

Dewar COEHS Advisory Council Meeting Documentation Form

All COEHS Advisory Councils are required to maintain appropriate meeting documentation. This form must be completed by all COEHS Advisory Councils following every meeting, including those held online or virtually. It is the responsibility of the Advisory Council Chairs and/or associated Department Head to ensure that the Meeting Documentation Form is completed and filed in a timely manner. The completed form should be submitted and filed online according to approved COEHS policies and procedures.

Advisory Committee Name: ASL/English Interpreting and Deaf Education

Associated Department: Middle, Secondary, Reading & Deaf Education

Associated Program(s): ASL/English Interpreting (BSEd) and Special Education: Deaf Education (BSEd, MED & MAT)

Chairperson/Responsible Contact: Nanci A. Scheetz

Purpose of the Meeting: Spring 2015 Advisory Board Meeting (Agenda and supporting documentation is attached)

(NOTE: Please include the meeting agenda and supporting documents upon submitting this report.)

Date: February 26, 2015 **Time:** 7:00 – 9:00 PM **Location:** Dewar College of Education, Room 2154

Attendees/Organizations Represented (indicate all guests, proxies, and their affiliations): Mr. Taylor Patterson, Student Representative, MED, Special Education: Deaf Education; Ms. Rencia Gravesande, Student Representative, BSEd, ASL/English Interpreting; Ms. Ronnie Mae Tyson, Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor & Deaf Consumer; Mr. Chris Hiers, High School ASL Teacher & Deaf Consumer; Philip Bishop, Informational Technology Specialist; Ms. Stacy Shapiro, Field Experience Liaison, Atlanta Area School for the Deaf; Ms. Vanessa Robbisch, Superintendent, Atlanta Area School for the Deaf; Ms. Melissa Artz, Teacher of the Deaf, Thomas County; Ms. Christia Williams, Program Coordinator, ASL/English Interpreting Program; Dr. Jennifer Beal-Alvarez, Assistant Professor, Special Education: Deaf Education; Dr. Nanci Scheetz, Professor and Program Coordinator for the Special Education: Deaf Education and Faculty for the ASL/English Interpreting Program. Not in attendance: Ms. Dana Pass, NE Georgia RESA; Ms. Etta Faggioni, Director, Program for Exceptional Children, Moultrie, Georgia; Dr. Evelyn Chivers, ASL Teacher, Colquitt County; Ms. Cindy Horne, Interpreter, Lowndes County, and Dr. Shirley Thompson, Associate Professor, Early Childhood, Special Education Department.

Meeting Objectives:

1. Provide Advisory Board Members with an update on our upcoming CAEP visit
2. Obtaining feedback and recommendations from our partners on:
 - Raising the current GPA for incoming students in both the Special Education: Deaf Education Program and the ASL/English Interpreting Program
 - Assessments used to evaluate pre-service teachers of the deaf and interpreting interns command of American Sign Language – Partner’s views on the SLPI and the ASLPI
 - Field experience hours particularly with respect to the ASL/English Interpreting Program: Mock interpreting hours versus hours required in school settings

- Use of technology by our pre-service teachers – what additional skills, if any do they need?
 - Diversity – are our pre-service teachers and our future interpreting students prepared to work with diverse populations? Are modifications to the program needed to meet these needs
3. Provide Advisory Board Members with data with respect to our pre-service teachers' scores on the:
- GACE Content Knowledge Tests
 - Candidate Assessment on Performance Standards (CAPS)
 - EdTPA
4. Ask partners to express any concerns regarding our ASL/English Interpreting or Special Education: Deaf Education Programs

Data/Information Discussed:

- Because we added a new Advisory Board Member the purpose of the Advisory Board was discussed
- Information was presented on CAEP: What it is, when the visit is scheduled, what we will be sharing with the CAEP team
- Data on CAPS was presented: Advisory Board Members were provided with charts illustrating the 10 standards. Dr. Scheetz explained what the 5 power standards are. Summative evaluation data were presented on our MED and MAT candidates. This data was compared with all teacher candidates completing their clinical experience in the fall, 2015. Dr. Scheetz explained that some supervisors were under the impression that they could not award an Exemplary rating. However, this has now been clarified and this rating can indeed be awarded to candidates but only on the summative evaluations, not during those that are formative.
- Data on the GACE Content Knowledge Tests (085 and 086) was also presented. During the 2014-2015 academic years, 10 teacher candidates have taken the GACE Content Knowledge Tests. Candidates are required to earn a minimum score of 220 for an Induction Certificate and a 250 for a Professional Certificate. All 10 teacher candidates earned a 220 or higher; 6 earned a Professional Certificate and 4 an Induction Certificate. Dr. Scheetz indicated that GaPSC required programs to have an 80% pass rate on the GACE Content Knowledge tests. Due to the fact that, in the past, during two consecutive years, VSU Special Education: Deaf Education majors struggled with this assessment enrichment activities were created and placed on a website. Designed as tutorials pre-service teachers can now complete the case studies, and compare their answers to those characterized as "model answers". The website also contains information regarding test taking strategies and how to deal with stress during "high stakes" testing. This website was implemented in response to candidates previous test scores over two consecutive years. Ms. Tyson questioned is there were opportunities for tutoring. Dr. Scheetz explained that the modules were designed to serve in that capacity.
- Data on GPAs were shared with respect to both the Special Education: Deaf Education majors and the ASL/English Interpreting majors. Dr. Beal-Alvarez began with a Power Point illustrating our current major's undergraduate GPAs. Currently, students wishing to declare Special Education: Deaf Education as a major must meet a minimum of a 2.75 GPA. Furthermore, they must maintain this GAP through graduation. Currently 3 of the Special Education: Deaf Education majors are below the 2.75 GPA. A discussion followed about the desire to raise the GPA to a 3.0 as this is what is being recommended throughout the Dewar College of Education. It should be noted that this is a CAEP requirement and that

we will begin working towards it by requiring students to earn a 3.0 in Area F courses as well as all major content area courses. In the discussion that followed Ms. Tyson questioned what this would do to Deaf candidates wanting to become teachers of the Deaf. Dr. Scheetz indicated that we currently had and had previously had several qualified Deaf candidates who successfully completed the program maintaining a 3.0 or above at the Graduate Level. Ms. Shapiro questioned what other teacher training programs in Deaf Education, across the nation required of the teacher candidates. Dr. Scheetz indicated that the 3.0 was being recommended to align our program with the national trend. Ms. Robisch asked if there was any “wobble room” for candidates who might be strong but only have a 2.9 GPA or start the program, earn one C and drop below the required GPA required to remain in the program. Dr. Scheetz indicated that there was an appeals committee both at the undergraduate and the graduate levels to consider student appeals who might want to appeal being dismissed from the program. Mr. Patterson indicated that the Deaf Education is very rigorous, that students needed a strong background in English to successfully complete the requirements and that although his GPA was on the low side coming in he raised it during his undergraduate degree. Ms. Williams indicated that we wanted the highest quality of teachers possible to service our D/HH population and that the better prepared our teacher candidates were the better prepared our K-12 Deaf student population would become. The consensus of the Advisory Board Members was to raise the GPA to a 3.0 as long as an appeals process was in place.

- Ms. Williams then provided the Board Members with data on the GPAs of our current ASL/English Interpreting students. She explained that when the College of Education as a unit raised their GPA requirements from a 2.5 to a 2.75 that the ASL/English Interpreting Program elected to remain at a 2.5. As a result, some students have been advised to seek this as a major if they did not have the GPA to enter the teacher preparation programs. She indicated that this sent the wrong message – indicating that the teaching requirements were more rigorous than the interpreting requirements which all agreed was untrue. Ms. Gravesande indicated that their interpreting program was indeed rigorous and that the GPA should be raised to a 3.0. Ms. Williams indicated that students whose GPA was below a 3.0 currently struggled with spoken and written English production and that because the program was ASL to English and English to ASL it was critical that students be competent in both languages. The Advisory Board also voted to raise the entry level GPA to 3.0 for the ASL/English Interpreting majors. Note that once admitted into either program students must maintain a minimum of a 3.0 GPA.
- This led into a discussion of the SLPI and the ASLPI. Dr. Scheetz indicated that students enrolled in the Special Education: Deaf Education Program are now required to pass the SLPI at an Intermediate Level before they can enroll in any of their graduate course work (this includes all courses that have a field experience component as well as their clinical practice). She indicated that VSU was now considering switching to the ASLPI as an alternative measure. Ms. Williams explained that historically we used the SLPI, however, due to the fact that results are not being returned in a timely manner and that there seems to be great variability in the scores students receive that we were considering alternative instruments. She asked the Board for input. Ms. Shapiro provided information on the ASLPI, and indicated that is what they use at AASD. Ms. Williams showed the ASLPI website and indicated it is a more typical assessment of what might occur in a dialogue between a hearing and a Deaf individual. Ms. Shapiro indicated that the ASLPI is a better assessment of language while the SLPI is designed to

assess the structure of ASL. Ms. Shapiro indicated because of the inconsistency with the ratings on the SLPI they had switched to the ASLPI. She further indicated that the raters are from a national pool and therefore there is not bias due to being familiar with the candidate. Ms. Gravesande stated she felt the ASL/English interpreting Program should set the ASLPI – Level 2 as a pre-requisite for the senior interpreting courses. Mr. Hiers stated that the SLPI and the ASLPI are completely different and that he was in strong support of using the ASLPI. Dr. Scheetz indicated that the Graduate Catalog now specifies that all major courses requiring a field experience have the SLPI Intermediate as a pre-requisite for enrolling in them. However, she said the program could give the students the choice to take either the SLPI (Intermediate Level) or the ASLPI (Level 2) for course entry. This is monitored by the Program faculty so either could be accepted until a catalog change is put in place. The Advisory Board voted to required ASL/English Interpreting majors to earn a Level 2 on the ASLPI prior to enrolling in senior interpreting courses and to allow Special Education: Deaf Education majors the option of taking either the SLPI or the ASLPI (and earning the appropriate required scores) as the pre-requisite to their graduate course work.

- Data was then presented on the fall results from candidates submitting their edTPA portfolios. Dr. Beal-Alvarez indicated that the edTPA is a new requirement from the GaPSC. This is an external evaluation of pre-service teachers' abilities to write lesson plans, and teach lessons that clearly demonstrate their ability to collect pre-post data, utilize assessment data to plan lessons, and demonstrate they can give feedback to students. Through the commentaries students demonstrate their ability to plan, assess, reflect, and make modifications to their lesson plans. In the fall the first group of teacher candidates from the College of Education submitted their portfolios to Pearson for review. When the results were reported students majoring in Special Education: Deaf Education exceeded the national average on their portfolios. They were the only students in the COE to accomplish this feat. Dr. Beal-Alvarez indicated that we have four additional students submitting their portfolios this spring. This will be the last group whose test scores are "non-consequential". Beginning in the fall, 2015 students must successfully meet the "cut score" to be considered for an induction certificate by GaPSC.
- Ms. Williams then presented information on the ASL/English Field Experience component. She wanted input from our community partners regarding the number of hours that should be spent doing "mock interpreting" versus observation hours in academic settings. Ms. Williams explained the types of field experience hours the students had been engaged in during the fall. Students had the opportunity to interpret a field experience at Grand Bay, interpret in the Vocational Rehabilitation Office, doctors' offices, etc. Ms. Artz suggested that a breakdown of 70% be spent in mock interview placements with 15% in the K-12 schools and 15% in the post-secondary setting. Dr. Scheetz indicated that she felt 60%, 20%, 20% might be a better breakdown. Ms. Tyson stated she would like to see the students have more interpreting opportunities in her office. Ms. Williams explained that the Field Experience Office would be making the placements. It was decided by the Board to adhere to a 70/20/20 breakdown.
- The next information sharing item was related to technology. We asked our partners how our teacher candidates were doing with technology. Ms. Robisch indicated that AASD has an abundance of technology and that although teacher candidates know how to use it they need to get the technology into the kids' hands. Ms. Artz indicated that they are using Google docs, etc. and that their students are

learning how to use it. Mr. Patterson also indicated that he uses Google classroom and Android systems. He stated students in the schools are now using technology as preparation for college. Dr. Scheetz asked if our pre-service teachers were lacking any technology. Ms. Shapiro indicated that the interns were “tech savvy” and that they could demonstrate to some of their veteran teachers how to use it.

- The last item for information sharing revolved around the question of whether or not our VSU students are prepared to work with diverse populations. Ms. Shapiro indicated that although students are familiar with differentiation it is very difficult to move from theory to practice using differentiation strategies. However, she also noted this is difficult for seasoned teachers as well. Dr. Scheetz asked if they could video tape any of their veteran teachers demonstrating differentiation for our students. Ms. Robisch said that was a possibility. Mr. Heirs indicated that we needed to be sure we added a Deaf plus experience whenever possible for our student teachers. He said many were not familiar with this population. Dr. Scheetz explained that she had recently taken a group of our students to LARC to explicitly acquaint them with this segment of the population.
- The meeting concluded with an open forum for discussion.

Specific Partner Input and Recommendations for Program Improvement:

- Increase the GPA to 3.0 for both the Special Education: Deaf Education and the ASL/English Interpreting majors with the stipulation that an appeals process is in place
- Adapt the ASLPI at a Level 2 for both the Special Education: Deaf Education and the ASL/English Interpreting majors. The Deaf Education majors will need to meet this requirement prior to entering the graduate program. The ASL/English Interpreting majors will need to meet this requirement before enrolling in senior interpreting courses.
- Change the 100 hour practicum field experience hours to reflect 70% of the time designated for mock interpreting, 15% for observations in the K-12 setting, and 15% in the post-secondary setting.
- Encourage pre-service teachers to put technology in the hands of the students.
- Expose pre-service teacher to individuals who are deaf plus.
- Encourage pre-service teachers to keep their instruction “student-centered” rather than “teacher-centered” when they are being observed.
- **Other Meeting Outcomes:**

Means by Which Partner Input was Solicited (Check as many as apply):

What specific actions will be taken as a result of the meeting and input of the advisory partners?

- A curriculum change form will be submitted for both programs indicating the increased GPA requirement
- A curriculum change form will also be submitted reflecting the new ASLPI – Level 2 requirement for both programs.
- The syllabus for the INTP 4040 Practicum class will be modified reflecting the new distribution of hours per mock interpreting and observation hours.
- A survey will be sent out to all of the teacher training programs through ACE:DHH to determine their current GPA requirements. This will then be shared with the Board.
 - Please note: The survey was sent to all of the teacher training programs. Results received and reported by Dr. Beal-Alvarez indicate that of the 15 responses we received the requirements were listed as follows:
Regarding entry level GPA requirements the number of programs requiring a 3.0 (10), 2.75 (3), 2.5 (2); with respect to Maintaining a GPA 3.0 (11), 2.75 (3), 2.5 (1), most permitted one C with no consequence using a 10-point scale (6), 7-point scale (7), 2 N/A.

Completed by (include title/position): Nanci A. Scheetz, Ed.D., CSC Professor and Program Coordinator,
Special Education: Deaf Education, Department of Middle, Secondary, Reading & Deaf Education