

## Notes from the Faculty Planning Group for School Engagement Initiatives March 3 and 4, 2008

Attending March 3: Hilary Conklin, Dava Coleman, Mark Faust, Julie Kittleson, Karen Watkins, Andy Horne, Janna Dresden

Attending March 4: Kyunghwa Lee, Jeff Broome, Tracie Costantino, Paul Matthews, Elaine Adams, Allison Nealy, Kathy Thompson, Gayle Andrews, Lew Alleln, Kathleen DeMarrais, Janna Dresden

1. We briefly reviewed our discussions from previous meetings.
2. PDS Art Education Proposed Model presented by Tracie Constantino
  - a. Cohort focused on art integrations as a separate track within art education teacher prep program
  - b. Placed in elementary and middle schools
  - c. 10 students
  - d. Students would have to apply for this track
    - i. Demonstrated interest in art integration
    - ii. GPA
    - iii. Writing statement
    - iv. Interview
  - e. Students would take their methods class at the PDS and student teaching
  - f. Would not affect faculty load as we would only offer methods course in art integration once an academic year
  - g. Important to offer tuition credits for graduate work for participating teachers (master's or specialist degree)
3. Following the art education proposal we discussed the issue of incentives for cooperating teachers—how important this would be and possible options:
  - a. As the art ed. proposal stated, teachers might be given vouchers that they could use to pay for graduate classes
  - b. They might be given PLUs
  - c. They might be given stipends (perhaps a lab fee charged to student teachers could be used to cover these costs)
4. Also following the art ed proposal we discussed the value of curriculum integration. A number of people will be getting together to further explore this idea. I will send more information about this opportunity.

5. We discussed whether, especially at the secondary level, we would try to have a PDS where all (or many) program areas were involved or have a different PDS site for each program.
6. We also discussed the possibility of working with a group of people, rather than with a specific school site.
7. We discussed how PDS sites (if we use this model) might be selected and recruited. We reviewed the application that the University of South Carolina asks schools to complete if they are interested in becoming a PDS site.
8. Discussion of Outcomes—how might we attempt to measure our attainment of our goals?
  - a. It will be important to use both quantitative and qualitative measures and to conduct evaluation in both the short term and long term. It will be particularly important to include longitudinal (long term) measures.
  - b. When measuring students educational attainment we should consider (among other things):
    - i. The Georgia Performance Standards
    - ii. Graduation rates
    - iii. Students' knowledge, skills, dispositions and feelings—all are important
  - c. When measuring teacher preparation we should consider (among other things):
    - i. Teacher retention (**It was pointed out that there is a constant press to prepare more teachers. There is a limit to the number of teachers UGA can prepare, but we can try to prepare teachers who stay in the profession longer, thus increasing the number of teachers that way.**)
    - ii. The diversity of the teachers we graduate
    - iii. Student exit surveys
    - iv. Employer surveys
9. Next steps
  - a. Hopefully several people will be attending the PDS conference in Orlando in April
  - b. We will invite Bruce Field, director of PDS programs at South Carolina, to come visit and talk to us
  - c. We will try to schedule a time for staff from Clarke County School District to make a brief presentation to the Faculty Planning Group