacy coaching, literacy leadership teams, instructional practices, and adolescent literacy. Some of the collaboration included the DOE, consortia, 67 school districts, individual schools, individual classrooms (K-20), FLaRE area coordinators, Florida Online Reading – Professional Development (FOR-PD), Reading First, Florida Center for Reading Research at FSU, Florida Reading Association, International Reading Association, National Reading Conference, American Reading Forum, Council of Language Arts Supervisors, Reading Recovery Council, Holmes Partnership, Morgan International Reading Center, etc. The group has produced materials for the National Reading Institute (research reports, white papers, professional papers, journal articles, chapters, books). The presenters emphasized the need to connect, collaborate, and create with colleagues. FLaRE professional papers are provided at http://flare.ucf.edu/FLaRE_Resources.htm.

5:00 - 6:00 pm **Reception**

Friday, October 16, 2009

8:30 am **Coffee and refreshments**

Jennifer recognized the following members of the Executive Committee:

- President-Elect – Terry Fasel, Dean, Warner University
- Past President – Scott Hewitt, Director of Teacher Education, Rollins College
- Secretary – Jan Yates, Program Professor, Nova Southeastern University
- Treasurer – Mike Stewart, Associate Dean, University of South Florida
- Chair of the Policy and Legislative Committee – Gloria Pelaez, Director of Teacher Education, University of Miami
- Chair of the Professional Development Committee – Eliah Watlington, Associate Dean, Florida Atlantic University
- Chair of the Research Committee – Marsha Lupi, Associate Dean, University of North Florida
- Executive Director – Bob Shockley, Department Chair, Florida Atlantic University

Jennifer recognized Donna Leinsing (UCF Academy for Learning, Teaching, and Leadership). The academy has been in operation for six years and focuses on teacher and administrator preparation. Some of the academy's current activities include grant operations, technology labs, and classrooms. The Academy houses the Toni Jennings Exceptional Education Institute and the Morgridge International Reading Center.

Announcements:

- Florida Memorial is now Florida Memorial University.
- Ed Moore would like some photos of the panelists and quotes for the *ICUF Newsletter*.
- AACTE has asked for names and contact information for graduates who have received awards and who would be willing to speak to the press about the strengths of the programs.

9:00 am **Topic: *Title II Data Reporting: New Requirements***



- Allison Henderson, Director of Title II Data Reporting, Westat (Contractor to Handle Title II Data Collection for the U.S. Dept. Of Education)

Presentation and Discussion

Allison provided an overview of the reporting documents that will be used. These documents are on the Sharepoint Web site. The U.S. DOE works with the states to develop definitions and to provide technical assistance in the reporting process. This Title II report will require **145.75 hours per response**, but some of this time will be absorbed by the state (i.e., the state will be populating some of this information at its Web site, e.g., Summary Pass Rates [p. 5]).

Next, Allison described the background of the Title II reporting process and reviewed the timeline for the implementation of the most recent legislative changes. **The reporting is only for the state-approved programs.** The Title II legislation was reauthorized in 2008. All teacher preparation programs (traditional and alternative) must be reported. "Alternative" is defined by the state. The district routes also have to report. The April 2010 reporting year will be a pilot report for the 2008-2009 academic year. If institutions cannot provide information, Westat will want to know why. In 2011, complete and accurate data will be expected. Institutions have to provide enrollment and application data. On the yellow form, which was developed for 2009-2010, institutions will submit information for the 2008-2009 year.

Regarding changes, the rankings of institutions by test scores were dropped. There will no longer be quartile rankings, and they will go to scaled scores. Florida is also going to scaled scores, as mandated by the U.S. DOE. Will this be ready by April? Westat will not ask institutions to reformat old data. Westat has spoken with ETS and Pearson, and these companies will produce the scores for the institutions. Westat is requesting scaled and cut scores. John Hansen and Rebecca will develop a dataset and will send this information to the institutions. The enrollment data will be submitted through the eIPEP for the ICUF institutions. All of the data will not go to Westat through the states. **The reporting of the Title II data in the catalogs is no longer required.**

There is an institutional fine of \$27,500.00, which gives Westat an increased role in looking at the quality of data.

Admission information is aggregated by the institution for the program, i.e., not for admission to the institution. Westat may go to program reporting. Institutions will provide the link for the admission requirements. Institutions only have to check for GPAs, i.e., the institution does not have to provide the specific average. This response will be in a check box format online that is provided by the Florida DOE. If any program has one of the conditions, the institution will indicate this with a checkmark.

Information on enrollment will be overall, by gender and by race-ethnicity. Florida has three collection processes (SUS, community/state college, ICUF, and SUS). The dates for collection are September 1 through August 31.

The race-ethnicity categories are institution-wide and not just for the teacher education programs, i.e., the categories are the same. These data are not useful for further analysis outside of the institution. These are voluntary and may not be reported.

In Section C, supervised clinical experiences are defined, but this is a state decision. Some institutions may embed these experiences from day one. This definition doesn't work for alternative route programs. Institutions are asked to provide this as well as they can. School psychology, counseling, media, and reading programs will not report this information. "Year-long" (bullet a) is defined by the institution with the state. Westat wants the first experience reported. Rebecca will provide guidance for this section, and she will meet with the Board of Governors and some of the ICUF institutions to discuss the process. In Florida, all programs begin with a field experience. There was concern about how the data will be analyzed, but Westat does not know yet what this process will be. The primary concern is that institutions report the requirements consistently within the state. Some states are only reporting student teaching; some states are reporting everything. This variance causes a problem with report pass rates. Rebecca will discuss FTE for adjuncts with ICUFs.

The DOE will calculate Section D. This does not match the completers. This will be provided on the Web site. This is for 2008-2009, 2007-2008, and 2006-2007. Section E will include this past year's completers.

For Section II, the goals and objectives must be set for teacher shortage areas in each state. What will be reported is up to the DOE. Westat expects that states will set the baseline first. In some states, the goal is to hold steady on the development of programs. This law does not require the development of new programs. These same areas are required for the Teacher Partnership Grants. The goal could be the number of recruited students, graduated students, etc. If a program only has one



program, a goal is still needed, e.g., instruction of Limited English Proficient students. The state can define this. Rebecca will find out if endorsements must be reported.

It is not known how the assurances information will be used. Institutions are asked to check all of these boxes for the approved programs. These, collectively, answer "Are your placements diverse?"

Pass rates are moving away from the cohort concept. The completer list is supposed to never change. Four new groups have been added:

1. Enrolled, completed all non-clinical coursework (2008-2009)
2. Other enrolled in program (2008-2009)
3. Completed program (2008-2009)
4. Completed program (previous 2 years)

Enrollees will not be linked to a certificate area. Westat wants to know how many candidates are being enrolled, the rate of completion, and who receives financial aid. Are the institutions "gaming the system," and are institutions producing high qualified teachers (i.e., are institutions requiring the passing of the test prior to graduation)?

Westat suggests that institutions put the students in categories (enrolled, internship, etc.). SUSs get this information through the teacher education file. ICUFs will provide admission and enrollment files. Student teachers will be in the first group and all others, except completers, are in the other group. John stated that interns are only in one category for assessment rates. The enrolled category is for freshmen, sophomores, and juniors. Other enrolled students would have completed course work only (not student teaching).

Institutions are asked to provide a narrative that puts the information on technology in context. The state can synthesize all of these responses or cut and paste all of these. "Universal design" is defined as differentiating work with diverse students.

Regarding Section VI, Florida will answer all of these as "yes," unless the institution does not have an ESE program. Contextual information is not required, but institutions can include what they want the public to know. Westat will release all of the state and institutional information into the public.

John and Rebecca will complete the green reports. The DOE will send a letter to all of the deans about the reporting. In the meantime, information is available at <https://title2.ed.gov> or through Title2@westat.com.

10:30 am Break

10:45 am Business Meeting

I. Call to Order – President Jennifer Platt

Approval of the Agenda – Jennifer called the meeting to order at 10:45 a.m., and the institutional roll was called. A quorum was present with the following 23 institutions represented:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| 1. Barry University | 9. Florida Memorial University | 17. University of Central Florida |
| 2. Bethune-Cookman University | 10. Florida State University | 18. University of Miami |
| 3. Clearwater Christian College | 11. Jacksonville University | 19. University of North Florida |
| 4. Flagler College | 12. Nova Southeastern University | 20. University of South Florida |
| 5. Florida Atlantic University | 13. Palm Beach Atlantic University | 21. University of South Florida St. Petersburg |
| 6. Florida Gulf Coast University | 14. Rollins College | 22. University of West Florida |
| 7. Florida Institute of Technology | 15. Saint Leo University | 23. Warner University |
| 8. Florida International University | 16. Southeastern University | |



There was a motion to approve the agenda (Gloria Pelaez moved, Marsha Lupi seconded), and it was approved unanimously.

Approval of Minutes – There was a motion to approve the minutes of the 2009 Spring Meeting (Adriana McEachern moved, Mildred Berry seconded), and the minutes were approved unanimously.

II. Reports:

President - Jennifer Platt – Jennifer provided the President's Report Fall 2009 (http://facte.info/2009_2010.php). FACTE priorities have been to increase the visibility, recognition, and impact of FACTE at the state and national levels. Preparations are in process for the third Day on the Hill in Tallahassee. Visibility has increased at the state level through speaker participation at meetings and at the national level through the participation of Terry and Jennifer at the national AACTE and Advisory Council of State Representatives (ACSR) meetings in the summer. Jennifer is also on the ACSR Executive Committee. In addition, Marian Smith (FAMU), Sandra Robinson (UCF), and Colleen Kennedy (USF) sit on AACTE committees. Gloria Pelaez works on policy issues throughout the year and monitors legislation and follows bills and updates. The organization continues to collaborate with the Florida DOE, which provided over two hours of sessions at this meeting, in addition to a presentation yesterday. Rebecca and John provided a preview of the Title II reporting process to prepare us for the presentation today. Jennifer described the following FACTE actions:

- **Assessment workshop** – This was attended by almost 60 participants and was well received by all. Information was shared, and we hope to continue work with Hilda.
- **Short-notice suspension of FTCE/SAE computer-based testing and competencies and skills revisions** – This directly impacts pre-service students. Jennifer wrote a letter that was shared with the Executive Committee and was sent to Kathy. The issue was that the change was punitive to candidates who were scheduled to take the test at an increased fee and late fee. The second concern was that the computer-based test was suspended until the new tests were implemented. Implementation of the FTCE should be timed to coincide with the student coverage of the new curriculum. FACTE identified a concern and a proposed solution. This was approved by the Executive Committee, and Kathy responded quickly. The next day, Genae send out a memo on the revisions of the test. This is an example of a responsive and proactive action taken by FACTE.
- **Recommendations for improving efficiency and cost savings in Florida's teacher education program approval process** – This proposal was reviewed by the Executive Committee and was sent to the membership on Monday, prior to this meeting. Kathy Hebda received the proposal on Friday prior to this meeting.
- **Day on the Hill 2009** – There were 27 institutions and 71 participants (21 from Florida) in Washington, DC, which was impressive in view of the budget problem. Topics covered were the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (Francis Haithcock), community college initiatives (Will Holcombe), legislative priorities, and teacher retention. Marshall Ogletree (FEA) attended. The Higher Education Opportunity Act and its clinical component were discussed.
- **Friends of FACTE Awards** – Awards were given to Bob Budnick (Live Text) and Senator Ted Deutch at the March 2009 FACTE Reception in the Old Florida Capitol Building. Senator Deutch has co-sponsored the teacher retention bill.
- **ACSR (Advisory Council of State Representatives)** – This group recognizes 45 state chapter associations of colleges for teacher education. The president of each state chapter is a member of ACSR. The council meets twice each year to advise AACTE on policy issues. Participation in ACSR increases visibility for FACTE. Terry and Jennifer attended the institute where they discussed the value of AACTE membership, the economy and education, and national events and AACTE leadership initiatives.

Upcoming events include:

- **AACTE Annual Meeting (February 19-22, 2010, Atlanta)** – Arne Duncan, U.S. Secretary of Education, will be a keynote speaker. The ACSR major forum will be "On the Firing Line: State Preparation Standards under Siege." Sandra Robinson spoke about the leadership for the profession and AACTE and asked participants to bring an emerging professional (e.g., assistant professor) to the conference.
- **FACTE Day on the Hill (March 15-16, 2010, Tallahassee)** – This event will be co-hosted by Flagler College and Tallahassee Community College (TCC). Meeting space will be at the TCC Capitol Center. Lodging will be at the Doubletree and Aloft hotels. The FACTE Executive Committee will provide FACTE badges, bookmarks, and talking points for FACTE attendees.



Treasurer – Michael Stewart – Mike reported that the FACTE treasury balance was \$49,343.57 as of March 4, 2009. Income in the form of donations (e.g., congressional staffers), institutional dues, and registrations totaled \$26,130 (March 4, 2009 - October 8, 2009). The balance on October 8, 2009, was \$75,473.57. Expenses (March 7, 2009 - September 9, 2009) were \$18,826.78. The balance is \$56,646.79. FACTE has lost some institutional members this year, so the expected registration fees will be around \$19,000. Many speakers have attended the meetings at no charge to FACTE. There are 34 institutions represented at this conference, and there were 38 represented last year. There were 103 paid participants at this conference. There were no fee increases this year. As a result, the budget is increasing, and we may be able to afford national speakers for the future or have mid-year organizational workshops that can be offered in conjunction with a meeting. The organization did not charge for the pre-conference workshop. Enough FACTE lanyards (500) were purchased for this year and three future conferences. Mike provided the following balance sheet and the proposed budget for 2009-2010.

Balance Forward as of March 4, 2009

\$49,343.57

<u><i>Date</i></u>	<u><i>Income</i></u>	
3/12/2009	Deposit – Donations for spring conference reception	\$35.00
3/12/2009	Deposit – Conference registration	\$550.00
3/13/2009	Deposit – Conference registration	\$550.00
3/23/2009	Deposit – Return of deposit for Florida Historical Capitol - reception	\$350.00
4/3/2009	Deposit – Donations for spring conference reception	\$45.00
4/22/2009	Deposit – Live Text contribution	\$1,500.00
4/28/2009	Deposit – Conference registration	\$200.00
7/6/2009	Deposit – Conference registration	\$150.00
8/3/2009	Deposit – Institutional dues	\$6,300.00
8/14/2009	Deposit – Institutional dues	\$4,300.00
9/9/2009	Deposit – Institutional dues	\$5,100.00
9/16/2009	Deposit – Conference registration	\$450.00
9/22/2009	Deposit – Institutional dues	\$2,300.00
9/22/2009	Deposit – Conference registration	\$1,200.00
9/29/2009	Deposit – Institutional dues	\$700.00
10/1/2009	Deposit – Institutional dues	\$500.00
10/1/2009	Deposit – Conference registration	\$1,100.00
10/8/2009	Deposit – Conference registration	\$800.00
	Total Income	\$26,130.00
	Balance (Carry Forward + Income)	\$75,473.57
<u><i>Date</i></u>	<u><i>Expenditures</i></u>	
3/7/2009	Reimbursement to Robert Shockley for award	\$214.10
3/7/2009	Reimbursement to Robert Shockley for pre-conference meeting	\$569.09
3/7/2009	Robert Shockley - Jan/Feb '09 Honorarium	\$1,833.33
3/7/2009	Reimbursement to Robert Shockley for AACTE meeting	\$1,315.52
3/9/2009	Reimbursement to Gloria Pelaez – Photocopies	\$21.70
3/10/2009	Security for reception – Curtis Miller	\$90.00
3/11/2009	Reimbursement to Gloria Pelaez – Shipping for spring conference	\$65.00
3/12/2009	Conference hotel – Residence Inn	\$3,841.40
3/12/2009	Deposit – Uptown Café – conference reception	\$3,660.60
3/12/2009	Banner for table display – Kira Bannerworks	\$384.00
3/12/2009	Bookmarks for Day on the Hill – Blue Max Press	\$125.00
3/13/2009	Refund to Jeffery Cornett – Spring Conference registration	\$50.00
3/23/2009	Reimbursement to UCF – Photocopies	\$116.08
5/28/2009	Robert Shockley - Mar/Apr '09 Honorarium	\$1,833.33



5/28/2009	Robert Shockley – Trip to Tallahassee	\$871.18
6/26/2009	Robert Shockley - May/June '09 Honorarium	\$1,833.33
6/29/2009	Robert Shockley – Summer board meeting to UCF	\$134.80
8/31/2009	Reimbursement to Jason Karp for web site domain charge	\$34.99
9/9/2009	Robert Shockley – July/August '09 Honorarium	\$1,833.33
	Total Expenditures	\$18,826.78
	Balance	\$56,646.79

Proposed Budget for 2009-10

Florida Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

Balance forward from June 5, 2009	\$37,583.24
Revenue	2009-10 Estimated
Annual Dues	\$22,900.00
Fall Conference Registrations	\$6,550.00
Spring Conference Registrations	\$3,750.00
LiveText Contribution - Fall 2008	\$1,500.00
LiveText Contribution - Spring 2009	\$1,500.00
Spring Conference Reception Donations	\$40.00
TOTAL REVENUE	\$36,240.00
Expenses	2009-10 Estimated
Fall Conference	\$3,000.00
Spring Conference	\$6,000.00
Speakers and Consultants	\$1,000.00
Travel Reimbursement (speakers and consultants)	\$2,000.00
AACTE Leadership Conference (travel and registration for exe director and other officers)	\$1,500.00
Executive Director Honorarium	\$11,000.00
Executive Director Travel & Expenses	\$2,500.00
Website Maintenance and Domain Fee	\$250.00
Legislative Books	\$1,000.00
Memorial Contribution	\$100.00
Award - Plaque	\$225.00
Supplies and Materials	\$50.00
Photo Copying	\$500.00
Bank Fees	\$50.00
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$29,175.00
DIFFERENCE	\$7,065.00

Executive Director – Robert Shockley – Bob described his work as being external (advocacy) and internal (providing support to the president and the board and providing recommendations on initiatives). Since the last meeting, Bob attended budget hearings in Tallahassee and met with representatives of many different groups. He acknowledged that FACTE could not get attention on the retention bill due to the economic issues. He met with Governor Crist's education policy director, Marshall Ogletree (now the Executive Director of the Pinellas Classroom Teachers Association), Michael Monroe (Marshall's replacement in FEA), Bill Montford (Chief Executive Officer of the Florida Association of District School Superintendents), Wayne Blanton (Director of the School Board Association), Pam Stewart (former Deputy Chancellor for Educator Quality, Kathy Hebda's new position), Dottie Minear (Senior Associate Vice Chancellor, State University System/Board of Governors), Jon Rogers (Florida Board of Governors), and Ted Deutsch (legislator, now a candidate for Robert Wexler's Congressional seat).



The focus of Bob's trip was to learn how the stimulus dollars will work. There are possibilities for organizations to partner in the "Race to the Top."

Jan Yates works with the FACTE Web site, and she recognized Jason Karp, the webmaster, for his work.

Policy Committee Chair – Gloria Pelaez – Gloria asked the membership to go to the FACTE Web site (<http://www.facte.info/>) and link to the ESOL standards that are open for review until January 6. Jane Giovanni and Gloria participated on the ESOL review in Sanibel. The first public hearing on these standards will be at the University of Miami in November. Gloria urged everyone to support the standards. She referred to the FACTE legislative agenda that will be determined today, based on the white paper that Bob presented. She is also working to align the U.S. DOE Title II definitions to the Florida requirements. Gloria will e-mail Web sites for a multistate review of teacher education standards (<http://www.wested.gov>). She said that Florida is first on diversity in teacher preparation and wants us to let the legislators know about this. She also encouraged the group to look at the NCES Web site for the PISA Report on international student assessment (<http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/pisa/>) and to be familiar with this report prior to the Day on the Hill visit.

Research Committee Chair – Marsha Lupi – Marsha provided a summary of the FTCE issue. According to the statute, Pearson was not to raise the price of the test.

Professional Development Committee Chair – Eliah Watlington – Eliah reminded the participants about Wednesday's workshop that was attended by 60 participants. The presentation is posted at the Web site at <http://www.facte.info/FACTE1.ppt> and <http://www.facte.info/FACTE2.ppt>. Attendees were asked to let Eliah know if they have issues or concerns for professional development.

III. New Business

- A. Approval for FACTE membership:
- Broward College
 - Chipola College
 - Daytona State College
 - Indian River State College

A few years ago, these institutions joined FACTE and paid their dues, but they were never officially admitted. There was a motion (Gloria Pelaez moved, Trish Parrish seconded) to admit these institutions, which was unanimously approved

- B. Nominations Committee and Election of Officers
President-Elect - Terry Fasel

According to the bylaws, Terry will convene a committee to nominate officers. The next President-Elect will be from a state university. A motion was made (Larry Daniel moved, Deborah Blenis seconded) to approve the committee of Lou Cleveland (Chipola College), Christina Ramirez Smith (Jacksonville University), and Mike Stewart (USF). The motion was approved unanimously.

- C. Executive Committee Proposal – *Recommendations for Improving Efficiency and Cost Savings in Florida's Teacher Education Program Approval Process*

A motion was made (Cissi Carol moved, Sandra Robinson seconded) to approve the proposal, which was passed with a vote of 22-1 (one institution opposed). FACTE will move ahead and take the next steps to address the issues, but recommendations will vary, i.e., some recommendations will go to the DOE, some recommendations will go to the legislature, and some recommendations will go to the State Board of Education. The position paper was shared with Representative Proctor, and he is willing to discuss this with the legislature. Bob will follow up.

- D. Spring FACTE Meeting and Day on the Hill, Tallahassee
March 15 and 16, 2010, co-hosted by Tallahassee Community College and Flagler College-Tallahassee

Yesterday, the Commissioner of Education was invited to work with us. Jennifer will follow up with him.



IV. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 noon.

Minutes approved, March 15, 2010.