

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
EDUCATION COMMITTEE

MAIN CAPITOL  
ROOM 140  
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

CHAPTER 49.2 TEACHER PREPARATION  
FOLLOW-UP HEARING

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2008  
9:37 A.M.

BEFORE:

- HONORABLE JAMES R. ROEBUCK, JR., CHAIRMAN
- HONORABLE PATRICK J. HARKINS
- HONORABLE LAWRENCE H. CURRY
- HONORABLE THADDEUS KIRKLAND
- HONORABLE BARBARA MCILVAINE SMITH
- HONORABLE MIKE CARROLL
- HONORABLE RICHARD T. GRUCELA
- HONORABLE MARK LONGIETTI
- HONORABLE JOHN E. PALLONE
- HONORABLE JOHN T. YUDICHAK
- HONORABLE KATHY L. RAPP
- HONORABLE KAREN D. BEYER
- HONORABLE MIKE FLECK
- HONORABLE DARYL D. METCALFE
- HONORABLE DUANE MILNE
- HONORABLE SAM ROHRER

---

BRENDA J. PARDUN, RPR  
P. O. BOX 278  
MAYTOWN, PA 17550  
717-426-1596 PHONE/FAX

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

ALSO PRESENT:

SONIA TERECH, LEGISLATIVE AIDE (D)  
TRACEY MCLAUGHLIN, RESEARCH ANALYST (D)  
MILTONIA PEAL, INTERN (D)  
PATTY WHITE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (R)  
ASHLEY DEMAURO, RESEARCH ANALYST (R)  
JOY ANDERSON, RESEARCH ANALYST (R)

BRENDA J. PARDUN, RPR  
REPORTER - NOTARY PUBLIC

## INDEX

1	NAME	PAGE
2		
3	KATHLEEN M. SHAW, Ph.D.	7
4	Deputy Secretary, Postsecondary and Higher Education, PA Department of Education	
5		
6	DR. DON FRANCIS	105
7	President, Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of PA	
8		
9	LEX O. MCMILLAN, III, Ph.D.	109
10	President, Albright College	
11		
12	FAY GLOSENGER, Ph.D.	112
13	Chair of Education, Juniata College	
14		
15	DR. DENNIS TULLI	121
16	CEO, Commonwealth Connections Cyber Charter; Former Superintendent, Lebanon City School District	
17		
18	KATHY RUTHKOSKY	146
19	President, PA Association of Colleges for Teacher Education	
20		
21	C. JAY HERTZOG, D.Ed	152
22	Dean, College of Education, Slippery Rock University of PA	
23		
24	JACKIE EDMONDSON, Ph.D.	160
25	Associate Dean for Teacher Education and Undergraduate Programs, Penn State University	
26		
27	JOANNE R. DEBOY, Ed.D.	165
28	Chair, Education Department, Lincoln University	
29		
30	PETER GARLAND, Ph.D.	175
31	Executive Vice Chancellor, State System of Higher Education	
32		
33	DR. DONNA L. PATTERSON	180
34	Associate Dean, College of Education and Human Services, Clarion University of PA	
35		

1	INDEX (Cont'd)	
2	NAME	PAGE
3	DR. MICHAEL R. MCGOUGH	190
4	Associate Professor and Chair,	
5	Department of Education,	
6	York College	
7	DR. MIKE MCGOVERN	194
8	Vice President for Academic Affairs,	
9	Northampton Community College	
10	WRITTEN REMARKS SUBMITTED	
11	PA AMERICAN ASSOCIATE DEGREE	208
12	EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATORS (PA ACCESS)	
13	KENT CHRISMAN, PRESIDENT,	213
14	PENNSYLVANIA ASSOCIATION OF EARLY	
15	CHILDHOOD TEACHER EDUCATORS (PA AECTE)	
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

## P R O C E E D I N G S

1  
2 CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Good morning. I'd  
3 like to call the House Education Committee  
4 meeting to order.

5 We have an extensive agenda today.  
6 And before we begin, I do, however, want to  
7 note the passing of our Lieutenant Governor,  
8 Catherine Baker Knoll. Certainly we're all  
9 saddened by that, and I'd ask that we might  
10 have a moment of silence in her memory.

11 (Whereupon, there was a moment of  
12 silence.)

13 CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Thank you.

14 We have an extensive agenda. I've  
15 asked that those who are making presentations  
16 would limit their comments. We all have  
17 copies of those comments. And the hope is  
18 that we could put most of our emphasis into  
19 the discussion of the dialogue between the  
20 committee and the presenters.

21 Before we begin, however, I want us  
22 each to identify ourselves. I'm  
23 Representative Jim Roebuck from Philadelphia,  
24 chairman of the House Education Committee.  
25 Let me then go to my left, to Representative

1 Metcalfe.

2 REPRESENTATIVE METCALFE:

3 Representative Daryl Metcalfe from the 12th  
4 district in Butler County.

5 REPRESENTATIVE ROHRER:

6 Representative Sam Rohrer, 128th district,  
7 Berks County.

8 REPRESENTATIVE RAPP: Representative  
9 Kathy Rapp, 65th district, Warren, Forest, and  
10 McKean County.

11 REPRESENTATIVE MCILVAINE SMITH: Barb  
12 McIlvaine Smith -- McIlvaine Smith, 156th,  
13 Chester County.

14 REPRESENTATIVE MILNE: No problem.  
15 I'm also Chester County. Duane Milne, 167th.

16 REPRESENTATIVE FLECK: Representative  
17 Mike Fleck, 81st District, Blair, Huntingdon  
18 and Mifflin County.

19 REPRESENTATIVE YUDICHAK: Good  
20 morning. Representative John Yudichak,  
21 Luzerne County.

22 REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: Good  
23 morning. I'm representative Mike Carroll from  
24 Luzerne and Monroe Counties.

25 REPRESENTATIVE HARKINS: Good

1 morning. Pat Harkins, 1st district up in  
2 Erie.

3 REPRESENTATIVE LONGIETTI: Hello.  
4 Mark Longietti, 7th district, Mercer County.

5 REPRESENTATIVE KIRKLAND: Good  
6 morning to you all. I'm Thaddeus Kirkland,  
7 Delaware County, 159th legislative district.

8 CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Okay. Thank you.

9 Our first presenter is Dr. Kathleen  
10 M. Shaw, deputy secretary, postsecondary and  
11 higher education, Pennsylvania Department of  
12 Education.

13 DR. SHAW: Good morning, Chairman  
14 Roebuck and members of the House Education  
15 Committee.

16 I am pleased to be here today to  
17 testify about the implementation process  
18 created by the state Board of Education and  
19 changes in Chapter 49, commonly known as  
20 Chapter 49-2, which represents a significant  
21 but essential transformation in the way that  
22 Pennsylvania trains its new teachers.

23 The changes in Chapter 49-2 replace  
24 the current K-6 elementary certificate with  
25 two certificates: preK through fourth grade

1 and fourth through eighth grade. It also  
2 requires all teachers certified in special  
3 education to also be certified in PreK through  
4 fourth, fourth through eighth, or seventh  
5 through twelfth grade. Finally, it requires  
6 all new teachers and education specialists to  
7 graduate ready to teach all students by  
8 embedding nine credits of special education  
9 and three credits on teaching English language  
10 learners into all certificate programs.

11 The goal of Chapter 49-2 is to ensure  
12 that all of our children emerge from their  
13 educational experiences ready to succeed in  
14 society, whether by going on to college or by  
15 entering the work force. With your help, the  
16 Rendell administration has made historic  
17 investments in our preK-through-twelve schools  
18 to provide the resources needed to achieve  
19 this goal. But we will fall far short of that  
20 goal if we do not also ensure that our  
21 teachers are up to the challenge.

22 We know that teachers are the single  
23 most important predictor of student success.  
24 While the changes required by Chapter 49-2 are  
25 undoubtedly challenging for teacher-



1 preparation programs, I have faith that our  
2 excellent higher education institutions can  
3 rise to this challenge.

4 Like other professions such as medicine,  
5 nursing, and accounting, teaching requires a  
6 specific set of knowledge, skills, and  
7 practices. It is both an art and a science.

8 Chapter 49-2 lays the foundation for  
9 ensuring that our teachers have the content,  
10 the pedagogy and the knowledge of human  
11 development to effectively teach all of our  
12 students.

13 If we are to prepare a workforce up  
14 to the challenges posed by the 21st century  
15 global economy, our teachers need to hit the  
16 ground running and ready on the first day that  
17 they enter the classroom. Thanks to your  
18 support, Chapter 49-2 helps accomplish this.

19 Our work in this arena is right in  
20 line with both national and state reports. As  
21 you know, the Governor's Commission on  
22 Training America's Teachers indicates that  
23 both K-through-12 teachers and administrators  
24 report that their initial preparation is  
25 lacking.

1           The fact that college of education  
2 deans reported exactly the opposite beliefs --  
3 that is, that their graduates are very well  
4 prepared to enter the classroom -- points to a  
5 disconnect we must address. To do so, the  
6 report calls for greatly increased oversight  
7 by PDE and the development of accountability  
8 mechanisms that will ensure that preparation  
9 programs are performing at high standards.

10           The Higher Education Reauthorization  
11 Act echoes many of these recommendations, as  
12 do recent reports by US Secretary of Education  
13 Margaret Spellings.

14           Because certification programs and  
15 institutions of higher education provide a  
16 license to enter a profession, they are held  
17 to a different set of standards than  
18 noncertification programs or majors. The  
19 Pennsylvania Department of Education's  
20 authority to issue professional teaching  
21 certificates is vested in the department by  
22 the state Board of Education and also by the  
23 federal government as per Sections 205 and 207  
24 of the Title II Higher Education Opportunity  
25 Act.

1           In fact, our federal funding is  
2           dependent on setting criteria that raises the  
3           standards for entry into the teaching  
4           profession and that are specific enough to  
5           allow us to adequately address whether  
6           programs are performing well.

7           In implementing the revised Chapter  
8           49 regulations, the Department of Education  
9           created a process for collaborating  
10          extensively with the field. Under the  
11          leadership of Terry Barnaby in my bureau, over  
12          an eighteen-month period, PDE worked very  
13          closely with work groups that were comprised  
14          of individuals from all sectors of higher  
15          education as well as preK-through-twelve  
16          teachers, educational administrators, parents,  
17          and national experts to develop the individual  
18          guidelines for the three new certificates.

19          In total, PDE held one hundred fifty-  
20          eight meetings with the work groups and others  
21          from the field to vet the draft certification  
22          program guidelines repeatedly. By choosing to  
23          work directly and deeply with the field, we  
24          have ensured that the final guidelines are  
25          informed by a broad range of perspectives,

1 reflect the best thinking of the field and  
2 strike a balance between clearly articulated  
3 requirements and the flexibility that  
4 institutions need to determine how they will  
5 meet these requirements.

6 Our old guidelines provided almost no  
7 clear guidance to the field regarding elements  
8 of a high-quality program. As a result, we  
9 saw huge variations in the breath and depth of  
10 basic elements of teacher-preparation  
11 programs.

12 Our revised guidelines are designed  
13 to correct these shortcomings. Let me  
14 describe a few of the most important  
15 improvements.

16 Our new guidelines provide a detailed  
17 framework for what teachers need to know and  
18 be able to do, tied to specific credit  
19 amounts. This is a way to clearly communicate  
20 the relative importance of each competency  
21 that we feel is essential.

22 New guidelines require institutions  
23 to show that faculty members are qualified to  
24 teach specific courses based on their own  
25 relevant experience. And the guidelines also

1 ensure that all teacher candidates take grade-  
2 specific courses in relevant content, human  
3 development, and pedagogy.

4 In other words, if a candidate is  
5 preparing to teach middle school students, the  
6 candidate must have a mastery over the subject  
7 area content and also have a solid  
8 understanding of how children that age learn  
9 and behave.

10 We have heard from some the PDE  
11 guidelines are too specific and that they  
12 violate institutional autonomy. Let me take a  
13 moment to respond to these concerns. Because  
14 PDE has the responsibility for determining  
15 whether a preparation program is approved, it  
16 is important that our guidelines communicate  
17 clearly and specifically the criteria against  
18 which each program will be judged. That kind  
19 of clarity simply has not existed up until  
20 this point. Yet our new guidelines do not  
21 dictate a standard curriculum or specific  
22 courses. Instead, they provide a flexibility  
23 for institutions to determine how they will  
24 meet our standards.

25 Pennsylvania is blessed with a

1 remarkable diversity of higher education  
2 institutions ranging from small, private  
3 liberal arts colleges to open-admission  
4 community colleges to large, comprehensive  
5 state and state-related universities.

6           The curriculum and the organizational  
7 structures at these institutions are equally  
8 varied. As a result of this diversity,  
9 different types of institutions encounter  
10 different types of challenges as they move  
11 toward implementation of their new teacher-  
12 preparation programs.

13           Some institutions have very large  
14 general education curricula that poses a  
15 challenge for incorporating the increased  
16 amount of new content that the certificates  
17 will require. Others have staffing  
18 challenges, and still others have encountered  
19 the internal struggles that often ensue when  
20 one department or program is being phased out  
21 and others created.

22           Yet through a strong foundation of  
23 leadership, collaboration, and a commitment to  
24 the spirit of 49-2, many institutions have  
25 already been able to successfully overcome

1 these challenges. For example, three  
2 independent institutions -- two small liberal  
3 arts colleges and a religious institution --  
4 have submitted initial program drafts to us  
5 already, well ahead of the date required.  
6 Although we have not yet conducted a formal  
7 review, our analysis strongly suggests that  
8 all three of these institutions meet our  
9 credit requirements, our content requirements,  
10 and our faculty requirements.

11 We are also hearing encouraging news  
12 from a range of PASSHE institutions. And I  
13 think you'll hear about some of that later.

14 As has always been the case, the  
15 program-review process will be conducted with  
16 significant input from content experts from  
17 the field, and if an initial review suggests  
18 that a program will not meet the department's  
19 requirements, PDE will provide additional  
20 technical assistance and additional time for  
21 programs to collect and submit the evidence  
22 needed. Moreover, if institutions disagree  
23 with the decision of the department, there  
24 will be a straightforward appeals process in  
25 place to resolve the issue.





1 options to provide evidence that students have  
2 met these measures.

3 Others states, such as Louisiana and  
4 Tennessee, have a good experience with such  
5 models, and we will be in contact with these  
6 states as we embark on this next important  
7 step.

8 PDE is also actively working with the  
9 field to provide the kind of technical  
10 assistance needed to overcome the remaining  
11 hurdles. Based on feedback from institutions,  
12 PDE's technical assistance is designed to be  
13 concrete and tailored to the specific needs of  
14 each institution's certification programs.

15 This technical assistance includes  
16 consultants that can be deployed to specific  
17 institutions or regions; workshops focused on  
18 common challenges; more frequent and  
19 consistent communication regarding timelines  
20 and deadlines; meetings to bring together key  
21 partners, such as community colleges and  
22 school districts; and online seminars to  
23 assist in the application process.

24 I know from experience that  
25 curricular change of this magnitude is a

1 difficult process. Prior to becoming deputy  
2 secretary, I served for ten years on the  
3 faculty of the College of Education at Temple  
4 University, and I worked closely with my  
5 colleagues on curricular change as department  
6 chair and also as a member of the college's  
7 curriculum steering committee.

8           The kind of change that these  
9 institutions are engaged in can sometimes take  
10 up to three to five years, yet we are  
11 expecting them to complete the process much  
12 more quickly.

13           This tight timeline has created a  
14 real hardship for some institutions, and we  
15 recognize that, and also for some students who  
16 may not be graduated from the old programs  
17 before the new programs are up and running.  
18 Because this really is a legitimate concern,  
19 Secretary Zahorchak has agreed to grant a six  
20 months' extension of the deadline by which  
21 students must graduate under the new  
22 certificates.

23           This extension will provide  
24 institutions with some breathing room to  
25 create the kind of strong programs that we

1 envision. And it reduces the chance that some  
2 students will get caught between programs.

3           The application deadline for an  
4 extension is December 31st, 2008. Already 35  
5 percent of all programs have applied, and I am  
6 encouraged by the positive reaction we have  
7 received from the field. Clearly, we are  
8 responding to legitimate institutional  
9 concerns, and we also working hard to provide  
10 the support needed for our teacher-preparation  
11 institutions to meet the high standards that  
12 our students need to succeed.

13           In closing, I would like to emphasize  
14 that PDE is committed to ensuring that our new  
15 teachers are prepared to enter the classroom  
16 ready to effectively teach all of our  
17 students. We have provided the necessary  
18 specificity to ensure that programs meet the  
19 standards for certification. We provide  
20 significant flexibility to allow our diverse  
21 array of institution to determine how to meet  
22 the standards. And we are prepared to offer  
23 the technical support to help every  
24 institution successfully design new programs.

25           In short, we are laying the necessary

1           groundwork to move toward an effective,  
2           performance-based higher education system that  
3           produces teachers ready to enable student  
4           success.

5                         Thank you very much for this  
6           opportunity to speak with you, and I would be  
7           happy to take any questions you might have.

8                         CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Thank you.  
9           Questions from the committee.

10                        Mark.

11                        REPRESENTATIVE LONGIETTI: Thank you  
12           very much for your testimony.

13                        One of the areas that I'd like to ask  
14           some questions are in regard to the credit  
15           hours. And if I understand currently what is  
16           measured are competencies, and there is no  
17           credit hours mandate; is that correct?

18                        DR. SHAW: Yes, that's correct.

19                        REPRESENTATIVE LONGIETTI: How many  
20           credit hours are we looking at, for example,  
21           preK-through-four certification?

22                        DR. SHAW: Well, first of all, one of  
23           the things that I have to stress is that we  
24           have provided pathways for all institutions to  
25           meet the requirements in all certification

1 programs within a hundred twenty hours. And  
2 that's something that institutions are  
3 required to do. So that basically means  
4 within a four-year period, a student will be  
5 able to be certified.

6 In preK -- in four-through-eight  
7 certificates, there is a professional core,  
8 and that's -- the core that -- the courses  
9 that focus specifically on human development  
10 and pedagogy, assessment, et cetera. There is  
11 twenty-seven credits that we require of all  
12 programs. And then there's additional set of  
13 content requirements that institutions need to  
14 offer.

15 And I want to be clear about why  
16 that's the case. In grade bands four through  
17 eight, we need to prepare students that are --  
18 teachers that are both generalists and can  
19 teach the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades, and  
20 we also need to produce teachers that will be  
21 considered highly qualified in content areas  
22 in grades seven and eight.

23 And so what that means is that we  
24 have to require increased content across the  
25 four subject areas that teachers will be

1 teaching. And so I think that's one of the  
2 reasons that institutions are having a bit of  
3 a difficult time, because on paper it looks  
4 like there's quite a lot more credits  
5 required.

6           However, what we have attempted to do  
7 is to provide multiple pathways for  
8 institutions to essentially double-count  
9 general education courses towards the content  
10 areas. So, for example, many institutions  
11 have general education courses in math, in  
12 science, in English, in social studies. Many  
13 of those courses can be counted towards the  
14 content requirements in these certificates.

15           So that we have tried in whichever  
16 way possible to reduce the total number of  
17 courses that students need to take but still  
18 we need to ensure that they graduate with  
19 adequate content knowledge so that if they are  
20 certified to teach science, for example, not  
21 only will they be able to teach science in a  
22 generalist way in grades four through six, but  
23 they can walk into an eighth grade class and  
24 actually teach a science course and be  
25 considered highly qualified.

1                   And that's a difficult thing to pull  
2 off, but I think we have provided multiple  
3 scenarios by our institutions to achieve that  
4 goal.

5                   REPRESENTATIVE LONGIETTI: If I am  
6 seeking a preK-grade four certification, how  
7 many credit hours am I going to be required  
8 under these guidelines to achieve in order to  
9 reach that certification?

10                  DR. SHAW: Well, again, there's a cap  
11 of about a hundred twenty credits or so, so  
12 everything will be achieved within four years,  
13 but there's a professional core that is about  
14 sixty credits.

15                  REPRESENTATIVE LONGIETTI: So if I'm  
16 hearing that correctly, we're talking about  
17 potentially, if not more, about half of the  
18 credit hours that I would take in college that  
19 are going to need to be dedicated towards that  
20 core requirement in order to meet with these  
21 stated.

22                  DR. SHAW: Yes, except, again, I  
23 would say that some of those courses can also  
24 be counted toward general education, depending  
25 on the institution's decision to do that, and

1 so there is a -- there is a sixty-credit  
2 minimum, but those credits can be distributed  
3 different ways in an institution, depending on  
4 how the general education curriculum is  
5 structured, so there really is a lot of  
6 variation, because the institutions themselves  
7 vary so much in how they structure this  
8 curriculum.

9 REPRESENTATIVE LONGIETTI: And I  
10 realize that, for example, my undergraduate  
11 degree came from a liberal arts college, and I  
12 know from that experience and I value that  
13 liberal arts education very much. I think in  
14 today's society it's critically important. It  
15 made me well-rounded, it made me understand a  
16 lot of different subject areas, but I get  
17 concerned and how's this going to affect the  
18 liberal arts college where there are a number  
19 of credit requirements that I have outside of  
20 my major, and how does that affect, for  
21 example, you know, what room for error do we  
22 have? Because we know students change  
23 majors. We know sometimes they drop a  
24 course. And are we going to mandate credit  
25 hours to the degree where there really isn't



1 any margin of error and we are going to impede  
2 upon the liberal arts college?

3 DR. SHAW: I think, and I mentioned  
4 in my testimony, there are already liberal  
5 arts colleges that have figured out how to do  
6 this. And so, I think that -- I certainly --  
7 I'm a liberal arts college graduate too, by  
8 the way, and I value the liberal arts colleges  
9 as well, but I think that the tension that  
10 you're discussing is that tension between the  
11 liberal arts college mission and the need for  
12 the state to ensure that teachers are  
13 graduating with the content and the -- and the  
14 knowledge of human development and pedagogy  
15 that they need in order to walk into the  
16 classroom and do a good job.

17 And so I think that, you know, as I  
18 said, we have significant technical assistance  
19 that we're willing to deploy to any  
20 institution that wants it to help them work  
21 through their curricular issues, but I know  
22 that, in some instances, institutions are  
23 going to have to think creatively about their  
24 general education curriculum.

25 For example, I know of one

1 institution that decided to allow several  
2 education courses to count towards general  
3 education because some of the content really  
4 could be considered general education, like  
5 courses on human development, for example, are  
6 essentially psychology courses that could  
7 count.

8           So I think that it absolutely  
9 requires creativity, but I also believe and I  
10 know that institutions are already meeting  
11 that challenge. That doesn't mean that there  
12 are no institutions in this room today that  
13 are having difficulty, and I recognize that.  
14 But what we are trying to do is to find  
15 institutions that are doing a good job with  
16 this, and then put them in front of other  
17 institutions so that, as colleagues, they can  
18 begin to share ideas of how to meet the  
19 challenges of ensuring that all of the  
20 requirements of the department are met and  
21 they can continue to offer the kind of  
22 education that they would like to.

23           REPRESENTATIVE LONGIETTI: And the  
24 feedback that I'm receiving from small  
25 colleges in my area, and people that, you

1 know, that I know and respect in the field is  
2 that you measure competencies, like the  
3 department currently does, the tagging of  
4 credit hours in and of itself doesn't  
5 necessarily tell us what is the rigor of that  
6 class, what is the rigor of that credit hour  
7 and if it varies from institution, between  
8 institutions, how much effort the student must  
9 put in.

10 And so they're posing a question,  
11 well, why not -- why can we not move in this  
12 direction but measure it in term of  
13 competencies, and not just say, well, X number  
14 of credit hours is what we need to achieve?

15 DR. SHAW: Let me address that,  
16 because that's a question that we get all the  
17 time as well. When we think about credit  
18 hours, I think the best way to think about  
19 credit hours is a way to clearly communicate  
20 to programs the relative emphasis that we  
21 believe should be placed on specific areas of  
22 content. And so if we, for example, say that  
23 student must know how to do -- how to use  
24 assessment instruments, and that is a  
25 competency, that could be covered in one

1 institution with half of one class. It could  
2 be covered in another institution with three  
3 courses. It really will vary.

4 What we're saying is, six credits of  
5 assessment knowledge means that we would like  
6 you to place significant emphasis on teaching  
7 students how to use assessment instruments  
8 that the state of Pennsylvania has provided to  
9 all teachers.

10 So I see the credit requirements as a  
11 way to explicitly communicate to programs,  
12 this is what we're going to be looking  
13 for when your program comes in front of us and  
14 we have to decide whether or not we're going  
15 to approve that program.

16 So that's what I would say to the  
17 credit requirement argument. It certainly is  
18 a change, moving away from competencies. But  
19 the other thing to remember is, these are  
20 brand-new programs. We don't have any  
21 measures of their effectiveness yet because  
22 they haven't been up and running yet.

23 And one of the things that I  
24 mentioned in my testimony that I'm really  
25 committed to is, over the long term, I think

1        what we want to do is to look at the outcomes  
2        of these programs. In other words, now we  
3        know you're offering this content. Are the  
4        students learning the content? Are the  
5        students performing well when they go out and  
6        they student teach? Are they able to apply  
7        the content?

8                    I think over time, when we get the  
9        kind of performance measures we want to see in  
10       place, we can move towards an outcome-based  
11       review process, and I think it would be  
12       possible to relax some of the specific credit  
13       requirements that we're talking about right  
14       now. But in the absence of any performance  
15       data, the only thing that we can look at is  
16       what did the quality program look like.

17                   And one of the things that we saw  
18       when we looked at the current programs is that  
19       there is an enormous variation in how  
20       institutions deliver content. And there's a  
21       difference in the amount and the quality of  
22       content that's delivered.

23                   So we're trying -- we're taking the  
24       first step towards providing a more standard  
25       set and a clearer set of expectations, and

1 then, over time, I think we should move  
2 towards performance, because, in the end, the  
3 proof is in the pudding; right?

4 REPRESENTATIVE LONGIETTI: I would  
5 agree with that. I know there are other  
6 questions. I'm going to just state this: I  
7 know the credit hours gives us a hard-and-fast  
8 measure because it gives us a number. I don't  
9 know how accurate our -- or how good it is in  
10 really measuring what we want to measure. And  
11 we certainly would hope the department would  
12 give some more thought to that.

13 Last area I'm just going to cover  
14 real quickly, the matrix. And I'm going to  
15 admit I didn't study all the proposed  
16 guidelines or regulations, but one concern  
17 that I have, based on feedback, is -- and I  
18 will give you an example. My undergraduate  
19 degree came from Westminster College.  
20 Excellent education. They have good classroom  
21 teachers. You could not cut it at Westminster  
22 if you were not good in the classroom. You  
23 were not going to stay there.

24 My law degree came from Boston  
25 College. Great institution. The big thing

1 that I noticed the difference was Westminster,  
2 at that time, did not have an emphasis on  
3 people researching, writing, making  
4 presentations. Boston College did.

5 Now, Boston College, the difference  
6 was that you had a highly motivated student  
7 body that really caused us to learn better,  
8 but I can tell you that I had great professors  
9 at Boston College, but I also had ones that  
10 had an emphasis on research and writing that  
11 were terrible classroom teachers.

12 And so I'm concerned when I hear  
13 about the matrix, about scoring people based  
14 on research, based on writing, based on  
15 presentations, and how that affects smaller  
16 colleges where that has not been an emphasis,  
17 and does that really get us to good classroom  
18 teachers teaching students what they need to  
19 know to become good teachers.

20 DR. SHAW: Let me address the issue  
21 of the faculty matrix. I presume most of you  
22 have not studied this as closely as I have.  
23 The faculty matrix that is included in the  
24 program guidelines -- or in the program-review  
25 guidelines is designed to ensure that faculty

1 members that are teaching specific courses  
2 actually have content knowledge in the courses  
3 that they're teaching.

4           So, for example, if a course is being  
5 taught in special education, we want to make  
6 sure that the faculty member has experience in  
7 special education. The way that the matrix is  
8 laid out, there is multiple pathways to  
9 showing us that the faculty member has that  
10 expertise.

11           One pathway -- a portion of one  
12 pathway might be research or presentations in  
13 the area of the course. So a presentation or  
14 a research project or a publication in special  
15 education.

16           But there are other ways to show  
17 expertise as well. Do you have a degree in  
18 special education, a master's degree or a  
19 doctoral degree? Are you certified in special  
20 education as a K-through-twelve teacher? Have  
21 you taught special education courses at the  
22 K-through-twelve level or at the higher ed  
23 level?

24           So the faculty matrix does not  
25 provide one pathway, nor do I think it



1 overemphasizes research. It recognizes that  
2 some people develop expertise through  
3 research, but it also recognizes that many  
4 people develop expertise through practice,  
5 through actually being in the classroom,  
6 through being a student of special education,  
7 as an example itself, or by teaching special  
8 education.

9           So I think that it's pretty flexible,  
10 and I don't think that it overemphasizes  
11 research, but I certainly understand your  
12 concern about that because we want to make  
13 sure that the faculty members in our  
14 classrooms are actually really good teachers,  
15 and I'm sure that they are. But we just need  
16 to make sure that, you know, in the program-  
17 review process, we just want institutions to  
18 show us that.

19           REPRESENTATIVE LONGIETTI: Thank you,  
20 Mr. Chairman.

21           Thank you, Deputy Secretary.

22           DR. SHAW: Sure.

23           CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Thank you.

24           Representative Kirkland.

25           REPRESENTATIVE KIRKLAND: Thank you,

1 Mr. Chairman.

2 Good morning. Just one real quick  
3 question as we continue this conversation.  
4 The -- I assume this is -- these standards or  
5 guideline are directed at new teachers?

6 DR. SHAW: Yes.

7 REPRESENTATIVE KIRKLAND: So what --  
8 what is in place for what I would call senior  
9 educators? How do they get into this mix?  
10 How do they catch up in these standards, or  
11 are they involved in it?

12 DR. SHAW: That's a good question.  
13 These particular standards don't have anything  
14 to do with sitting -- with teachers that are  
15 already in the classroom. The teachers that  
16 are already in the classroom are required to  
17 engage in professional development through Act  
18 148 and other ways to continue to develop  
19 their expertise. But the guidelines that we  
20 have in place now don't really directly  
21 address professional development except that  
22 they do require institutions to show how  
23 they're going to continue to support their  
24 teachers after they graduate and are in the  
25 classroom.

1           So there is an element of Chapter 49  
2           that requires institutions to do that, and at  
3           this point, we're inclined to allow  
4           institutions to meet that requirement in  
5           multiple ways.

6           One of the things that we will be  
7           able to do is to help institutions track more  
8           accurately where these teachers are actually  
9           placed, because you can have teacher-  
10          preparation programs, say, at Temple  
11          University, and you can have teachers  
12          throughout the 501 school districts, but what  
13          we have in place is a data system that is  
14          going to allow us to report back to a teacher-  
15          preparation program and say, you just  
16          graduated a hundred teachers; here are the  
17          districts that they're in. And now you can  
18          contact them and you can ensure that they're  
19          getting the continued support that they need  
20          from you as they begin their career.

21                 REPRESENTATIVE KIRKLAND: So what  
22                 we're doing is we're saying that we have the  
23                 old way of educating a student by way of the  
24                 senior teachers, but we are coming with a new  
25                 way of educating our -- or not educating our

1 children, new way or standards with our newer  
2 teachers, so we're -- like it is too  
3 different.

4 DR. SHAW: I think that the vast  
5 majority of the emphasis in this particular  
6 regulatory change is focused on preparing  
7 teachers, but I agree with you that we need to  
8 turn our attention to continuing to support  
9 our sitting teachers through, you know,  
10 multiple pathways of professional  
11 development.

12 REPRESENTATIVE KIRKLAND: Thank you,  
13 Mr. Chairman.

14 Just one quick comment as I complete  
15 my comments to the chairman, and that was, we  
16 do a lot of work when it comes to preparing  
17 teachers and reeducating our teachers and how  
18 they educate our children.

19 One of the things I think we are  
20 missing, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that we  
21 have not done anything to deal with parental  
22 involvement. It is one thing to educate, to  
23 prepare our teachers, but when the children go  
24 home to parents that are not prepared to get  
25 them ready for education, it becomes a

1           difficult job for the educator. So one day  
2           we'll be able to look that up.

3                     Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

4                     CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Representative  
5           Rohrer.

6                     REPRESENTATIVE ROHRER: Thank you,  
7           Mr. Chairman.

8                     Thank you, Secretary.

9                     Probably a lot of questions I think  
10          the members will have here today because this  
11          is rather a big change that's being  
12          recommended. And I did note in your comments,  
13          to which I agree, it says that what -- from  
14          your testimony that this represents a  
15          significant transformation in the way  
16          Pennsylvania trains its new teachers. And you  
17          also said "essential," so I look at and I see  
18          "significant," probably objective; "essential"  
19          is probably somewhat more subjective.

20                    But in any regard, one -- as I look  
21          at that part of it, I'm drawn to the aspect  
22          that, I mean, as a committee, we have dealt  
23          with and have held hearings on many, many,  
24          many proposed regulations and changes by the  
25          department over the years. And one of the

1 questions that naturally arises out of our  
2 function here is, when we review these things,  
3 it does go to the authority of the -- of the  
4 department, as granted by the legislature  
5 years ago, to recommend changes.

6           And so, in that regard, I'm drawn to  
7 the word "significant" transformation in this  
8 regard. If you look specifically at what  
9 you're putting forth here, if I could -- let  
10 me start right at the bottom. What is the  
11 driving -- if you could sum up for me, what is  
12 the driving issue or the reason that the  
13 department is trying to put forward these  
14 substantial changes? What is -- what's the  
15 problem -- if you can enunciate for us, what  
16 is the problem that you're trying to address?

17           DR. SHAW: The problem that Chapter  
18 49-2 was designed to address is the problem  
19 that teachers who are teaching in the  
20 classroom were not being -- not receiving the  
21 kind of grade-specific content that they  
22 needed in order to teach students as well as  
23 they need to be teaching students.

24           Recall that all of these changes are  
25 happening in a "No Child Left Behind" world,

1 and what that means is that when a teacher  
2 enters the classroom in that first year, that  
3 teacher is being held responsible for ensuring  
4 that those students score proficient on the  
5 PSSAs. So that twenty years ago, when we were  
6 not living under NCLB, there might have been  
7 more time for a teacher to really get up to  
8 speed and to receive mentorship, et cetera, so  
9 that the teacher was functioning at full  
10 potential when they enter the classroom. I  
11 think that teachers are under enormous  
12 pressure now, and they don't have that time to  
13 do that, and so what that means is that now it  
14 is incumbent upon our teacher-preparation  
15 programs to ensure that they get the content  
16 that they need.

17 And it is not just about content. It  
18 is also about learning how to teach. And  
19 learning how to teach means learning  
20 pedagogy. And pedagogy, which is how children  
21 learn and how we teach them to learn, is not  
22 generalizable across all grade levels. There  
23 are certain kinds of teaching practices that  
24 work in a preK-through-four classroom that do  
25 not work in a mid-level classroom.

1           We know that mid-level students are  
2           early adolescents. We know that that's a  
3           difficult time in the human development cycle  
4           of an individual. Teachers need to understand  
5           what those students are going through when the  
6           students are sitting in the classroom, and so  
7           breaking the K-through-six band into preK  
8           through four and four through eight is simply  
9           a way to ensure that when teachers walk into  
10          those classrooms, they know the content. I  
11          think that's a given. We want everybody to  
12          know content.

13                 But more than that, we want to make  
14          sure that they know how to teach. And to know  
15          how to teach they need to know the right  
16          strategies and they need to know their  
17          students. They need to know where their  
18          students are developmentally. And that's  
19          really what the changes in Chapter 49-2 are  
20          designed to.

21                 I also don't want to miss the other  
22          portion of Chapter 49-2, which is the special  
23          education component. These changes require  
24          all special ed teachers to have dual  
25          certification, and they also require that



1 every certification program in the state,  
2 regardless of grade band, has significant  
3 content in special education and English  
4 language learners.

5 And the reason for that is also, I  
6 think, pretty clear. Special education  
7 students are being mainstreamed into the  
8 classroom, and teachers are now teaching a  
9 diversity of students in the classroom that  
10 they've never taught before. And we know that  
11 many teachers get frustrated and leave the  
12 classroom. We know that retention's an  
13 issue.

14 And one of the reasons that  
15 retention's an issue, as teachers tell us, is  
16 that they're not properly prepared to teach  
17 the diversity of students that they encounter  
18 in their classroom. So Chapter 49-2 is  
19 designed to ensure that they have basic  
20 knowledge of different learning styles and the  
21 different needs of students that they will  
22 encounter in their classroom.

23 REPRESENTATIVE ROHRER: Okay. Thank  
24 you.

25 And I -- one thing that you said,

1 basically -- basically what we're doing here  
2 is the department is attempting to continue to  
3 follow through with the -- with the full  
4 implementation of No Child Left Behind. Is  
5 that what basically what you're saying?

6 DR. SHAW: No. What I'm saying is  
7 that we are responding to the realities of No  
8 Child Left Behind.

9 REPRESENTATIVE ROHRER: In one of the  
10 letters that you had sent back to -- the  
11 department had sent back to members, you cited  
12 a fact that there -- part of the reason for --  
13 motivation for doing this was that you were  
14 responding to a federal government call for  
15 greatly increased -- quote, greatly increased  
16 oversight by the PDE.

17 Why is that important, frankly?  
18 Why -- the federal government standpoint of  
19 telling us what we need to do or we shouldn't  
20 do, I'm assuming that the reason that you said  
21 that is that is because of the tie-in with  
22 that NCLB. Is that correct? Why is it the  
23 feds are telling -- are telling PDE that you  
24 need to impose greater oversight?

25 DR. SHAW: The federal government is

1 telling all states that they should have --

2 REPRESENTATIVE ROHRER: Is that  
3 because of NCLB?

4 DR. SHAW: I can't presume to say  
5 what that's because of. I know that the  
6 federal government is paying increasing  
7 attention to the quality of our teacher-  
8 preparation programs at large. This may be  
9 because of No Child Left Behind. It may be  
10 because of other issues that I'm not aware  
11 of.

12 So I really -- I don't know. But I  
13 do think that it's fair to say that they've  
14 placed increasing emphasis on the quality of  
15 our teachers. And certainly No Child Left  
16 Behind has -- does define highly qualified  
17 teachers in particular ways, and we have to  
18 respond to that.

19 REPRESENTATIVE ROHRER: And I know we  
20 have -- as a committee, we have had a lot of  
21 discussions over the years over whether or not  
22 that -- whether NCLB is even the appropriate  
23 thing. Nonetheless, whenever we get pushed by  
24 the feds to tell us or to tell you or whatever  
25 that we need to do more what they want, it is

1 a natural thing to say why. And I would hope  
2 that the department would have asked that  
3 question, why, a bit more too.

4 I do know that one of the reports  
5 that we've gotten from the -- a federal report  
6 commenting on teacher quality state programs,  
7 that report states, quote, mandated education  
8 courses, unpaid student teaching, and the  
9 hoops and the hurdles of the state  
10 certification bureaucracy discourages  
11 potential teachers from even entering the  
12 pipeline. The tragedy is that none of these  
13 hurdles leads to improved quality, end quote.

14 Now, that's -- so that's -- so we can  
15 pull probably different statements from  
16 different federal reports relative to why  
17 we're doing what we're doing.

18 To that extent, I'm looking, and  
19 because of all that -- what you're requiring  
20 being very, very significant -- as you say,  
21 lays out what you're putting in form of  
22 guidelines. But the guidelines seem to be  
23 extremely prescriptive, which if you tend to  
24 look at prescription, I mean, guidelines,  
25 policies, regulations and how they stack up in

1 the aspect of enforcement, these seem to be so  
2 very close to regulations that I don't know  
3 how to describe them different and they really  
4 appear to be a mandate.

5 Because if you -- if you are laying  
6 out a new standard for the schools and telling  
7 them that if you do not do thus and so we will  
8 not recognize you, so it becomes really a  
9 mandate. That being the case, why has the  
10 department chosen not to follow this through  
11 the normal course of regulations but instead  
12 called it guidelines, but, in fact, it is a  
13 regulation? How do you respond to that?

14 DR. SHAW: I don't believe that they  
15 are akin to regulation. As I said before, the  
16 department has the responsibility to determine  
17 whether or not a teacher-preparation program  
18 is approved or not. That is -- that is what  
19 we do. And so I think it is incumbent upon us  
20 to communicate clearly to institutions what  
21 our standards are and what we are looking  
22 for.

23 I also mentioned that there is an  
24 appeals process in place, and there's multiple  
25 ways for institutions to communicate with us

1 regarding how they would like to meet the  
2 guidelines. But this is not a standardized  
3 curriculum. We are not mandating courses.  
4 We're simply saying, you need to spend -- you  
5 need to devote X number of credits to this  
6 kind of competency.

7           Institutions can decide to do that  
8 however they wish. For example, if we require  
9 six credits of a particular content area, an  
10 institution may decide to offer that content  
11 in two separate three-credit courses. It may  
12 decide to spread that content across multiple  
13 courses. There is infinite ways that an  
14 institution can meet the content requirements  
15 in the guidelines.

16           But if we don't communicate clearly  
17 to institutions what our standards are, then I  
18 don't know how we can ethically make  
19 determinations about whether or not we would  
20 approve or disapprove a certification  
21 program. So, in other words, I see this as an  
22 attempt to be completely transparent and as  
23 objective as possible so that institutions see  
24 clearly what the standards are and can show us  
25 how they will meet the standards.

1           But, again, this is not a  
2           standardized curriculum. We are not mandating  
3           a single course. We are simply telling  
4           institutions the content that we would like to  
5           see there, and we are showing the emphasis on  
6           specific content areas by communicating  
7           credits.

8           REPRESENTATIVE ROHRER: My -- I think  
9           most of us, I personally am in favor of very,  
10          very high standards. I think we know that  
11          when they get out, they need to be able to  
12          perform on the jobs.

13          Somebody's too close to the mic.

14          In any event, I think that is  
15          assured. But I also, at the same time, I do  
16          like the way our college system is set up, and  
17          teachers that taught you and taught me, when  
18          one would look back and say, Were they  
19          deficient? What's -- is there a real  
20          difference between those who taught us and  
21          today?

22          There were prescriptive standards in  
23          place years ago that told our various colleges  
24          and universities how they had to do  
25          everything, the credit hours they had to put

1 in. And really, regardless of what you say,  
2 this would be more prospective than what it is  
3 now.

4 Is more control by the department and  
5 bureaucracy what we need? And I think from  
6 the perspective as I am looking at it in this  
7 regard, it does appear to be rather  
8 significant. It does appear to smell like a  
9 regulation. And it does appear to provide not  
10 as much flexibility, as I view it anyway, as  
11 what you're suggesting, so I'm looking forward  
12 to this testimony coming later as to how the  
13 institutions perceive that.

14 But when I look at some of the credit  
15 hours, as an example, and look at our smaller  
16 colleges and others who operate according to  
17 mission statements, as an example, it tends to  
18 reduce a great deal of the flexibility that  
19 really have made them distinctive in who they  
20 are and actually tends to more standardize the  
21 instruction, which I'm not so sure that's a --  
22 that's sort of what you're wanting to do, but  
23 it probably would have the result of that.

24 And so I'm looking at some of those  
25 things, so I'm coming down right now -- I know



1 this questions other issues. I'm just coming  
2 down on the side of the authority of the  
3 department to essentially put into place what  
4 really is, in essence, a regulation but  
5 calling it a guideline, and therefore,  
6 bypassing the system that is in place to  
7 really ensure that what is taking place has,  
8 in fact, seen the right amount of sunshine,  
9 has been subject to the amount of evaluation  
10 by the legislative committees that statute has  
11 required, and I'm looking at it and I'm having  
12 difficulty not reading this as a regulation,  
13 and, therefore, that was my reason for my line  
14 of questioning here.

15 And I think that that's -- I think  
16 that that's a problem. That's what I think it  
17 is.

18 DR. SHAW: I'll just have to  
19 respectfully disagree with that these are  
20 regulatory in nature. I don't see them that  
21 way. But I will point out that we have  
22 learned an awful lot about effective teaching  
23 and learning since I was in grade school.

24 And the guidelines that were  
25 developed were developed with extensive input

1 from the field, not just from the state but  
2 nationally. They're based on what we know  
3 about how students learn and what kind of  
4 content and expertise teachers need to have in  
5 order to help students learn.

6 So it is a different day now. And I  
7 think that the guidelines and Chapter 49-2  
8 reflect that.

9 REPRESENTATIVE ROHRER: Mr. Chairman,  
10 I'm done now.

11 CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Thank you.  
12 Representative Rapp.

13 REPRESENTATIVE RAPP: Thank you,  
14 Mr. Chairman.

15 Thank you, Dr. Shaw, for being here  
16 today.

17 I just have a couple questions.  
18 Since we have reciprocity with other states as  
19 well as Puerto Rico and the District of  
20 Columbia, how are these changes going to  
21 affect students who are certified in other  
22 states and want to teach in Pennsylvania? How  
23 will it affect those who are certified here  
24 and choose to teach in other states?

25 DR. SHAW: Well, during the

1 regulatory review process, there was extensive  
2 research done to take a look at what other  
3 certification programs looked like in other  
4 states. And we know that the majority of  
5 states have a preK through four -- something  
6 similar to preK through four, might be preK  
7 through three. And we also know that multiple  
8 other states have similar certifications in  
9 middle level.

10 So it is going to be incumbent upon  
11 the department to sit down and take a look at  
12 other states when these new programs are in  
13 place and to figure out reciprocity  
14 agreements.

15 So it certainly, I think, has the  
16 potential to change reciprocity agreements  
17 because the certifications themselves have  
18 changed, but what the department is doing with  
19 regard to the specific grade band is not out  
20 of step with what most states are doing. So I  
21 don't think it is going to be a problem that  
22 cannot be addressed.

23 REPRESENTATIVE RAPP: So from what  
24 you just said, you don't see this as  
25 potentially discouraging students from

1 enrolling in Pennsylvania teacher  
2 certification programs if other states offer  
3 different certifications?

4 DR. SHAW: I don't think so, no. I  
5 mean other states already offer -- no state --  
6 no two states have completely similar  
7 certification programs anyway, so there's  
8 already a negotiation that goes on between  
9 states with regard to reciprocity. This is a  
10 new set of programs, and so those negotiations  
11 will have to happen again.

12 REPRESENTATIVE RAPP: One last  
13 comment and question. On page three of your  
14 testimony, you said: Ultimately, we must  
15 ensure that our preparation programs are  
16 effective; and that -- two years we will begin  
17 full program approval process which can and  
18 should be based on performance measures such  
19 as evidence that students have actually  
20 mastered the required content and  
21 competencies.

22 How exactly is that going to be  
23 done? Through the PSSAs? Do you continue  
24 to --

25 DR. SHAW: No. I meant teachers

1 themselves.

2 REPRESENTATIVE RAPP: Teachers  
3 themselves. But how do you measure the  
4 teachers being competent without measuring  
5 students?

6 DR. SHAW: Well, there is a number of  
7 ways you can do that. You can take a look at  
8 student portfolios. You can have faculty  
9 members do a number of assessments to ensure  
10 that students have actually met the content  
11 requirements.

12 REPRESENTATIVE RAPP: You also say  
13 competency, so that's competencies of the  
14 teachers, not of the students.

15 DR. SHAW: Exactly. Some states do  
16 measure teacher performance -- or success of a  
17 teacher-preparation program based on the  
18 performance of students when they get out. So  
19 that's one model.

20 I would not say that we're wedded in  
21 particular to that model. I think that's --  
22 when we put together the committee, I think  
23 that's one of the things that we have to think  
24 about. But at this point in time, I am really  
25 looking to the field to help us understand how

1 best they can show us that their teachers --  
2 their emerging teachers have mastered the  
3 content of their program.

4 REPRESENTATIVE RAPP: My concern, you  
5 know, in this country, we have -- we do seem  
6 to do a good job at -- in grade one through  
7 three in reading and math, and then in the  
8 middle school, we see those scores drop off  
9 from compared to the rest of the nation, and  
10 as the students get older, they drop off even  
11 further.

12 And I know that the department seems  
13 to be pursuing those competency tests for  
14 students at the end of the day, even though I  
15 don't know of a member in the legislature that  
16 agrees with that.

17 It just seems that, you know, that  
18 the Department of Education is continually  
19 looking for new, innovative ways, and it  
20 doesn't seem to have been real successful up  
21 to this -- in a lot of ways, and obviously  
22 many of our student are doing very, very  
23 well. Our colleges are doing well, our  
24 universities, our schools. I'm just concerned  
25 that this is just one more thing that we're

1 going to put teachers through. Ultimately  
2 we're going to have to have new testing for  
3 students to see if what the teachers learned  
4 is going down to the students, and this is  
5 just one more program that's going to cost a  
6 lot of money to the universities, to people  
7 who want to go into the educational system,  
8 want to teach children, and it's -- at the end  
9 of the day, has, again, not proven effective.  
10 That's my concern.

11 DR. SHAW: I think that that's a  
12 legitimate concern. I think that what we're  
13 trying to do here is going to ensure the  
14 opposite. I think that the very fact that we  
15 are being much clearer than we ever have been  
16 before about what we expect teachers to do,  
17 that we are deciding to take a leadership role  
18 with regard to ensuring that we consider  
19 teaching as a profession in the same way that  
20 we consider other professions like math --  
21 math -- like medicine and law. I think that's  
22 a step in the right direction. And I think  
23 it's needed.

24 At the end of the day, I don't think,  
25 nor have we ever proposed, that we measure the

1           quality of the teacher based on a single test,  
2           for example, a Praxis exam. Praxis is one  
3           element of taking a look at the quality of  
4           teachers, but certainly not a sufficient  
5           measure of understanding how well teachers do  
6           once they get into the classroom.

7                        So I don't really see that as the  
8           philosophy of how we're ruling out Chapter  
9           49-2. And the fact that we want to form a  
10          state-wide committee to take a look at  
11          performance measures so that we begin to work  
12          within institutions that may be objecting to  
13          the credit requirements right now, to move us  
14          towards a time when institutions will be able  
15          to show us that teachers are doing well when  
16          they exit their programs, I think that is a  
17          step in the right direction.

18                       REPRESENTATIVE RAPP: I'm glad to  
19          hear that we are not going to base our  
20          teacher's competency on one test. And I  
21          certainly hope that will be true of our  
22          students as well.

23                       Thank you.

24                       CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Thank you. I'm  
25          going to advise that Kate Shaw will stay for



1 the entire hearing, so we'll have an  
2 opportunity to engage her individually if we  
3 so desire as the process continues.

4 We've also been joined by, I believe,  
5 three additional representatives. Ask that  
6 they would identify themselves for the  
7 record.

8 REPRESENTATIVE BEYER: Thank you.  
9 I'm Representative Karen Beyer. And I'm from  
10 Lehigh, Northampton Counties.

11 REPRESENTATIVE GRUCELA:  
12 Representative Rich Grucela from Northampton  
13 County.

14 REPRESENTATIVE CURRY: Representative  
15 Lawrence Curry, Montgomery County.

16 CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Okay. Thank you.  
17 I believe that Representative Grucela  
18 has a question.

19 REPRESENTATIVE GRUCELA: Thank you,  
20 Mr. Chairman.

21 Good morning, Dr. Shaw. And thank  
22 you for your testimony.

23 Your last few comments, though, threw  
24 me off what I was originally going to say. So  
25 with all due respect, let me say, number one,

1           there is no reciprocity in Pennsylvania.  
2           Please understand that. Take it off the  
3           website.

4                       Those of us who have district offices  
5           that deal with other teachers that want to  
6           come to Pennsylvania, we do not have  
7           reciprocity. That is a misnomer.

8                       We make teachers coming into the  
9           state do other things, including the Praxis  
10          test, which I just heard you say, is not of  
11          value. Did I hear this right?

12                      DR. SHAW: I knew you were sitting  
13          there.

14                      REPRESENTATIVE GRUCELA: Well, I'm so  
15          glad that you're on board with us now to  
16          changing this astronomical barrier to the fact  
17          that passing one test, standardized test, will  
18          make you a great classroom teacher. So I'm  
19          really willing to work with the department  
20          again with a bill that Representative Dan  
21          Surra, who will not be with us next session --  
22          but I will be picking up Dan's torch and  
23          throwing some more gasoline on it, and we will  
24          be -- you know, to the day I die, to the day  
25          they carry me out of this place, I want to see

1           you understand, and the department, that this  
2           Praxis test and, you know, being a genius on  
3           paper doesn't make you a good classroom  
4           teacher.

5                     DR. SHAW: I just want to say that I  
6           did not say that the Praxis was irrelevant. I  
7           simply said that it is -- in and of itself, is  
8           not a complete measure of how well a teacher  
9           will do in the classroom.

10                    REPRESENTATIVE GRUCELA: Absolutely.  
11           I love that statement. Let's underline and  
12           highlight it and work with changing.

13                    DR. SHAW: I admire your tenacity.

14                    REPRESENTATIVE GRUCELA: And with all  
15           due respect -- I got sidetracked from what I  
16           really wanted to say. But with all due  
17           respect, also, I -- please don't take this  
18           personally, but I heard a little bit of  
19           background on you. Have you ever been an  
20           elementary or secondary classroom teacher?

21                    DR. SHAW: No, sir.

22                    REPRESENTATIVE GRUCELA: You  
23           haven't.

24                    There is some disagreement and some  
25           concerns about some people about these

1 guidelines/regulation/rules, whatever. I just  
2 want to know if you've talked with people in  
3 the field? There seems to always be a  
4 disconnect between the department and those in  
5 the front lines.

6 Did we talk to those individuals who  
7 had some concerns? And did we try to reach  
8 some kind of a compromise?

9 And as part of the people that we  
10 talked to, we often leave out the most  
11 important people, that is the students. And I  
12 want to know if we've talked to those people  
13 when we made these guidelines?

14 DR. SHAW: As I noted in my  
15 testimony, we had over a hundred fifty  
16 meetings with various people in the field,  
17 both official meetings, smaller meetings.

18 One of the things that we might hear  
19 today is that it has taken too long for the  
20 department to issue guidelines. And I will  
21 say that it has taken us longer than I think  
22 would be ideal. The reasons it's taken longer  
23 is because we have been talking to the field  
24 so much.

25 So it is not as though folks at PDE

1 sat in a cubicle and then came up with these  
2 guidelines all by themselves. They were  
3 vetted repeatedly with people from the field.  
4 We had national and state experts on board.  
5 And they reflect the best thinking of the  
6 field.

7 I don't think any set of guidelines  
8 would make everybody happy. I think that's  
9 impossible. The state is too diverse. The  
10 higher education institutions are too  
11 diverse. And the viewpoints of the faculty  
12 members and department chairs are too  
13 diverse.

14 Having said that, I do believe  
15 strongly that the deep input that we got from  
16 the field improved these guidelines and got  
17 them -- and certainly these guidelines reflect  
18 the concerns of the field. It doesn't mean  
19 that every concern by the field -- expressed  
20 by the field was resolved in the guidelines,  
21 because sometimes we disagree with the field.  
22 But in -- every time that we could, we tried  
23 to address the concerns of the field, and we  
24 continue to try to address the concerns of the  
25 field by putting significant resources into

1 technical assistance.

2 REPRESENTATIVE GRUCELA: And I'm  
3 sorry, did we talk to students?

4 DR. SHAW: You know, I wasn't deputy  
5 when we were going through the regulatory  
6 process, and I'm not sure if students  
7 testified at state board hearings.

8 REPRESENTATIVE GRUCELA: You may want  
9 to talk to me later because, despite they're a  
10 small amount, I teach a class in East  
11 Stroudsburg University later this evening.  
12 I'll be -- you gave me a lesson plan. And I  
13 will be talking to the students. I'll be  
14 happy to tell you what they say. There is  
15 only some forty of them out of the thousands,  
16 but they may have some opinions.

17 DR. SHAW: I would welcome it.

18 REPRESENTATIVE GRUCELA: I'm not sure  
19 about these divisions. Other states you said  
20 had them. When I first saw them, you know, K  
21 through four, four to eight, five to eight,  
22 wow -- I mean, between a fifth grader and a  
23 sixth grader, and a seventh grader and an  
24 eighth grader, is a huge difference as is even  
25 possible. I taught seniors in high school,

1 but I know -- that just seems to me to be a  
2 really wide gap. I'm not sure how we arrived  
3 at that particular division.

4 DR. SHAW: Would you like the grade  
5 bands smaller?

6 REPRESENTATIVE GRUCELA: Yes. Yes, I  
7 would. Quite honestly. Because seventh and  
8 eighth grader and ninth -- seven, eight, and  
9 nine is formative, changing years. Those  
10 are -- and if you're in the classroom, those  
11 classroom teachers are -- those are the  
12 toughest years to teach. They're the  
13 toughest. I had it easy. When they came to  
14 me, they wanted to get out.

15 Will these regulations, rules,  
16 guidelines result in higher costs to  
17 students?

18 DR. SHAW: To high -- to student  
19 teachers, like to college students?

20 REPRESENTATIVE GRUCELA: Yeah.

21 DR. SHAW: I don't think so.

22 REPRESENTATIVE GRUCELA: They won't.

23 DR. SHAW: Apparently people disagree  
24 with me.

25 REPRESENTATIVE GRUCELA: I think so,

1           which I understand, and maybe we'll find out  
2           when you have this performance measures  
3           committee --

4                     DR. SHAW:   Um-hum.

5                     REPRESENTATIVE GRUCELA:   I'd like to  
6           know who's going to be on that.

7                     DR. SHAW:   I haven't formed it yet.  
8           I welcome your input.

9                     REPRESENTATIVE GRUCELA:   Add some  
10          students.

11                    DR. SHAW:   Okay.

12                    REPRESENTATIVE GRUCELA:   Okay?

13                    Just finally, believe me, it was my  
14          profession for a long time.   And I want the  
15          best teachers in the classroom, absolute best  
16          teachers in the classroom, but sometimes I  
17          think we need a little less bureaucracy and a  
18          some more realistic guidelines and  
19          regulations, especially listening to those on  
20          the front lines.

21                    This is nice.   This is good.   A lot  
22          of work went into this.   And I understand  
23          that.   And I appreciate it.   But we need to  
24          take this into a classroom and talk to the  
25          teacher and the student and a future teacher



1 and future student and see if this is really a  
2 way we want to go.

3 Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Thank you. I  
5 believe Representative Milne has a question.

6 REPRESENTATIVE MILNE: I'll stand up  
7 just so you can see me behind the barrier.

8 DR. SHAW: Thank you.

9 REPRESENTATIVE MILNE: Nice to have  
10 you here, Deputy Secretary, a neighbor from  
11 Chester County.

12 In the interest of full disclosure,  
13 I'm on the faculty at West Chester University.

14 DR. SHAW: I do know.

15 REPRESENTATIVE MILNE: I also  
16 represent a small private university, but what  
17 really struck me is similar level of concerns  
18 across the continuum of types of institutions  
19 in terms of their perception about these  
20 regulations or rules or guidelines.

21 I just want to return for a moment to  
22 the issue of pedagogy. This is actually not  
23 my original question either, but the ensuing  
24 conversation has got me thinking about it.

25 I did hear you reference a few times

1 a notion that we will need to -- I don't mean  
2 to quote you exactly, but in effect we need to  
3 strengthen or enhance the pedagogy aspects of  
4 the curriculum.

5 What I'm confused about -- and I was  
6 not in the department of education at the  
7 university. Different department. What I'm  
8 confused about is what is it that  
9 universities, whether it be state system,  
10 PASSHE, whether they're small private  
11 colleges, what is it they are not doing now in  
12 terms of enhancing or being able to provide  
13 their students the needed pedagogy  
14 background?

15 DR. SHAW: I think that there's two  
16 issues. The first is that because of the  
17 K-through-six grade band, and because of the  
18 lack of requirement around special education,  
19 the kinds of human development and pedagogy  
20 courses that the students could take under  
21 those certificates were far too broad. That  
22 does not mean that every institution was  
23 offering courses that were too broad.

24 Again, there's 95 higher education  
25 institutions in this state that offer teacher

1 preparation. There are 1200 different  
2 teacher-preparation programs, because many  
3 institutions have multiple preparation  
4 programs. So there's an enormous range in  
5 terms of the number of credits and emphases  
6 that different institutions would place on  
7 different parts of a teacher-preparation  
8 curriculum.

9           So what I don't have for you is an  
10 analysis of how many preparation programs  
11 offered how many courses in pedagogy, et  
12 cetera. I will tell you that our guidelines  
13 were so broad that institutions could  
14 sometimes offer a single human development  
15 course that was from birth to death, really  
16 didn't provide any in-depth knowledge about a  
17 student that might be appearing in that  
18 person's classroom when this student graduated  
19 and became a teacher.

20           And so I -- what we are trying to do  
21 with these new guidelines is to provide a  
22 minimum set of expectations, clearly stated,  
23 because I do think that the department, to  
24 some degree, is at fault because its prior  
25 guidelines were not specific enough. And just

1 to be really clear, here's what we see needs  
2 to be in these programs. Here's the amount of  
3 emphasis we'd like you to place on different  
4 areas of content, pedagogy, and human  
5 development, and then what you decide to do  
6 with that, whether you decide to go beyond  
7 that, how you decide to distribute that  
8 knowledge across the courses, that's up to  
9 you.

10 REPRESENTATIVE MILNE: If the maximum  
11 level goal is -- at least in part, and sounds  
12 like a kind of a major part, just based on  
13 conversations this morning -- to elevate the  
14 pedagogy part of the curriculum, that sort of  
15 taps back to the larger concern a lot of  
16 institutions have about why we can't just set  
17 that out as the goal, put that out as eventual  
18 content that needs to be an outcome form that  
19 needs to be met as opposed to the overemphasis  
20 and trying to prescribe it by credit.

21 I mean, why can't we set that out as  
22 a mission of the institutions, that we need to  
23 enhance the pedagogy, and let the states --  
24 allow the institutions have the autonomy to  
25 decide what works? Because maybe West Chester

1 University, how we can arrive at that is much  
2 different than what, say, Immaculata  
3 University, a small private university in my  
4 district, can do.

5 There's a lot of concern about the  
6 erosion of local autonomy.

7 DR. SHAW: I think you're right about  
8 that. And my response to that is that, again,  
9 because this is a -- we are granting licenses  
10 to teachers and because we have to think about  
11 teaching as a profession, I do believe that we  
12 need to be clear about what is required in a  
13 profession, in the same way that a medical  
14 degree is clear about the content that has to  
15 be in a -- in M.D., I think we need to be  
16 really clear about what needs to be in a  
17 teacher-preparation program.

18 REPRESENTATIVE MILNE: I don't mean  
19 to interrupt, but we agree on that. The  
20 pedagogy is an important part. I think the  
21 institutions themselves certainly agree on  
22 that.

23 But why is it they can't decide how  
24 they best can get to that point of having  
25 enhanced pedagogy in their curriculum as

1       opposed to coming from the state level as a  
2       prescription of specific credits in specific  
3       sets?

4               DR. SHAW: Well, again, I would go  
5       back to what I said earlier, and that is that  
6       these are now -- these are new programs. And  
7       so we don't have a way -- we have -- we have  
8       to initially review and approve these  
9       programs. And we don't have a way of knowing  
10      whether or not an institution has been  
11      effective in delivering content because there  
12      aren't students in the program yet to take a  
13      look at.

14              In two years, we are going to begin  
15      full program review, which means that students  
16      will begin to be moving through these programs  
17      and we'll be able to take a look at these  
18      programs and be able to look at outcomes. And  
19      when we're able to do that, I think your  
20      question about allowing institutions to try to  
21      get there in somewhat less prescriptive ways  
22      becomes a real possibility. Because in the  
23      end, if a program is producing teachers that  
24      meet that content and competency standards  
25      that we've set out, and they can show us that

1 they do that, it is a little bit of a  
2 different ball game.

3 But at the moment, they're new  
4 programs, and we don't know how they perform,  
5 so what we have to do is rely on what we know  
6 about good programming. And what we to have  
7 do, again, is communicate really clearly:  
8 Here's how much we think you need to be  
9 focused on this. Here's how much we think you  
10 need to be focused on this content area.

11 So I understand your concern, but I  
12 still think that it's really important to  
13 communicate that clearly, and we have been  
14 talking a lot to institutions and trying to  
15 help them figure out how to do this. And a  
16 lot of institutions have been successful. I  
17 know you have spoken to your two  
18 institutions. I have spoken to many, many  
19 institutions that are addressing these  
20 challenges and have found really creative and  
21 really high-quality ways to get to where the  
22 guidelines are asking them to go to.

23 So there is a way to do it. There is  
24 lots of ways to do it. And I think part of  
25 our mission and part of our goal is to help

1 other institutions get there by showing them  
2 how some of their colleagues have gotten  
3 there. And that's what we're really trying  
4 to do.

5 REPRESENTATIVE MILNE: Sure. And I  
6 think I'll just leave it that -- this  
7 particular line of thoughts, but I think your  
8 phrase is exactly right. There are lots of  
9 ways to do it. You just echoed that  
10 yourself. And that, I think, speaks to why  
11 the state needs to be a little less  
12 prescriptive in how we allow this new end goal  
13 to try to be met.

14 Secondly -- I know that the  
15 chairman's trying to move along here, but,  
16 secondly, I would echo Representative  
17 Grucela's observations about the students. I  
18 mean, certainly those of us who have taught in  
19 the classroom, we are motivated and rewarded  
20 by our student. You are there because that is  
21 really the driving force of what gets you into  
22 the classroom.

23 So some of my concerns, as somebody  
24 who has been in the classroom, advised college  
25 students and try to help them think about



1 future alternatives, is really potentially  
2 some of the dampening effect these kind of  
3 guidelines/regulations, I think that they  
4 would have to sort out. They're still -- the  
5 are guidelines and regulations. It is just  
6 what kind of potential barriers do they  
7 create, perhaps inadvertently, but do they  
8 create for trolling and tracking more  
9 individuals into the teaching profession.

10 It's a very noble profession, and I  
11 think as a nation we obviously want to  
12 encourage highly qualified, motivated  
13 individuals to get into the profession.

14 I also would reconcile it with  
15 Representative Longietti's observation that  
16 the liberal arts model really should be the  
17 gold standard for education in the  
18 university.

19 And a separate matter, but I have  
20 grave concerns the pendulum has moved far too  
21 far away from the liberal arts model in the  
22 university. But I'll leave that aside.

23 My concern is with the prescriptive  
24 nature of these. It does make it very  
25 difficult for students to have some

1 opportunity to explore, to try to pursue some  
2 version of a liberal arts approach to one's  
3 education. It is almost a lock-step sequence  
4 literally from the first semester, just about,  
5 that a student has to get on that path.

6           And as I -- and I'm sure you know too  
7 from Temple, many students at eighteen,  
8 nineteen, twenty -- and I will put myself in  
9 that category, as what is a so-called good  
10 student -- many people, of course, go through  
11 a lot of exploration those first two, three  
12 years of college trying to get a sense of  
13 what's really possible, what is motivating and  
14 so forth.

15           I think it is a real detriment for  
16 somebody to maybe start out as another major,  
17 perhaps along the way become inspired to  
18 become a teacher. From a student's cost-  
19 benefit perspective, it is very difficult at  
20 that point to even want to switch, and I think  
21 that is a real detriment to trying to attract  
22 more good, highly qualified individuals into  
23 the teaching profession. If somebody makes a  
24 subsequent decision, college career begins one  
25 and two, and I think it is really a disservice

1 to the students to have them locked in such a  
2 prescriptive framework from their first  
3 semester of college as opposed to letting a  
4 more liberal arts curriculum take hold.

5 I know there's a question imbedded  
6 there somewhere. This is just what was on my  
7 mind.

8 DR. SHAW: I appreciate that.

9 I absolutely think that you are  
10 right, that students who wish to become  
11 teachers within a four-year time frame, a  
12 traditional four-year time frame, are going to  
13 need to know very early on that they want to  
14 become teachers. I absolutely think that's  
15 true, and I think it is that incumbent upon  
16 both high school counselors and college  
17 counselors to help students understand what it  
18 is going to mean to become a teacher in the  
19 state of Pennsylvania.

20 So I do agree that there is less  
21 flexibility in taking one or two years to  
22 decide whether or not somebody wants to become  
23 a teacher. Having said that, I think we have  
24 to balance that against what happens when that  
25 person graduates from college and becomes a

1 teacher. I think that what we really need to  
2 be focused on is the quality of teaching that  
3 goes on in our public schools, and we need to  
4 ensure that those teachers can teach all of  
5 the students that they're going to find in  
6 those classrooms.

7           And that tension, I think, becomes  
8 one that I'm not sure will ever be completely  
9 resolved, and I think that independent  
10 institutions or institutions that see  
11 themselves first and foremost as liberal arts  
12 institutions have to have that conversation  
13 internally.

14           I do know that there are several  
15 liberal arts colleges, as I mentioned before,  
16 that are working hard across departments to  
17 adjust their general education requirements so  
18 that some of the education courses can also  
19 count as general education course. I think  
20 that there's different ways to do this, but I  
21 certainly think that, at base, students are  
22 going to need to be much smarter about what  
23 they're going to want to do, and we're going  
24 to really need to ask more of our college  
25 counselors and high school counselors to fully

1 inform students about what it takes to become  
2 a member of this wonderful profession, because  
3 it is a profession.

4 REPRESENTATIVE MILNE: I just want --  
5 have to respectfully disagree there, just for  
6 the record, because I don't think it is  
7 realistic that we can somehow mandate  
8 eighteen-, nineteen-, twenty-year-old young  
9 people to be able to feel that they have --  
10 can make that kind of finite decision when we  
11 know statistically on any given college campus  
12 upwards of 40 percent of the students change  
13 majors to some extent. I just think it  
14 doesn't really quite mesh with the operating  
15 reality of many college campuses, or I think  
16 it is unfair to the student to put that kind  
17 of burden on them.

18 Most colleges are trying to move more  
19 toward and shift the pendulum back toward a  
20 more liberal arts approach, which means giving  
21 the time for students to take a wide variety  
22 of courses, explore the different major  
23 options. And some of the courses, I think,  
24 require them so soon, so early, I think is a  
25 detriment to that, but I'll leave it at that.

1           And just real quickly, I do want to  
2           also look at another state core for a moment,  
3           and that's just the faculty members. In terms  
4           of the faculty matrix -- and I apologize if  
5           I'm -- I've not read every word of the  
6           guidelines, but does the faculty matrix apply  
7           to adjunct faculty members? And if so, what  
8           credit levels of an adjunct?

9           DR. SHAW: The faculty matrix applies  
10          to any faculty member that is teaching part of  
11          the professional core of a teacher-preparation  
12          program. So if an institution decides to have  
13          an adjunct faculty member teach a course in  
14          the professional core, in pedagogy, in human  
15          development, in a content area, then that  
16          faculty member needs to meet the specification  
17          of the faculty matrix. In other words, that  
18          faculty member has to know the content that  
19          they're teaching.

20          So the matrix does not -- is not  
21          global in terms of, yes, a faculty member is  
22          qualified to teach anything. It's course-  
23          specific. And that's something that is  
24          certainly a departure from past practice.

25          REPRESENTATIVE MILNE: In terms of

1 the credit load, are we suggesting, then --  
2 that's why there was a second part of my  
3 question -- there is obviously some difference  
4 between an adjunct faculty member, that  
5 happens to be teaching a full load and is not  
6 a tenured faculty, and an adjunct faculty  
7 member that may teach three credits.

8 DR. SHAW: Sure.

9 REPRESENTATIVE MILNE: So they're  
10 coming in for, let's say, hypothetically, a  
11 day on Wednesday at 6:00 to 9:00 -- just  
12 random example comes to mind -- but for those  
13 individuals, really, that's really, I think, a  
14 real administrative concern here. Can we  
15 really equate this requirement in terms of the  
16 qualifications from a one-class adjunct who  
17 may be the local principal at a local high  
18 school who's coming in to maybe teach the  
19 principal supervisory course just one night a  
20 week, three credits, just wants to do it as  
21 almost a community service back to the  
22 profession, but does this scale of the nine  
23 points -- are we seeing this is equally  
24 weighted, equally counted from that kind of  
25 individual, one-course adjunct to a full-time

1 adjunct to somebody that's actually on tenure  
2 tract? These are very different types of  
3 individuals --

4 DR. SHAW: Sure.

5 REPRESENTATIVE MILNE: -- at a campus  
6 institution.

7 DR. SHAW: Sure, but, again, the  
8 faculty matrix applies to a specific course,  
9 so -- and I also want to point out that  
10 somebody coming in -- a principal coming in  
11 and teaching a supervisory doesn't come under  
12 49-2 because this is --

13 REPRESENTATIVE MILNE: Sure. That's  
14 just a random example.

15 DR. SHAW: Yeah. I mean, if an  
16 adjunct member -- faculty member comes in and  
17 teaches a course in special education, that  
18 faculty member needs to know special  
19 education, whether that person is full time,  
20 whether that person is teaching only one  
21 course, et cetera, because the content is  
22 still the content. And student teachers need  
23 to know that content, and so it is not  
24 something that applies, as I said, in a global  
25 sense to every course that the faculty member



1 teaches. It is says --

2 REPRESENTATIVE MILNE: I'm sorry to  
3 interrupt. And that's a great example too.  
4 In that particular case, why is it that the  
5 department of -- department chair of the  
6 education department at, say, Albright  
7 College, which I don't represent, just a  
8 hypothetical example, cannot decide -- can  
9 decide or not decide if an adjunct is going to  
10 come in on Wednesday night and teach that  
11 special ed course is somebody who is  
12 qualified, has the background, has the  
13 experience, and can relate to the students?

14 I'm not clear why we're eroding that  
15 local decision making.

16 DR. SHAW: I don't think that we are  
17 eroding the local decision. I presume that  
18 every department chair would only hire  
19 somebody who's qualified to teach the courses  
20 they're teaching. I think that that's -- I  
21 think that that's a good assumption to have.

22 REPRESENTATIVE MILNE: But that  
23 speaks to the reality that we --

24 DR. SHAW: We just need to have --

25 REPRESENTATIVE MILNE: -- pursue the

1 expertise.

2 DR. SHAW: We just need to have that  
3 document that the faculty member is  
4 qualified. If the faculty member is qualified  
5 and the faculty matrix provides multiple  
6 pathways for that be shown, then I don't see  
7 where that problem is. I mean, I don't--

8 REPRESENTATIVE MILNE: Sure. Well, I  
9 think it does speak to the need to allow the  
10 local departments who presumably often know  
11 the local talent pool, know the local school  
12 districts, and many of these teacher-  
13 preparation programs traditionally rely on a  
14 number of adjuncts, particularly for your  
15 point, to fill a very specialized teaching,  
16 which is good for the students, but I'm really  
17 concerned that the requirements of the faculty  
18 qualification matrix is really going to be a  
19 detriment to an institution to be able to hire  
20 adjunct faculty members.

21 There is little incentive for the  
22 one-credit -- one-course adjunct member to  
23 engage in the kind of scholarship or other  
24 activities that is going to allow one to  
25 accumulate the nine points. That burden

1       should be on the tenure-track members and the  
2       full-time members. No question about it.

3                 We could probably have some  
4       discussion about how much full-time adjuncts  
5       would have to do some of that, but an adjunct  
6       that's in a part-time status, they're there to  
7       come in and teach just their specialty course,  
8       and most of them tend to work in some other  
9       full-time occupation. So it is not really  
10      their focus. For many of them, it is not  
11      about the money. For many of them, they are  
12      doing it just on an hourly basis or a cost-  
13      benefit perspective. This is not something  
14      they should be doing just in pure economic  
15      terms, but many feel an obligation to give  
16      back to their profession. They enjoy the  
17      classroom or just like the interaction.

18                I don't see why most of them would  
19      have the incentive or the desire to want to go  
20      through the kind of steps that are necessary  
21      to accumulate the nine points. That is really  
22      a tenure-track kind of approach.

23                DR. SHAW: I think that if -- if the  
24      department chair is hiring somebody that has  
25      that content knowledge, then they'll meet the

1 specification of the faculty matrix. There is  
2 multiple ways for them to do that. For  
3 example, if they are already certified in that  
4 area, they then get points on the matrix. If  
5 they have a master's degree in that area, they  
6 get additional points. If they have a  
7 doctorate, they get additional points. If  
8 they're teaching at a higher ed level in that  
9 area already, they get additional points.  
10 There is multiple ways for an institution to  
11 show us that any faculty member is qualified.  
12 And I presume that they are already all  
13 qualified. We are just asking institutions to  
14 show us that their faculty are qualified.

15           And so I understand that adjuncts  
16 come in and do a great service for an  
17 institution from the department's  
18 perspective. As the entity that has to  
19 approve programs, we just have to make sure  
20 that the faculty members know the content that  
21 they're teaching. It is really that simple.

22           But I presume that they do, so I  
23 don't think that the faculty matrix will  
24 provide a real burden for institutions that  
25 are hiring high-quality faculty.

1                   REPRESENTATIVE MILNE: I'll just wrap  
2 it up by suggesting I think that is an area --

3                   DR. SHAW: I enjoy this line of  
4 questioning.

5                   REPRESENTATIVE MILNE: -- just  
6 because I would respectfully disagree that the  
7 nine points can be accumulated simply by  
8 professional experiences that they have at the  
9 moment. It does require some additional  
10 requirements that I think the average adjunct  
11 is not going to have a lot of incentive to go  
12 down.

13                  DR. SHAW: I'll make an appointment  
14 to come in and speak with you and we can work  
15 through that.

16                  REPRESENTATIVE MILNE: Sure. We can  
17 meet back in Chester County.

18                  DR. SHAW: Absolutely.

19                  REPRESENTATIVE MILNE: And I would  
20 just close by -- and this is where I just ask  
21 for some reconciliation, and I expect an  
22 answer, but in today's Patriot News, the  
23 secretary himself is quoted as saying -- it is  
24 on page A3 of today's Patriot News: Zahorchak  
25 said the goal is to standardize teacher-

1 preparation programs statewide.

2 And I would just ask to take that  
3 under consideration as we move ahead with  
4 this.

5 DR. SHAW: I just want to clarify  
6 that is -- first of all, that was not a direct  
7 quotation. I would point out that.

8 The secretary was speaking with  
9 Ms. Murphy on a variety of things with regard  
10 to what we are trying to do in teacher  
11 certification, and as you know, if you will --  
12 if you read further into the article, what  
13 he's talking about is providing a set of very  
14 clear standards for teacher-preparation  
15 programs.

16 So standards are not the same as  
17 standardization and standard curriculum. It's  
18 a set of expectations that we're trying to  
19 communicate clearly to teacher-preparation  
20 programs. And so I'm sure if he were here  
21 today he would agree with me that he was not  
22 meaning to imply that every institution must  
23 have the same curriculum and, in fact, it is a  
24 misstatement in that article to suggest that  
25 our guidelines require that, because it's

1 simply not true. We do not.

2 REPRESENTATIVE MILNE: Okay. Very  
3 good.

4 DR. SHAW: Thank you.

5 REPRESENTATIVE MILNE: I would just  
6 ask that we take into consideration the  
7 competency versus credit as we move forward  
8 with this discussion.

9 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

10 CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: I think you've  
11 clearly illustrated the lack of power of the  
12 chairman.

13 Representative McIlvaine Smith.

14 REPRESENTATIVE MCILVAINE SMITH:  
15 Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

16 I will keep mine really brief.

17 I am very concerned about the dual  
18 certification for special ed. And is it true  
19 that it is just nine credits for dual  
20 certification? Can you please clarify for  
21 me? I hear the big no, but please clarify for  
22 me.

23 DR. SHAW: Sure.

24 REPRESENTATIVE MCILVAINE SMITH:  
25 Thank you.

1 DR. SHAW: I think what you're  
2 comparing are two different things. Chapter  
3 49-2 requires all certification programs to  
4 include nine credits or two hundred and  
5 seventy hours of special education content.  
6 Everybody has to do that.

7 REPRESENTATIVE MCILVAINE SMITH:  
8 Right.

9 DR. SHAW: Okay. Then we are also --  
10 there then are new special education  
11 certification programs. Okay? That's thirty  
12 credits of special education content,  
13 pedagogy, human development. And that is to  
14 be combined with a certification in preK  
15 through four, four through eight, or seven  
16 through twelve.

17 REPRESENTATIVE MCILVAINE SMITH: So  
18 thirty credits. This is where I'm losing --  
19 I'm sorry.

20 DR. SHAW: That's okay.

21 REPRESENTATIVE MCILVAINE SMITH: So  
22 the thirty credits is the special education  
23 you must take along with your -- that's in the  
24 hundred twenty credits?

25 DR. SHAW: Yes.



1                   REPRESENTATIVE MCILVAINE SMITH: It's  
2 not in the hundred twenty credits? They're  
3 saying no; you're saying yes. Well, I have to  
4 believe you because you're the person that I  
5 think helped write this.

6                   DR. SHAW: Thank you.

7                   REPRESENTATIVE MCILVAINE SMITH: My  
8 concern is is that I also was a teacher, and I  
9 had a special needs child, and I am the  
10 special education major, chairwoman of our  
11 subcommittee. But I'm very concerned. I know  
12 that when I went to West Chester University in  
13 the '90s to become a teacher -- so I was an  
14 older student, nontraditional student -- that  
15 I took one introductory course in special ed  
16 'cause I knew I was going to be confronted  
17 with special needs learners -- and since then  
18 I have learned that pretty much everybody is a  
19 special needs learner -- that I was very  
20 excited when I was at West Chester -- and West  
21 Chester is one of the oldest, finest state  
22 teacher colleges that we've had since the  
23 beginning of time.

24                   Anyway, that -- that I learned about  
25 multiple intelligences and all of those great

1 ideas that somehow get lost with the new  
2 teacher when you walk into that classroom.  
3 And I did graduate at the top of my class, but  
4 I'm a lousy teacher.

5           You know, I'm very concerned that,  
6 you know, we do need, for sure, to require our  
7 teachers to be of the highest standard. I  
8 totally believe that. It's not about the  
9 building that we build. It really is about  
10 that very engaged teacher who understands how  
11 to reach each child where they are. They're  
12 not understanding math concepts. They're not  
13 understanding how science fits into -- I mean  
14 -- I won't go on, but we need someone, and I  
15 had one teacher like that at West Chester  
16 University that really was capable. When she  
17 taught math, she was able to bring each one of  
18 us on board from where we were. That's a  
19 gift. And that's where it is: science versus  
20 art in a sense.

21           But so the special ed, just want to  
22 make sure -- so those thirty credits are  
23 within that hundred twenty, and then they also  
24 have to have their pedagogy of how children  
25 learn from, say, K through four and --

1 DR. SHAW: In multiple -- in order to  
2 provide a pathway to a dual certification in  
3 four years, we have identified a number of  
4 ways in which special education content can be  
5 substituted for content in the traditional,  
6 non-special education certification. Okay?  
7 So that when they are learning, for example,  
8 pedagogy for preK through four, that they're  
9 getting a dual certification in special  
10 education. They're learning how to teach  
11 diverse learners in those courses, and so I  
12 think it really actually deepens the quality  
13 of the preparation of the student.

14 REPRESENTATIVE MCILVAINE SMITH:  
15 Okay. Thank you.

16 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

17 CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Thank you.

18 Representative Fleck.

19 REPRESENTATIVE FLECK: Thank you,  
20 Mr. Chairman. I had about ten questions.  
21 Nine and a half have been answered, luckily.  
22 So these are some pretty huge hurdles to  
23 overcome in a short amount of time requiring  
24 implementation. And I believe we're already  
25 giving out a lot of emergency certifications

1 and such because of shortages.

2           Won't this only exacerbate that  
3 problem until we're up and running? You know,  
4 do we see a shortage of qualified teachers in  
5 the interim that --

6           DR. SHAW: I don't -- no, I don't  
7 think so. We have projections -- we have  
8 pretty clear numbers in terms of where the  
9 shortages are. We also have numbers in terms  
10 of where long-term shortages might emerge,  
11 when you take a look at teachers in particular  
12 age bands and think about what retirement  
13 might look like twenty years from now, thirty  
14 years from now.

15           I think what -- you know, what we  
16 have been doing up until now is greatly  
17 overproducing elementary education students.  
18 We have been producing twelve to fourteen  
19 thousand students per year in this state. Six  
20 thousand of them have been elementary  
21 education students and only three thousand of  
22 them have gotten jobs in schools in  
23 Pennsylvania.

24           So what you see is a lot of people  
25 want to be teachers, a lot of people were

1 enrolling in elementary education programs,  
2 were exiting those programs, were not  
3 receiving jobs in elementary schools, and we  
4 don't actually know where they ended up.

5           So what I think -- what I anticipate  
6 what will happen is, again, we have to go back  
7 to high school counseling and college  
8 counseling. When somebody decides they want  
9 to be a teacher, they need to make an informed  
10 decision about what kind of teacher they want  
11 to be. Some of that is hard; right? Some of  
12 that is, Gee, I really want to teach those  
13 middle-schoolers. Because even though  
14 everybody hates them, I love them. Could be  
15 that.

16           But they also need to make that  
17 decision based on what the job market looks  
18 like, and luckily teaching is a profession in  
19 which we know very clearly what the job market  
20 looks like. So students can decide they want  
21 to be a teacher, and they can look at our  
22 data, and they can say, Hey, look, there's a  
23 shortage of special education teachers in  
24 almost every district in the state. I think  
25 if I go into special education and focus on

1 middle childhood, I'm going to get a great  
2 job. And maybe I'm going to have my pick of  
3 jobs.

4           So I think there's going to be an  
5 adjustment in the job market, and I don't  
6 think there's any question about that. But I  
7 think our obligation and the obligation of  
8 your teacher-preparation programs is to be  
9 straight with these students and to let them  
10 know what the job market looks like and what  
11 the projected shortages are in different  
12 areas.

13           And that varies by region too. You  
14 might have a shortage in math and science  
15 teachers in one part of the state and not have  
16 it in another part of the state. So you can  
17 cut the data in different ways. But I think  
18 that if we're smart about this, we're going to  
19 minimize the amount of shortages that we have,  
20 and we are going to minimize the number of  
21 emergency certifications that we have as  
22 well. But we need to start now working  
23 together to make sure that that happens.

24           REPRESENTATIVE FLECK: That answers  
25 part of it. The time restrictions, is it

1 feasible for -- I believe we have 95 --

2 DR. SHAW: Yes, we do.

3 REPRESENTATIVE FLECK: And you said  
4 three have already submitted that. What -- do  
5 you know what lead them do that? Did they  
6 just assume that the department was going to  
7 be doing this and kind of, you know, proactive  
8 approach?

9 DR. SHAW: I think some  
10 institutions -- when Chapter 49-2 passed, I  
11 think they immediately started looking at  
12 curriculum and trying to map their curriculum  
13 and figure out how they're going to change,  
14 because we just started recertification  
15 programs, and that requires a restructuring in  
16 many institutions in their programs or in  
17 their colleges of education.

18 So some of them have gotten out in  
19 front of the curve. I think others have just  
20 found ways to do this in a manner that has  
21 been collaborative and creative and  
22 productive.

23 And so, yeah, I think that some -- it  
24 takes some institutions longer than others,  
25 and sometimes that has to do with the internal

1 review process too. You know, how many layers  
2 do you have to go before you get full program  
3 approval at an institution. That can vary a  
4 lot.

5           The secretary has agreed to grant  
6 extensions for teacher-preparation programs  
7 that ask for them. And we're in the process  
8 of doing that right now. About 35 percent of  
9 all programs have requested that extension.  
10 The deadline to request an extension is  
11 December 31st, and I expect we are going to  
12 get quite a lot of requests.

13           We are trying to work with them. I  
14 think -- I think the timeline is pretty tight  
15 myself. And so this extension is going to  
16 give them potentially an additional year to do  
17 this work, so that when they do bring the  
18 programs forward to us, you know, programs  
19 that are currently not ready, when they do  
20 bring them forward to us in another year, they  
21 will have had opportunity to really think this  
22 through and figure out a more deliberative way  
23 how they're going to create the new programs.

24           REPRESENTATIVE FLECK: Of the  
25 remaining ninety-two who have not submitted



1 their paperwork or what-have-you, do you  
2 anticipate some of the institutions just doing  
3 away with the program all together because of  
4 the new standards?

5 DR. SHAW: That might happen. I  
6 don't know.

7 What I will tell you is that we hear  
8 different things from different institutions.  
9 We hear institutions change their minds about  
10 whether or not they're going to continue to do  
11 teacher preparation or not. I think it's fair  
12 to say that institutions are still really  
13 struggling with -- some institutions are still  
14 really struggling with this and figuring out  
15 what they want to do about it.

16 So that we have probably the  
17 majority -- the vast majority of institutions  
18 will continue to offer teacher preparation and  
19 there may be some that decide not to. There  
20 may be some that decide that they won't offer  
21 all certificates, maybe they'll just focus on  
22 middle level, maybe just focus on preK through  
23 four.

24 It's hard for us to say right now  
25 because it's so early in the process. So I'm

1 not sure.

2 REPRESENTATIVE FLECK: Okay. Thank  
3 you.

4 CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Thank you.  
5 Representative Harkins.

6 REPRESENTATIVE HARKINS: I think it  
7 is on. Is it on?

8 Thank you. Thank you for your  
9 presentation today. I don't think anybody can  
10 say that you didn't come prepared.

11 DR. SHAW: Thank you.

12 REPRESENTATIVE HARKINS: I had a  
13 number of questions, most of them which were  
14 answered.

15 I've been dealing with Gannon  
16 University, Mercyhurst College in the area and  
17 also Edinboro University. Their primary  
18 concern would be with the matrix and the cost  
19 and the time constraints within the  
20 limitation. I think, as you said, we have to  
21 work on it.

22 You're looking at granting extensions  
23 and things like that. I think that will go a  
24 long way to easing some of the concerns and  
25 some of the burdens.

1           I would almost, though, kind of  
2           compare it to spring, the graduation  
3           requirements. It was put out there, very well  
4           intentioned, I'm sure, but in the long run, it  
5           wasn't really followed through with. It  
6           wasn't, I guess, adequately explained or --  
7           you know, how it was going to be implemented.

8           I think if we could do a little bit  
9           more on communication of this, it may go a  
10          long way.

11          DR. SHAW: Thank you.

12          REPRESENTATIVE HARKINS: I'll keep it  
13          short, like I said, and thank you. I don't --  
14          I thank you for your presentation.

15          DR. SHAW: Thank you.

16          REPRESENTATIVE HARKINS: Thank you  
17          very much.

18          CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Representative  
19          Beyer, you're going to be my clean-up.

20          REPRESENTATIVE BEYER: I'm going to  
21          be clean-up. I'll only be ten, fifteen  
22          minutes, tops. I'm not teasing, too.

23          I don't think you intended to do  
24          this, Deputy Secretary Shaw, but you made  
25          comment probably five or six times in your

1 testimony -- and I was late for it. You  
2 talked about how children should, you know, I  
3 guess have to determine already that they're  
4 going to be teachers when they're sixteen  
5 years old and seventeen years old and how --  
6 you know, how their guidance counselors should  
7 really be focusing children, if they want to  
8 pursue -- they have the thought of pursuing  
9 education, they have thoughts of becoming a  
10 teacher.

11 And you should know better than  
12 anyone that high schools across the state  
13 don't have enough guidance counselors; that we  
14 have guidance counselors with seven hundred  
15 children they're trying to guide into college  
16 and into some type of career, and I have to  
17 tell you, as a former school board president,  
18 I'm just a little bit offended by the fact  
19 that you would say that, knowing the great  
20 need that is out there already.

21 So I had to just take issue with you  
22 on that.

23 And you talk about outcomes with --  
24 related to teachers, teacher programs. And I  
25 just have a little bit of information here.

1 Based on the data provided in the 2007 annual  
2 report on teacher quality, Pennsylvania pass  
3 rate on teacher tests, Praxis, was 92 percent,  
4 including 96 percent on the basic skill  
5 component and 93 percent on academic content  
6 components.

7 It should also be noted that just to  
8 enter and exit a teacher-preparation program,  
9 a student must have a 3.0 GPA and six credits  
10 in college mathematics, and six credits in  
11 college English.

12 Now, we know that many states are  
13 recruiting our teachers, our young students  
14 who are graduating from college. They are  
15 recruiting them out of Pennsylvania. We know  
16 that. Because, by other states' standards, we  
17 provide already the highest quality of college  
18 students graduating from a teacher program in  
19 this country. I put that second to none.

20 And you should know too that I'm a  
21 Lehigh Valley legislator where we have Lehigh  
22 University and DeSales and Moravian, and they  
23 strongly object to what you're doing here.

24 So I want to know, given the fact  
25 that we already have stringent requirements on

1 students in education programs throughout this  
2 state, why do we -- why do we need more? What  
3 exactly are you hoping to achieve?

4 And I would like to know out of the  
5 hundred-plus meetings that you say you had  
6 related to this, if you wouldn't mind  
7 providing to me a list of those meetings and  
8 who you met with.

9 DR. SHAW: Sure.

10 REPRESENTATIVE BEYER: Because it  
11 seems to me that the very people -- that is,  
12 colleges and universities across the state,  
13 have been excluded, really, in my mind, or at  
14 least the discussions I've had, this is  
15 something they don't want. And they're  
16 adamantly opposed to it.

17 DR. SHAW: Okay.

18 REPRESENTATIVE BEYER: And I'm done,  
19 Mr. Chairman. So if she can just answer.

20 CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Very good.

21 DR. SHAW: First of all, I think it  
22 is not accurate to characterize all higher  
23 education institutions as opposed to these  
24 guidelines. I think that you're hearing  
25 from --

1                   REPRESENTATIVE BEYER: All of mine  
2                   are. All of mine.

3                   DR. SHAW: Okay. I think that you're  
4                   hearing from institutions that are in  
5                   opposition to the guidelines. I think today  
6                   you'll hear from institutions -- at least some  
7                   institutions that are in support of the  
8                   guidelines. So I will say that.

9                   In terms of your comments with regard  
10                  to Praxis exams, I think one of the things  
11                  that we know and that we're very concerned  
12                  about with regard to teachers in the state of  
13                  Pennsylvania and nationally is the degree to  
14                  which -- the incredible degree to which  
15                  teachers leave their profession very quickly.  
16                  Half of all teachers leave the profession  
17                  within five years.

18                  One of the things that we know about  
19                  why this happens is because teachers tell us  
20                  that they do not feel adequately prepared for  
21                  the classroom. Superintendents tell us that  
22                  teachers are not as prepared for the classroom  
23                  as they would like them to be when they  
24                  graduate from programs.

25                  So I think it's fair to say that

1           there's multiple ways in which we can gauge  
2           the preparation of our teachers, and that's --  
3           and I'm not saying that the teachers are  
4           ill-prepared in the state of Pennsylvania.  
5           What I am saying is that we changed the  
6           certification guidelines for specific reasons,  
7           and that was because -- or certification, the  
8           regulations, Chapter 49-2, and that was so  
9           that teachers could be prepared with grade-  
10          specific content, pedagogy, and human  
11          development.

12                         The guidelines are simply  
13          communicating what those teacher-preparation  
14          programs should have included in them. And so  
15          this is not an implicit criticism of teacher-  
16          preparation programs so much as it is our, I  
17          think, obligation once there are new  
18          guidelines in place or once there are new  
19          regulations in place, to communicate to  
20          programs that want to offer teacher  
21          certification what it is that we think needs  
22          to be in these certification programs.

23                         REPRESENTATIVE BEYER: Thank you.

24                         CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Thank you. Thank  
25          you for your presentation, which -- from what



1 Ms. McLaughlin indicates, you will be here to  
2 further that discussion as we go forward with  
3 this agenda.

4 Thank you.

5 Let us go then to Don Francis and the  
6 second panel. And, again, I would ask that as  
7 they come forward -- and I know they have some  
8 material to present. We do have the written  
9 testimony, so we're trying to avoid everyone  
10 reading their testimony word for word. And so  
11 we want the opportunity to offer the  
12 viewpoint, but hopefully we can do that in a  
13 way that will allow us as much time for  
14 questions and answer, which you can see is a  
15 concern.

16 Don.

17 DR. FRANCIS: We appreciate that,  
18 Mr. Chairman, and we will be very respectful  
19 of that.

20 We do have written testimony. I want  
21 to make sure that we have time for questions.  
22 And so all of us, though we talked about this,  
23 we had a few statements that we felt needed to  
24 get on the record. So we will be very quick  
25 and not read through the testimony.

1           But I do want to thank the committee  
2           for having this hearing, Mr. Chairman for  
3           giving us this opportunity today.

4           I'm the president of the Association  
5           of Independent Colleges and Universities in  
6           Pennsylvania. And our association is very  
7           concerned about these guidelines. And as a  
8           matter of fact, the board of our association,  
9           which is composed of 23 private college and  
10          university presidents, has asked us to raise  
11          the level of concern because of the great  
12          concern within our sector.

13          We are aware that there are concerns  
14          in other sectors as well, and we are also  
15          aware that not every single institution feels  
16          exactly the same way about these guidelines.  
17          So I do need to make clear that my remarks and  
18          the others on this panel do not represent all  
19          of the independent colleges and universities  
20          in Pennsylvania.

21          I do want to be clear. We are not in  
22          opposition to the Chapter 49.2 regulations. I  
23          also want to make clear that we support high  
24          standards for teachers, very much support  
25          those standards, but we believe that these

1 standards should be measured by competencies  
2 and not by credit hours.

3 In the guidelines, credit hours are  
4 equated with quality. And they are not. And  
5 I think that came up in some of the prior  
6 questioning. They are not the same. And we  
7 actually are very concerned that these credit  
8 hour requirements can actually reduce the  
9 quality of the future teachers in  
10 Pennsylvania.

11 We are also opposed to these  
12 guidelines because they are not guidelines at  
13 all, but they are mandates, not authorized by  
14 regulation or statute.

15 AICUP is opposed to these guidelines  
16 because we also think they are going to worsen  
17 the teacher shortages in Pennsylvania in  
18 shortage areas, such as special education,  
19 math, science, and foreign languages.

20 I have -- in my testimony, I give you  
21 a chart that shows the percentage of the  
22 teachers that are produced by the independent  
23 colleges and universities in Pennsylvania in  
24 the shortage areas, and they are frequently  
25 above or around 50 percent of the teachers

1 coming from these institutions. And we are  
2 very concerned that we will be faced with  
3 future teacher shortages if these guidelines  
4 are allowed to stand.

5 We are opposed to these guidelines  
6 because we primarily believe that it is very  
7 important to preserve the autonomy of the  
8 institutions to decide what they teach to meet  
9 the standards and the competencies and who is  
10 hired to teach that. That is fundamental to  
11 American higher education, and we think this  
12 is big mistake.

13 We were told that we're trying to  
14 professionalize -- Deputy Secretary Shaw talks  
15 about professionalizing teachers. We're all  
16 for that. But you do not determine what  
17 the -- the curriculum is of our doctors in the  
18 state of Pennsylvania. And we think this  
19 is -- this is -- you shouldn't be -- and  
20 should not be doing this at the state level.

21 And finally, we are opposed to these  
22 guidelines because they will significantly  
23 increase the cost of producing teachers to the  
24 students, the parents, the institutions, and  
25 the state. And this runs counter to our

1           desire to restrain costs as much as possible  
2           during these challenging economic times.

3                         We will continue with the panel. We  
4           will take questions.

5                         So Lex McMillan, president of  
6           Albright.

7                         DR. MCMILLAN: Thank you. Thank you  
8           all for giving us the opportunity.

9                         I do have some talking points, which  
10          are all covered in my testimony. I am pleased  
11          that members of the committee have actually  
12          raised issues that I have raised here. I am  
13          pleased to see there's some sensitivity to  
14          that, because Albright College is an old  
15          liberal arts college. We believe that the  
16          liberal arts are the best way actually to  
17          prepare young people for a world of  
18          unexpected, unpredictable change.

19                        There is a lot of evidence out  
20          there. There is a growing consensus of the  
21          value of the liberal arts degree being, under  
22          the circumstance, the most practical kind of  
23          education that you can have.

24                        We have had a respected teacher  
25          education preparation program for many years.

1 We have a great track record of placing  
2 students who are prepared. We get great  
3 feedback from their supervising teachers, from  
4 the principals who hire them, and they come  
5 back to us for more.

6 We are not aware, from the students  
7 themselves, who we also survey and follow up  
8 with, a sense of being ill prepared to teach.  
9 There certainly may be some, and we think that  
10 should be a problem that should be addressed  
11 on an institution-by-institution basis, if  
12 there are institutions that are not doing an  
13 adequate job preparing. We are not aware of  
14 that where Albright College is concerned.

15 We have never had a major, per se, in  
16 education. We have a certification program.  
17 We have a very interdisciplinary approach to  
18 education. Sixty percent of our graduates  
19 graduate with two or more majors, or what we  
20 call concentrations.

21 This new regulation, these  
22 regulations, would require us to create  
23 education majors or education concentrations  
24 and would make it virtually impossible, given  
25 the robust and broad-based nature of our

1 general educational requirements, being the  
2 liberal arts, would make it virtually  
3 impossible for our students to complete the  
4 certification program in four years without  
5 taking overload almost every semester that  
6 they were enrolled.

7 We think this will make our program  
8 less attractive, which is to both the students  
9 from Pennsylvania and students from other  
10 states. We know it will make it more  
11 expensive. It will add costs. These costs  
12 are a concern to us.

13 We also are concerned about what's  
14 been mentioned, the matrix, the intrusion, if  
15 you will, on the hiring and certifications,  
16 review of the faculty members. We think that  
17 oversteps the bounds of our autonomy as an  
18 independent institution.

19 We -- I would say we anticipate that  
20 there will be programs that will close. We  
21 think this could lead to a shortage of  
22 teachers, qualified teachers.

23 In short, as I've said, I know this  
24 was not the intention, but if the Commonwealth  
25 had intended to get the private sector out of

1 teacher certification business, this would  
2 have been a great way to do that.

3 So we are deeply concerned about it.  
4 And we hope very much that there can be some  
5 alterations in these mandatory guidelines.

6 DR. GLOSENGER: Hi. Thanks for  
7 meeting with us today.

8 I'm Fay Glosenger from Juniata  
9 College. And I'm here to speak on behalf of  
10 many of my colleagues from all kinds of  
11 institutions across the state.

12 Specifically, I want to address the  
13 credit mandates that you've addressed as well  
14 as the prescriptive nature that come out in  
15 these new guidelines.

16 I will say right up front that you've  
17 stolen all the thunder from my testimony  
18 already. So you can just read it.

19 But I will try to respond to some of  
20 the questions that were asked as they relate.  
21 First, I'm looking at you, and you asked about  
22 students, and would the Juniata students  
23 please stand up.

24 They're here. They're concerned.  
25 All of the other people in this room, I would



1 mostly say, the grand majority are here from  
2 all kinds of institutions because they are  
3 concerned.

4 Now, I'd like to start with some  
5 points of agreement and then I will go into  
6 the disagreement and why we disagree about  
7 credit mandates and standardization. And I  
8 chose that word intentionally.

9 First, I agree with almost everything  
10 that Kate Shaw says. You might -- and I'm one  
11 of the biggest objectors to these new  
12 guidelines. We agree with all of the things  
13 about the goals and the commitments to  
14 producing high-quality teachers. That is what  
15 we want to do.

16 We agree there's been a lot of  
17 criticism of teacher-preparation programs.  
18 And, you know, there's been a lot of criticism  
19 of higher ed in general across the entire  
20 nation.

21 So we are concerned about that  
22 criticism, and we take that criticism very  
23 seriously. And we are working hard, in spite  
24 of what some people may think, to address the  
25 criticism and embrace reform.

1           So we agree with the need for  
2 reform. And we accept that challenge.

3           As we speak today, dedicated  
4 professionals that are my colleagues across  
5 the state are working really, really hard to  
6 try to meet these mandates. We can meet the  
7 competencies. We don't object to meeting the  
8 competencies. If they had produced their  
9 performance goals, we would like to meet  
10 those. But we're shooting in the dark. We're  
11 trying to design new programs and the -- what  
12 the -- the guide that we have to help us not  
13 be shooting in the dark is excessive  
14 prescription, and that amounts to more  
15 credits.

16           So we are committed to reform. We're  
17 committed to preparing great teachers. But we  
18 want them to be participants in a global  
19 society, a global community, and a global  
20 economy. So this is where the problem  
21 arises. We're being asked to do something  
22 that we fundamentally disagree with.

23           I have been a first grade teacher.  
24 I've been a sixth grade teacher. I have my  
25 principal and all of my administrative

1 credentials, and I've been in higher ed for  
2 thirty years. My specialty is early childhood  
3 education.

4           You asked how many credits does that  
5 new certificate require. And you didn't get a  
6 real specific direct answer. There are  
7 sixteen -- sixty mandated credits, but that  
8 doesn't count student teaching. Student  
9 teaching will be twelve to fifteen credits  
10 additional on top of that, and because our  
11 students have to student teach full time for  
12 twelve weeks, they have to take twelve credits  
13 a semester to keep their financial aid. So  
14 early childhood in this state will be seventy-  
15 two credits.

16           At Juniata, we currently offer one --  
17 and it's one of the first in most respected  
18 early childhood special ed unified programs.  
19 We also offer unified elementary combined with  
20 special ed.

21           Our early childhood program right  
22 now, without special ed, is sixty-three  
23 credits. That includes fifteen credits of  
24 student teaching.

25           We can allow students to go abroad.

1 We can allow them to combine teaching with  
2 what they come to Juniata for, which may be  
3 world language, ELL, doubling teaching with  
4 our program in peace and conflict studies, and  
5 I could go on and name the special  
6 characteristics of Juniata College. What I'm  
7 telling you is every college in this state and  
8 every university -- private, state, or state  
9 related -- all of us have special and unique  
10 characteristics. All of us have ways we can  
11 improve, and we want to do that.

12           However, all of the technical  
13 assistance -- it's true. There have been  
14 hundreds of meetings. And all of the  
15 technical assistance and all of the extensions  
16 in the world are not going to convince someone  
17 like me that I want to embrace credit  
18 mandates. We have fundamental differences of  
19 opinion on that point, and I'm passionate  
20 about it.

21           I have attended probably eighty of  
22 those one-hundred-and-some meetings. And if  
23 I'm not there, my colleagues have been there.  
24 There has been a firm outcry against credit  
25 mandates. There's another outcry against the

1 faculty matrix. And I think that's pretty  
2 well widespread as well. That's not what I  
3 focused on, however. But all of our outcries  
4 has resulted in no change.

5 We don't agree with the excessive  
6 regulation, and I call it regulation because  
7 it is forcing us to do things that we want to  
8 do, if we want to continue to prepare  
9 teachers. Some of us, like the faculty at  
10 Juniata College, will not be able to cover the  
11 special ed unified program with the other  
12 majors because we feel that it will restrict  
13 our students' ability to get what they want  
14 when they come there.

15 We're not willing to give up study  
16 abroad. I'm not sure that we're going to do  
17 any of the middle-level certification --  
18 certificates. Excuse me.

19 And what I really am distressed about  
20 is that on a PowerPoint at the most recent  
21 PAC-TE meeting, I did see that there's going  
22 to be a form that is the intent to submit. I  
23 would think that PDE would like to know of all  
24 of the diverse institutions out there that  
25 Kate talks about, how many of us are actually

1 going to even offer the new certificates.

2           What -- from my place in the world,  
3 central Pennsylvania, what I hear, and I talk  
4 to state-related schools and state schools,  
5 many schools are not even going to bother with  
6 the middle level because it's too  
7 restrictive.

8           We've done the work. We've done the  
9 matrixes. We've looked at it at Juniata  
10 College. To do middle level and to do what we  
11 feel would be a good job to put all those  
12 credits in there, it will take one hundred  
13 thirty-two prescribed credits.

14           Somebody asked, is there room for  
15 error. There is none. Young people need to  
16 know what they want to do when they step foot  
17 on our campus, and if they screw up, if they  
18 come to pre-med, like most of them do, and  
19 take organic chem and then, you know, they  
20 decide they're going to do something else,  
21 forget it. We'll send them home.

22           I mean, that's -- a lot of them have  
23 to get straight As that sophomore year because  
24 after organic chem and that lineup of courses,  
25 they end up with a 2.5.

1                   But we have bought into all of it.  
2                   We've even accepted the changes in  
3                   certificates, which a lot of us objected to.  
4                   But, you know, this is just too much to  
5                   swallow. I liken it to the concept of there  
6                   is problems in teacher preparation. PDE's  
7                   come up with a new medicine. We don't know  
8                   the side effects. We can't quite predict  
9                   them, but people like me, with lots of  
10                  experience, think that we have got some pretty  
11                  serious side effects, including death. There  
12                  will no more teacher preparation at some --  
13                  preparation programs at some institutions.

14                  And I'm -- I know I'm not trying to  
15                  be dramatic. I'm telling you, my colleagues  
16                  are saying not that they can't. I haven't  
17                  heard one school say, we cannot meet the  
18                  competencies. We cannot do these programs.  
19                  But what I have heard schools say is it is  
20                  against what we believe, and I think we may  
21                  choose not to do the programs.

22                  You even heard Kate say that this is  
23                  a way that we can ensure you're giving the  
24                  appropriate strength and weight to the things  
25                  we think are most important. I could have

1 that intelligent conversation, and I think we  
2 could collaborate and agree or find some way,  
3 but piling credit upon credit upon credit is  
4 not the way to go.

5           And there is no empirical evidence  
6 that I have been able to find anywhere that  
7 says more credits will make better teachers,  
8 more standardization will ensure quality. In  
9 fact, we believe, at Juniata, and I share this  
10 belief with lots of others, that  
11 standardization -- and I don't want to speak  
12 for the secretary, because I wasn't there when  
13 whatever else was said, but my provost came to  
14 visit me, who talked to the secretary of  
15 education, and he said, We're looking for some  
16 good standard models so we can ensure  
17 quality.

18           Well, we believe that standardization  
19 will -- and uniformity will breed mediocrity  
20 and it will limit the creativity and the  
21 innovation that I think PDE truly wants to see  
22 in higher ed.

23           So we embrace the charge, but we  
24 condemn the vehicle and the way to get there.  
25 Thank you for listening.



1 DR. FRANCIS: Finally, we asked the  
2 former superintendent to join our panel today.  
3 Somebody that actually hires teachers.

4 DR. TULLI: Thank you.

5 And thank you for inviting me here  
6 today. I'm honored to be here.

7 While it's rare that a graduate from  
8 Lebanon Valley and Albright agree on anything,  
9 this is a unique opportunity for me. You read  
10 about my background. I was undergraduate  
11 degree at Lebanon Valley. And I went to  
12 Shippensburg and Temple, and I was a school  
13 superintendent, and now I'm a CEO of  
14 Commonwealth Connections Academy.

15 For about the last fifteen or twenty  
16 years, one of my direct jobs that I've had  
17 either as assistant superintendent or  
18 superintendent or CEO has been to hire  
19 teachers. And our track record, I think, is  
20 pretty strong in that we've hired some -- many  
21 outstanding teachers.

22 When we do a search, we look for  
23 talented, educated, well-educated young people  
24 who have great attitude about the teaching  
25 profession and possess diversity and skills

1 that we seek for the job for which we're  
2 advertising.

3 We screen these applicants very  
4 carefully, and I also screen them in terms of  
5 Pennsylvania graduates, because we value the  
6 job that Pennsylvania colleges are doing. I  
7 think Representative Beyer was right. We do  
8 the best in the nation in terms of educating  
9 our students for -- to be teachers.

10 To be sure, I have relatives in  
11 Florida and other states who are in  
12 administration, and they come to our state for  
13 our graduates to pull to their state, so I  
14 know we're doing an outstanding job.

15 We look for students from Albright,  
16 Lebanon Valley College, Juniata, and across  
17 the country -- across the state in private  
18 schools as well as Shippensburg, Millersville.  
19 We think that the combination of state  
20 university graduates and private school  
21 graduates gives us a great deal of vibrance  
22 and variety to our staff, which adds to the  
23 strength of our staff.

24 We believe in the fundamentals of  
25 what makes a good teacher. We recognize that

1 the colleges go about creating wonderful  
2 teachers, many very differently. We've found  
3 candidates to be very well prepared for the  
4 challenges of public school. The benefits of  
5 well-rounded liberal arts education are  
6 clear. We've enjoyed academic diversity that  
7 they bring to our faculty.

8 The graduates of the institutions are  
9 well trained and fully certified. They blend  
10 nicely with those we've hired from public  
11 college environment.

12 The richness of the private school  
13 experience brought to our schools by these  
14 teachers helps us to create a stronger and  
15 more fulfilling academic instructional  
16 program. I am hopeful that we can continue to  
17 hire teachers who are the products of public  
18 and private colleges to our school.

19 And, of course, I'd be happy to  
20 answer questions.

21 And let me point out, too, that we  
22 presently have shortages in some key areas.  
23 If -- we would hire a special education  
24 teacher today, a math teacher and a science  
25 teacher today. We have searches going on for

1 those position. And these private  
2 institutions send us many candidates in those  
3 areas who do a wonderful job in our schools,  
4 and I would hate to see any of them consider  
5 not offering those certification programs  
6 because we need them today.

7 Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Thank you.

9 Questions to the panel?

10 REPRESENTATIVE RAPP: Just real  
11 quick. What would you project to be a cost  
12 for you to have to offer or -- and to meet the  
13 guidelines that the department is proposing?

14 DR. GLOSENGER: Yeah, the cost would  
15 be to get rid of our integrity, and -- that's  
16 number one. And then secondly, the cost won't  
17 be ours as much as it will be on our students,  
18 who can't complete programs in four years.

19 REPRESENTATIVE RAPP: And --

20 DR. MCMILLAN: We also anticipate  
21 having to hire at least one full-time faculty  
22 member to teach the additional credit-hour  
23 load.

24 REPRESENTATIVE RAPP: If I heard you  
25 correctly, you're saying, all of you, in your

1 testimony, that even if you spend the money  
2 and the students -- you raise your tuition,  
3 whatever you have to do, you're not -- you're  
4 here basically saying that you do not believe  
5 that it would guarantee any different outcomes  
6 or possibly negative outcomes.

7 DR. MCMILLAN: I would concur with  
8 that. In fact, it seems to me that deputy  
9 secretary said exactly that. That we're  
10 trying something, and we'll evaluate after a  
11 couple years, and it's going to be very costly  
12 and dramatic change with a high impact on all  
13 these institutions affected, yet we don't know  
14 for certain if this is going to have the  
15 desired outcome.

16 REPRESENTATIVE RAPP: Thank you very  
17 much.

18 CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Representative  
19 Grucela.

20 REPRESENTATIVE GRUCELA: Thank you,  
21 Mr. Chairman.

22 First of all, I don't know if  
23 Dr. Shaw's still here. Thank you, Dr. Shaw.  
24 I want to recommend Dr. Glosenger for that  
25 committee.

1 DR. GLOSENGER: I won't be asked.

2 REPRESENTATIVE GRUCELA: Especially  
3 not now that you have my support.

4 But I would recommend her on that.

5 And number two, I'd like to ask, do  
6 you believe there should be some -- I don't  
7 know how to say this, because some students  
8 get close to passing the Praxis test but are  
9 good teachers. Do you believe that there  
10 should be something in addition to Praxis test  
11 that could either convince the department or  
12 legislature to say that if you're like within  
13 one or two points -- and you're a former  
14 superintendent, Mr. Tulli. You know, I've  
15 heard from superintendents and classroom  
16 teachers and department heads and principals,  
17 students that are close but are great  
18 teachers.

19 And I've said, if you give them this  
20 test after they've taught for two or three  
21 years, I'm sure they will pass it or do  
22 better, whatever.

23 Do you believe that there should be  
24 something or should the Praxis test continue  
25 to be the barrier that it is?

1 DR. GLOSENGER: I'm not our  
2 certification officer, and so there are some  
3 concessions and there are some ways.

4 Something recent just came out, but I don't  
5 want to give you misinformation. I will be  
6 happy to send it to you.

7 And I don't really think it's fair to  
8 accuse the Department of Ed that they think  
9 the Praxis is the only measure either. We all  
10 have our own student teaching rubrics, and we  
11 have portfolios and all those sorts of  
12 things. And so we try to work really hard  
13 with students.

14 What I'm more concerned about with  
15 the Praxis exam is a point that Kate made  
16 about not knowing where all that excess of  
17 teachers end up, the elementary people she  
18 spoke about, the surplus. We're required,  
19 under law, to submit reports; every  
20 institution submits a report at the end of  
21 year. It is a Title II report, and we call  
22 every graduate, and we know where those  
23 students are, and we submit that information  
24 to the state.

25 So they should be able to compile

1 that and tell you how many students stay in  
2 state, how many students go out of state, how  
3 many stay in public school settings. We feed  
4 that data into the state. I don't know if it  
5 goes into a black hole or what, but we know,  
6 it the institutional level, and we can give  
7 you those stats, and I have them here for  
8 Juniata.

9 REPRESENTATIVE GRUCELA: I just want  
10 to say, one of the rare times I would disagree  
11 with you, and I would just tell you that these  
12 people on this committee know it. It will  
13 take the next hour to tell you. But the  
14 department does think the Praxis test is a  
15 barrier. It is. And it has been. And there  
16 are several more examples.

17 I'll just close by saying, are all  
18 these guys future teachers?

19 DR. GLOSENGER: Yes. And they're  
20 doing double majors. One of our students that  
21 met with Mike Fleck and with me works for  
22 Senator -- Senator Don White. She's worked  
23 for three summers with him, but she's actually  
24 an elementary/special ed major who has an  
25 interest in politics.



1           She's studied abroad in Greece, and  
2           then she did ESL certification and studied in  
3           Ecuador over the summer. She's a star  
4           basketball player. And she's done all of  
5           this, with careful planning, in four years.

6           REPRESENTATIVE GRUCELA: I just want  
7           to say in closing, congratulations, guys.  
8           You're about to enter a great profession.  
9           Keep the heat on the bureaucrats.

10          CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Representative  
11          Carroll.

12          REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL: Thank you,  
13          Mr. Chairman. I kept quiet during the first  
14          round but won't this time.

15          The first thing that I -- it's not  
16          really a question, more of a comment, but I am  
17          concerned with the prospect of students having  
18          to know on day one what their desired  
19          profession will be.

20          I just don't believe, from my  
21          experience, that that is a practical  
22          possibility with respect to students as they  
23          begin their four-year college career.

24          And as I see this unfolding, if these  
25          guidelines or regulations are implemented,

1 we'll go through one generation after another  
2 of the courses, the next three years, in an  
3 effort to try to apply the practical reality  
4 of what's happening to the universities and  
5 colleges across the state.

6           So we'll head down this path, and  
7 then we'll center ourself out in five  
8 different directions to try and make a  
9 practical adjustment to what's happening all  
10 over the state. And so instead of that  
11 exercise, it just seems to me that we ought to  
12 a step back for a minute, get this right, and  
13 move forward from there with the practical  
14 reality of what's happening at all these  
15 diverse and wonderful colleges and  
16 universities we have in the state.

17           CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Representative  
18 Fleck.

19           REPRESENTATIVE FLECK: Thank you.

20           Thank you. I appreciate your -- all  
21 of your testimony. And welcome.

22           I don't know how many are  
23 constituents, but glad to see you. Juniata  
24 really does an excellent job in so many  
25 different fields. And I would hate to see a

1 program loss or impeded there because, as you  
2 know, I was on the school board for five years  
3 in Southern Huntingdon and Juniata did provide  
4 a great number of our student teachers into  
5 that program, which I think was a win/win  
6 situation for the students to learn what it is  
7 like in a rural district.

8 And I assume that Juniata is the same  
9 as many of our independent colleges and  
10 universities, in small, rural towns, and the  
11 impact would be felt over the ripple effect.

12 And I guess I'm curious,  
13 Dr. Glosenger, how many hours have you spent  
14 on working on this, and how many hours is it  
15 going to take for you and your department to  
16 get up and running? I know we talked a little  
17 bit about the increase in cost, but -- you  
18 know, assuming you're probably under contract  
19 and you've got to make it happen one way or  
20 the other, but it's not that easy.

21 DR. GLOSENGER: I think I've been  
22 working pretty much nonstop, and my colleagues  
23 are here, until 10 or 11 o'clock every night,  
24 and trying to provide the leadership for  
25 people who are new. And I mean the time has

1           been excessive.

2                       And then I feel like, in a way, we  
3           are branded as not being able to get on  
4           board. I think Kathy Ruthkosky will be able  
5           to tell you how widespread the discontent is,  
6           based on the resolution passed at PAC-TE.

7                       So lots of hours, and I guess our  
8           plan -- our most recent plan is that we are  
9           going to start meeting 8:00 to 5:00 one day a  
10          week as soon as -- not one a day, but as soon  
11          as we get our grades in, we will probably meet  
12          right up through, and we have planned a couple  
13          weekend retreats for the entire faculty. We  
14          will not be paid for those, and we don't  
15          care.

16                      We don't want to close down teacher  
17          preparation at all, but we'll probably be  
18          offering early childhood certification, preK  
19          through fourth. That will probably be what  
20          will come out of this, and will continue to  
21          offer all of our secondary ed programs.

22                      REPRESENTATIVE FLECK: And one  
23          follow-up question, I guess, probably for  
24          Dr. Francis here. Does this open the door as  
25          far as other programs in regard to autonomy,

1 that you spoke of, you know, taking a little  
2 bit of your decision process and throwing it  
3 to a department?

4 DR. FRANCIS: That's a very good  
5 question because that certainly -- at the  
6 AICUP board level, this issue actually  
7 surprised me. We brought this up with our  
8 board, and that was the fundamental issue for  
9 many of the presidents on the board.  
10 Dr. McMillan is one of our board members. And  
11 they were very concerned about the precedent  
12 that this established, because once the state  
13 starts telling people what their curriculum  
14 basically is going to be, the number of  
15 credits you have to teach in these various  
16 areas, and create a matrix that says, Well, we  
17 are not going to really judge the individuals,  
18 we are just going to say if you have so many  
19 points you can teach or you cannot teach.

20 Those are fundamental lines that we  
21 think the state's crossing here that could  
22 have very bad implications and a bad  
23 precedence down the road, because there will  
24 be other administrations that come in and feel  
25 that, you know, some other group of courses

1 are the correct courses that our teachers or  
2 other professionals, if you will, should have  
3 to take.

4 And we're very concerned about that,  
5 because we think American higher education is  
6 strong because of the diversity of the  
7 institutions and the independence of both  
8 public and private institutions from state  
9 control.

10 Frankly, if you go to Europe today,  
11 you're going to see European countries trying  
12 to change their systems from less of a  
13 ministry of education to more like an American  
14 system. And we're doing just the opposite  
15 with this.

16 REPRESENTATIVE FLECK: Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Representative  
18 Rohrer.

19 REPRESENTATIVE ROHRER: Thank you,  
20 Mr. Chairman.

21 One thing that came up in the  
22 testimony, which kind of ties back in with  
23 what I -- the track I was on earlier with the  
24 authority, is that do you see, as I would  
25 interpret it, that's a conflict, as I perceive

1       it, between Chapter 354 and the requirement  
2       that everything get done in four years, and  
3       what you're saying in reality just can't get  
4       done in four years?

5               DR. FRANCIS: I can -- I actually  
6       think the PAC-TE chair is even better, more  
7       authoritative, because I've listened to her  
8       talk about that issue, but yes, there is a  
9       conflict, because Chapter 354 does have in it  
10      requirements that you provide programs that  
11      students can graduate from in four years and  
12      that you provide programs that are consistent  
13      with the mission of the institutions. And  
14      those missions for many of our institutions  
15      require a broad-based liberal arts education.

16              Many of our education -- elementary  
17      education majors are also required to have  
18      another major, and so these kinds of  
19      requirements cannot be maintained with this  
20      kind of excessive credit requirement. So we  
21      think there is a conflict.

22              REPRESENTATIVE ROHRER: I think there  
23      is a very real major concern that we would  
24      have on a lot of fronts, that we do have one  
25      set of regulation and then another set of

1 guidelines which are really regulations that  
2 are in conflict, and we just can't do that.

3 So I think we have got a double  
4 problem here. Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Representative  
6 Longietti.

7 REPRESENTATIVE LONGIETTI: Thank you  
8 for your testimony.

9 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

10 If I hear the department correctly,  
11 if I understand their point, they're stating  
12 that people are leaving the profession, and  
13 they're stating -- that is the teaching  
14 profession, and they're stating that one of  
15 the reasons is that they're claiming that  
16 they're not adequately prepared for what  
17 they're getting into, and they're saying  
18 they've talked to -- teachers leaving the  
19 profession are stating that, and we've talked  
20 to high school and lower level grade  
21 administrators and they're validating that.

22 And so they're trying to attack that  
23 problem -- and this is a little bit of a  
24 paraphrase, but if I hear them, they're  
25 stating that we need to make a change and we



1 need to it to be rigid because we're not  
2 exactly sure what is going to work, and as we  
3 figure out what works, then we're going to  
4 become more flexible.

5 And I guess what I am asking you,  
6 what is the alternative to that? Do you agree  
7 there is a problem? And if there is, what, in  
8 your view, should be the alternative to that  
9 approach?

10 DR. FRANCIS: I think that --  
11 Dr. Tulli, did you want to say something about  
12 that? I believe we were talking a little bit  
13 before about the whole issue of why teachers  
14 actually do leave the profession in the first  
15 couple of years. And I don't think it has to  
16 do with teacher preparation.

17 DR. TULLI: The many fine young  
18 people that choose, after a few years of  
19 teaching, to go into another profession  
20 because of the challenges they face, I would  
21 submit, face the challenges in the classroom  
22 that come to them not just in special  
23 education and ELL, but the many diverse  
24 challenges that come to them that they need  
25 support and training for, but not the kinds of

1 training that we'd be looking for in  
2 undergraduate programs; wherever society is  
3 changing and challenges that we get. And it's  
4 our job as school administrators to create  
5 support and training program for them, but  
6 eventually, they just feel as though there is  
7 just so many challenge and so much work to do  
8 that there might be an easier way to make a  
9 dollar, so they lose their love for the  
10 profession that they had when they came with  
11 us, and they go elsewhere. But it has  
12 nothing, in my opinion, to do with the  
13 undergraduate training they get. It's what  
14 they face when they come in.

15           How often it changes. I mean, the  
16 teaching over the last fifteen, twenty,  
17 twenty-five years has changed dramatically,  
18 and teaching is a far more difficult job today  
19 than when I got into it. When I got into  
20 teaching, it was fairly -- in comparison, was  
21 fairly easy.

22           Today, it is a much more challenging  
23 profession, and we need to keep our teachers  
24 abreast of the changes and the challenges as  
25 the years go on. They come to us very well

1 prepared. And then it is up to us then to let  
2 them hit the ground running, as was testified  
3 before, and then make sure they have the  
4 competencies to get through particularly the  
5 first five or seven years, so that they do  
6 feel good about their profession and the  
7 accomplishments that they have.

8 DR. FRANCIS: If you look at  
9 governor's report of 2005, I believe it was,  
10 on the commission -- he had a commission on  
11 the future of teacher preparation, that report  
12 says the same thing that Dr. Tulli just said.

13 REPRESENTATIVE LONGIETTI: So you see  
14 the support's needed once they get out of  
15 school and they begin their profession. If I  
16 hear the department, and I think part of what  
17 they're saying is, but with the requirements  
18 that the federal government is putting on,  
19 they have to be ready on day one, and they  
20 can't -- we can't wait for them to get up to  
21 speed and handle the situation. How do you  
22 respond to that?

23 DR. TULLI: These people are -- most  
24 of us are life-long learners. This isn't  
25 something that there's a set -- there's a set

1 amount of skill that you need to be a great  
2 teacher and you can have it on day one, and  
3 then it will carry you through ten years.  
4 That's not the case.

5 The case is, you need to demonstrate  
6 that you're a good student and that you're  
7 willing to meet these challenges by studying  
8 hard and learning what you need to learn. And  
9 then you're willing to grow every year with  
10 the school to meet the ongoing challenges as  
11 students change, as -- one of the points were  
12 made about we don't have family support  
13 sometimes, working with the families, all  
14 those kinds of things that we have to  
15 continually train our staff about. That comes  
16 with the profession as you're a part of the  
17 profession.

18 But you're certainly not going to  
19 have all of it that you need on day one, and I  
20 don't know of any profession that can  
21 guarantee that.

22 DR. GLOSENGER: I'd just like to say,  
23 some of you, I know, are attorneys, but I  
24 don't know why people think that teachers  
25 should come out of an undergraduate program

1 and walk in and have everything figured out.  
2 We have induction programs. We provide  
3 support to them that is ongoing, and maybe  
4 that support needs to be stronger. But, you  
5 know, most lawyers that I know or most  
6 graduates from law school take that BAR/BRI  
7 prep course -- I just paid for it for my  
8 daughter -- so they can pass the bar exam, and  
9 then after they do that, firms hire them in  
10 and expect to mentor them into whatever area  
11 of law they're going.

12 So I think it's an unfair thing. I  
13 think it's unfair to say we're preparing  
14 teachers for other states and not say why do  
15 we let any doctor go to another state or any  
16 attorneys or anybody else.

17 We're a global community. And Lex's  
18 testimony cites some research that supports  
19 liberal arts education.

20 And you said, what can we do about  
21 that? In the short term, I think, if we  
22 didn't have to meet credit mandates, and we  
23 could demonstrate competencies, the -- I  
24 didn't count them, I didn't have time -- but  
25 Mike has a competency matrix that we've

1 developed for early childhood. I'm sure he'd  
2 be happy to share it with you.

3 The competencies are more than you  
4 can even imagine, but we can meet  
5 competencies. But we shouldn't have to be  
6 told how to do that with credits.

7 REPRESENTATIVE LONGIETTI: As a  
8 lawyer, I like the analogy. But seriously,  
9 coming out of school, you really did need that  
10 mentoring, to kind of step and grow over  
11 time.

12 DR. FRANCIS: I'll just add also that  
13 that governor's commission report talks about  
14 a two-year mentoring program for new teachers,  
15 and I haven't heard the department -- maybe  
16 they have plans for that coming down the road,  
17 but that's where a lot of the things we're  
18 talking about should be addressed.

19 CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Thank you.

20 Let me just ask a question. One of  
21 the things we've talked about in part, some  
22 various things, both from your side and from  
23 our side, is teaching as a profession. And  
24 that's one of the things that deeply disturbs  
25 me is that we don't treat teaching as if it is

1 a profession.

2 I mean, I guess it's the same thing  
3 as being a public official. No one's going to  
4 be a professional politician. But it is about  
5 quality. And one of the things that strikes  
6 me is, although I don't agree that a student  
7 should know on the first day they set foot on  
8 the campus what they want to do with their  
9 lives, it seems to me that at least in the  
10 high schools there ought to be programs in  
11 place for students who want to be teachers, so  
12 they have the sense of what the profession is  
13 like.

14 We don't do that. We create  
15 specialized schools for everything else except  
16 students who want to be teachers. And we  
17 tend, once they're on campus, many students  
18 have chosen career. I used to teach at an  
19 engineer school. So kids would step on that  
20 campus knew from day one that they were going  
21 into engineering, or they thought they were  
22 going to be doctors and went into the  
23 sciences.

24 We don't do that with teaching. So  
25 it is almost always if teaching becomes -- I

1 would not say the throw-away profession, but  
2 it is not given the same relevance and focus,  
3 and, indeed, I would say importance when we  
4 ask students to consider this profession as  
5 other things are.

6           So how do you address that?  
7 Shouldn't we be about trying to make sure that  
8 we ratchet up the importance of teaching? You  
9 know, when a student is really good in science  
10 and math, don't tell them they should be an  
11 engineer, tell them they should be a teacher.

12           DR. GLOSENGER: I agree with  
13 everything you've said. We do have a  
14 governor's school for teaching now, which I  
15 think is one good thing for high school  
16 students. We've always had governor's schools  
17 in other areas.

18           CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: We had two; now  
19 we're limited to one of the two.

20           DR. GLOSENGER: So that -- that was  
21 one thing.

22           We have our teacher candidates out in  
23 the schools a lot, and we encourage them to  
24 talk to people. We do participate in fairs,  
25 but there's -- there is -- you're right. We



1 need to be doing more of that.

2           And I don't think you'll find at some  
3 of our schools that people who come into  
4 teaching see themselves as second-class  
5 citizens. In fact, I love it when the pre-med  
6 students and the health profession people come  
7 and take child development and blow it off and  
8 fail the first exam, you know. That gives me  
9 a real good satisfaction. But I do think that  
10 our student really work hard, and on -- at  
11 least on lots of our liberal arts campuses,  
12 they have a voice and they don't take a  
13 backseat, so I think at the institutional  
14 level, we can do things that make them feel  
15 like this is important.

16           And really, we've had lots of  
17 articles in the Juniatican recently about how  
18 we're picking on teacher candidates. We are  
19 holding them to higher expectations for  
20 grades. We are holding them to way higher  
21 expectations in terms of character and social  
22 policies.

23           You know, you go smoke pot, you're  
24 probably not going to be in education  
25 tomorrow, because they tell us. I get letters

1 about that kind of thing.

2 So I agree with you. We need to do a  
3 better job of what you're talking about.

4 CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Thank you.

5 Let's go then to our third panel, Jay  
6 Hertzog and Kathy Ruthkosky.

7 MS. RUTHKOSKY: I think I'm the first  
8 panelist who can say good afternoon. Good  
9 afternoon, Mr. Chairman and committee members.

10 I'm Kathleen Ruthkosky from Marywood  
11 University. I'm here today to represent  
12 PAC-TE, the Pennsylvania Association for  
13 Colleges and Teacher Educators.

14 PAC-TE serves as a unified voice for  
15 seventy-plus institutions in the commonwealth,  
16 including PASSHE, state-related, and private  
17 colleges and universities.

18 The resolutions I have in your packet  
19 were approved by our membership at the annual  
20 business meeting held on October 30th. As you  
21 can see from my written testimony, we're in  
22 total agreement with what we've heard from  
23 AICUP this morning, from our other colleagues  
24 at other institutions and also by many of the  
25 members on this committee.

1           PAC-TE feels strongly that  
2           institutions must have the flexibility to  
3           design programs that meet the mandates of not  
4           just Chapter 49 but also of Chapter 354.

5           Specifically, our institutions must  
6           be able to design programs that are aligned  
7           with the institutional mission, minimize  
8           duplication of course work, and can be  
9           completed in four years.

10           The arbitrary credit requirements  
11           definitely hinder our efforts in meeting these  
12           mandates.

13           Can programs be designed with the  
14           credits prescribed? Yes, they can. But just  
15           because it's possible doesn't make it right  
16           for teacher education and teacher education  
17           students. The reason that we changed Chapter  
18           349 was in response to the Gaskin case and  
19           also the national and state emphasis on early  
20           childhood education.

21           As new demands are placed on  
22           institutions to better prepare teachers, the  
23           response to those demands cannot simply be  
24           let's add credits to students' programs. It  
25           should be that our programs -- if they're

1 based on competencies, we have the flexibility  
2 to adjust our programs to meet those new  
3 demands.

4 As we've heard, prescription of  
5 credits may have a negative impact on future  
6 teacher supply. We think this is particularly  
7 true in the field of middle-level education  
8 and high school education with respect to  
9 special education.

10 One of the advantages of strong early  
11 childhood education programs is that gives us  
12 the opportunity to early identify and  
13 remediate difficulties learners may be  
14 having. Disabilities do not just disappear  
15 once a child ends fourth grade -- or enters  
16 fourth grade.

17 We need to ensure that every child --  
18 and particularly, every child with a  
19 disability -- has a well prepared, highly  
20 qualified teacher. This can only be  
21 accomplished if institutions have the  
22 flexibility to design programs based on  
23 competency rather than credit numbers.

24 I was happy to hear Kate mention the  
25 Governor's Commission on Training America's

1 Teachers this morning. She talked about the  
2 fact that there were specific needs listed in  
3 that report. And, yes, there were areas  
4 listed as being lacking. Those areas are  
5 addressed by Chapter 49-2, primarily that our  
6 students need more work in terms of working  
7 with students with disabilities and English  
8 language learners.

9           However, the report also says that  
10 high marks were given to new teachers for  
11 developing and implementing lesson plans and  
12 delivering the appropriate content knowledge.

13           Also on the final report, one --  
14 okay, where is it -- summary of problems and  
15 practices in their report, the one program  
16 that was mentioned as having promising  
17 practice was Alverno College in Milwaukee,  
18 Wisconsin. What's unique about Alverno's  
19 program? They are a totally competency-based  
20 program. They do not require credits.

21           PAC-TE also favors the elimination of  
22 the faculty matrix. We, as an organization,  
23 feel that Chapter 354 is very clear on this  
24 point. It is the institution's responsibility  
25 to hire and evaluate faculty who are education

1 scholars, qualified for their assignment, and  
2 actively engage in the professional education  
3 community.

4 In the past, institutions provided  
5 evidence of the five criteria defined as  
6 faculty quality in Chapter 354. Quite simply  
7 put, the testimony of our colleague -- from  
8 the testimony of our colleagues, the  
9 imposition of a matrix, more importantly the  
10 imposition of the required scores, eliminates  
11 an institution's right to do that.

12 PAC-TE supports and recognizes the  
13 importance and need for clear articulation  
14 agreements with two-year programs. Indeed,  
15 many of our members already have these  
16 articulation agreements in place, and it  
17 allows students to move seamlessly from a  
18 two-year program to a four-year program.

19 However, Chapter 49 is clear that  
20 institutions have the autonomy to enter into  
21 such agreements.

22 PDE is not requiring that these  
23 agreements be in place in order for a program  
24 to be approved. As noted in written -- in the  
25 frequently asked questions that the PDE put on

1 their website, they know that the institutions  
2 have the responsibility to determine the  
3 quality of courses that are being transferred  
4 in. Well, if we have that responsibility to  
5 do that, then they can't require us to do that  
6 at the same time. So we feel that there's  
7 conflict there.

8 PAC-TE is committed to promoting  
9 quality teacher education, and we are grateful  
10 for the opportunity to discuss our concerns.

11 The Pennsylvania Department of  
12 Education has done its job by developing a set  
13 of competencies for teacher ed candidates.  
14 PDE must now let us do our job, which is to  
15 design teacher education programs to meet  
16 these competencies, programs that are aligned  
17 with our institutional missions, avoid  
18 duplication of course work, can be completed  
19 in four years, and are taught by faculty who  
20 our institutions recognize as education  
21 scholars, qualified for their assignment and  
22 actively engaged in the professional education  
23 community.

24 The goal of our work cannot be  
25 realized if the arbitrary credit requirements

1 established by PDE and the faculty matrix  
2 requirements remain.

3 Thank you.

4 DR. HERTZOG: Second person to wish  
5 you good afternoon.

6 My name is Jay Hertzog. I'm the dean  
7 of education at Slippery Rock University. I'm  
8 here on the invitation of Miss McLaughlin, and  
9 it's indeed a pleasure to be here.

10 I have forty-one years in education.  
11 I have been an elementary and secondary  
12 teacher. I've been assistant principal,  
13 principal at the middle school, assistant  
14 superintendent, and in higher education now  
15 for twenty years.

16 You have my comments in front of you,  
17 so I will just pick out a couple of the areas,  
18 and also stray from them just a bit to address  
19 some of the issues.

20 I'd like to point out that, in fact,  
21 PDE did hold sessions across the state. I  
22 attended many of those sessions, as my  
23 colleague from Juniata mentioned she was at  
24 eighty of them. I don't know that I was quite  
25 at eighty, but I was on the road a lot, let's



1 put it that way.

2 And at one of the sessions out near  
3 Pittsburgh that I attended, after an hour and  
4 a half, one of the participants said to the  
5 person from the department: We have been  
6 meeting -- in a meeting for an hour and a  
7 half. I've not seen one person take a note.  
8 I've not seen one recording device.

9 The comment was made, and I quote,  
10 We'll remember when we get back to Harrisburg.  
11 I'm concerned about that kind of input.  
12 Perhaps the two most disturbing issues in  
13 these new guidelines are the prescriptive  
14 nature in which they are addressed and the  
15 faculty qualification matrix.

16 In the state systems, all education  
17 programs must be accredited by the National  
18 Council for Accreditation of Teacher  
19 Education, called NCATE, which is one of the  
20 most rigorous accreditations that there are  
21 for any profession, and teacher education --  
22 about 47 percent of the schools who applied  
23 for NCATE accreditation actually receive it.

24 All fourteen state institutions and  
25 six additional institutions in the state of

1 Pennsylvania have NCATE accreditation.

2           To acquire NCATE accreditation,  
3 programs generally are nationally recognized  
4 by their respective subspecialized program  
5 areas, called SPAs. These SPAs establish  
6 nationally recognized standards of excellence  
7 in each of the certification areas. Then,  
8 along comes PDE, who develops prescriptive  
9 guidelines about courses, credits, and what  
10 these courses are to include and  
11 qualifications of those who teach them.

12           Case in point, the National  
13 Association for the Education of Young  
14 Children, N-A-E-Y-C -- NAEYC, as we call it --  
15 and the Council for Exceptional Children, the  
16 CEC, and the National Middle School  
17 Association, NMSA, are not prescriptive in  
18 their guidelines.

19           Because of the prescriptive nature of  
20 the PDE guidelines, we, at Slippery Rock, have  
21 -- and I'm sure all the other institutions --  
22 have been forced to rewrite our early  
23 childhood program and our special education  
24 program to conform with PDE guidelines, even  
25 though we have just recently -- when I say

1 recently, April -- we went through an NCATE  
2 visit, and on October the 14th, begin our  
3 re-accreditation for another seven years. And  
4 this is even though we have NAEYC and CEC  
5 national recognition for our programs.

6 It would seem to me that if our  
7 programs are nationally recognized, this  
8 should be acceptable to PDE, using those  
9 guidelines.

10 At the upper elementary, middle-level  
11 certificate, while I applaud the fact that  
12 Pennsylvania is acknowledging that a middle  
13 school certificate is important, many of us  
14 with middle school backgrounds provided input  
15 to PDE that there are some important areas  
16 that are conspicuously absent in the twenty-  
17 seven credits that they've talked about, the  
18 professional core.

19 In particular, these courses are  
20 middle school philosophy, middle school  
21 curriculum, and middle school organization.  
22 Having done my post-doctoral study in middle-  
23 level education, I have some idea as to what  
24 these middle school programs should look  
25 like.

1                   When I was -- when I informed PDE,  
2                   when I talked to some of the reps from PDE  
3                   about this, they said that a gentleman by the  
4                   name of Ken McEwin from Appalachian State was  
5                   instrumental in writing of the middle school  
6                   standards.

7                   To quote Lord Benson, I know Ken  
8                   McEwin. I've worked with Ken McEwin. I have  
9                   helped write the NMSA standards. So last week  
10                  I sent Ken a copy of our standards and asked  
11                  him, Ken, what do you think of these? His  
12                  reply's in the information packet you gave.  
13                  And he concurs that the three items I  
14                  mentioned are conspicuously missing.

15                  In addition, it is my understanding  
16                  that some of the impetus for this new  
17                  certificate -- certificate levels, grade four  
18                  to eight, is to increase the number of science  
19                  and math teachers in these grades.

20                  If a candidate is required to take  
21                  thirty credits -- that's ten courses -- that's  
22                  what we offer in math, does anyone really  
23                  believe that the student would opt for  
24                  teaching grade four to eight when they could  
25                  take the same content courses and teach grades

1 seven to twelve?

2 And what about science? When thirty  
3 credits, once again, ten courses, are required  
4 for a concentration in science, does anyone  
5 realize how many advanced math courses are  
6 needed for students to be successful in  
7 science? Will these requirements entice  
8 students, who will also be highly qualified to  
9 teach grades four to six, into the program? I  
10 really question that.

11 One of the -- some of the areas that  
12 were addressed earlier, not in my remarks, but  
13 I would like to address is, first of all, the  
14 idea of criticism of teacher education. We  
15 all know that that came about from a Nation at  
16 Risk, which has absolutely no data behind it.  
17 Please read the information behind Nation at  
18 Risk, which is called the manufacturing  
19 crisis, which says that when the authors went  
20 to look for data, there was none. It was  
21 derived out of, I quote, "I believe"  
22 statements. I believe this is what's wrong.  
23 We can't do that, ladies and gentlemen. We  
24 need data.

25 We need data on what is the problem.

1 Help us look for that data, get that data, and  
2 let's work together to resolve those issues.

3 As Kathy said, when the governor's  
4 commission came out, the reports from the  
5 superintendents and administrators who hire  
6 our kids are very, very, very complimentary  
7 about the preparation that goes into the way  
8 these kids are put through their programs.

9 Another area that came up was the  
10 special ed dual certificate. At Slippery  
11 Rock, all of our special ed majors are dual  
12 certified, except for one kid this year. One  
13 kid decided to stand on special ed, and  
14 that's -- but our students are special ed  
15 certified along with elementary education.  
16 They're not special ed certified with  
17 secondary education. Do they have the  
18 option? Yes, they do. Do they take it? None  
19 at all. Have we had any? In the ten years I  
20 have been at Slippery Rock, we have not had  
21 one person who is secondary certified go and  
22 get special ed certified.

23 One of the things that happens when  
24 we have dual certification -- and we need to  
25 be realistic about this -- is students get

1 hired because they are special ed dual  
2 certificate, but as soon as that opening comes  
3 about in a third-grade classroom or fifth-  
4 grade classroom, or whatever classroom, that  
5 special ed teacher is the first one to apply  
6 for it. And that's the population that needs  
7 the most consistency of all the kids that we  
8 have in our public schools.

9           And finally, I'd like to close by the  
10 guidelines that did come out. I believe in  
11 doing things once. I don't like doing things  
12 more than once, unless when I was a youth, I  
13 use to practice the piano, and I had to  
14 practice hours at a time, you know, to get it  
15 right. But I believe in writing curriculum,  
16 we only do it once. So at Slippery Rock, we  
17 did not begin anything on these curriculum  
18 guidelines until we had the final draft,  
19 because I wasn't sure what was going to be in  
20 the final draft. They came out June the  
21 15th.

22           My faculty is not in session on June  
23 15th. Well, some of them are in summer  
24 classes, but what we did is -- and we talked  
25 about additional costs -- we brought faculty

1 back and paid them to write curriculum over  
2 the summer and through the fall. And we want  
3 to thank the state system for providing that  
4 kind of support for this, but the timeline  
5 that's been established, we were supposed to  
6 have our first drafts in by November the  
7 10th. Today is November the 13th and we don't  
8 have our drafts in yet.

9 And I will be very honest with you.  
10 We are waiting till we get everything online  
11 so we can submit it in an online fashion.

12 And in conclusion, I want to thank,  
13 once again, the committee and Chairman Roebuck  
14 for allowing us to speak with you.

15 And I guess Kathy and I will address  
16 any questions you have.

17 CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Okay. Thank you.

18 Any questions?

19 Okay. Thank you very much.

20 Let's go then to our next panel,  
21 Jackie Edmondson and Joanne DeBoy.

22 DR. EDMONDSON: Mr. Chairman and  
23 committee members, thank you for the  
24 opportunity to speak with you this afternoon  
25 about Chapter 49-2.





1 million dollars per year.

2           This is coming at a time when the  
3 budget and the economy are presenting very  
4 difficult circumstances for the university and  
5 for families, and as you know, at Penn State,  
6 we're expecting at least a \$15 million  
7 reduction in our budget.

8           The second concern is -- that has  
9 been expressed is related to recruitment and  
10 retention of teachers in our programs. I  
11 spend a good deal of my time talking with  
12 incoming parents and families. We have about  
13 30 percent of our students who come from other  
14 states. This summer I heard from many of them  
15 that they're not interested in pursuing  
16 teacher education in Pennsylvania because they  
17 are concerned about reciprocity.

18           We have a special education  
19 undergraduate program that in 2006-2007  
20 certified fifty-five teachers. This year I  
21 have thirty-three students who have expressed  
22 interest in that program -- I don't know that  
23 they will all pursue the program -- that  
24 there's concern about the requirements for  
25 dual certification, even though that's not a

1 requirement for this particular cohort of  
2 students.

3 In addition, we have a master's  
4 program in special education that has  
5 traditionally served people who are career  
6 changers, people who had degrees in psychology  
7 or rehabilitation and decided that they wanted  
8 to become a special education teacher.

9 With the dual-certification  
10 requirements, that program will no longer be  
11 viable. It will not be an option at the  
12 master's level for career changers to become  
13 special education teachers.

14 Finally, I would like to say that, as  
15 you know, teacher education is quite a complex  
16 area, and there's new research emerging in the  
17 field that has important implications for how  
18 we can best prepare teachers.

19 My colleagues and I are willing and  
20 even eager to work with PDE to design and  
21 implement strong teacher education programs  
22 based on the best research and practices in  
23 the field. Teacher education needs to be a  
24 top priority led by experts in the field.  
25 Many of those experts are at my institution,

1 I'm proud to say, and at institutions across  
2 the state of Pennsylvania.

3 While some progress has been made, we  
4 see problems with the existing regulations,  
5 particularly in the drafts that we have  
6 received of the program review.

7 We have been appreciative of the  
8 opportunity to meet and talk with PDE about  
9 the program changes; however, given the input  
10 we and others have provided, we are puzzled by  
11 the few changes that emerged following the  
12 consultation process. We are appreciative of  
13 the extension period currently available, but  
14 given the magnitude of the changes, the  
15 complexity of the current proposal and the  
16 difficult budget situation, we hope the  
17 extension period could be lengthened to review  
18 a number of these new requirements and new  
19 mandates.

20 Finally, if this change is, indeed, a  
21 result of changes -- of pressure from the  
22 federal government and No Child Left Behind,  
23 we are looking at a new administration coming  
24 into Washington, D.C., and we are looking at  
25 certain changes in No Child Left Behind. I

1 think we need to take some time to reevaluate.

2 Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Thank you.

4 DR. DEBOY: Good afternoon. Thank  
5 you, Representative Roebuck and education  
6 committee of the House of Representatives.

7 It is wonderful to see you all here  
8 that you're interested in this topic, as we  
9 are. Underlying goal, as evidenced today,  
10 that all of you are concerned about the  
11 education that our children are going to be  
12 receiving. And we all want the best, highly  
13 qualified teachers to provide for our  
14 students.

15 Representatives of the Lincoln  
16 University have been involved in the review  
17 process and the informational meetings to look  
18 at the changes in the teacher-preparation  
19 program. And we do have concerns, and you had  
20 the document where we have eight different  
21 items that are identified.

22 Lincoln University is unique in that  
23 it is an HBCU, and we consider ourself the  
24 oldest that granted higher degrees, and so  
25 we're very proud of our tradition and our

1 legacy.

2           Often in liberal arts -- liberal arts  
3 colleges, sometimes education is seen in the  
4 past as a stepchild, and recently there's been  
5 a change in terms of -- at Lincoln University  
6 that we want the highly qualified teachers and  
7 we want Lincoln to provide these minority  
8 teachers who will be going out highly  
9 qualified. And so they have been supporting  
10 us.

11           However, these changes that are  
12 coming up are creating great concern to the  
13 department members and the faculty that are  
14 teaching. The first is the elimination of the  
15 elementary education.

16           When students are looking at colleges  
17 that they want to select, they're many times  
18 coming with the idea, I want to be an  
19 elementary teacher. When that is eliminated  
20 as an available program, students reconsider.  
21 So we will be losing students just because of  
22 the elimination of the name of that particular  
23 program.

24           And, also, the surrounding states  
25 that have elementary programs, those students

1 will go -- rather than coming to Lincoln or  
2 any of the Pennsylvania, they will remain in  
3 their state colleges that they are.

4 Secondly, with the middle-level  
5 certification which elementary is going to be  
6 replaced, the increased numbers of courses  
7 that -- credits that students are going to be  
8 required to teach, as a previous principal and  
9 person who has been in basic ed for eighteen  
10 years, I have a concern, and many times that  
11 concern is engrossed in are we teaching  
12 subjects or are we teaching students?

13 And when we look at the fifth and  
14 sixth grade where the emphasis is going to be  
15 on content, brings back that tension that we  
16 have about what we are -- what are we  
17 teaching.

18 We're also concerned about the  
19 increase in credits in the content areas for  
20 the middle school. We experienced it  
21 previously that in our teacher education  
22 programs at the secondary level, the sciences  
23 began to drop out and did -- they dropped our  
24 secondary chemistry and physics because they  
25 didn't have enough students in those

1 programs.

2           So when you go looking at the  
3 expected content for middle school teachers,  
4 will that content be available in the science  
5 and the math programs that are being offered  
6 at our -- in our science and math departments?

7           So we're having a great deal of  
8 concern about the middle school program. It's  
9 very much a concern to us. Again, will we  
10 be -- not being able to provide minority  
11 students in these particular areas.

12           And the early childhood education  
13 program requires -- does require seventy-two  
14 professional core credits for a four-year  
15 program. And in meeting a well-rounded  
16 liberal arts education, it seems, again, which  
17 has been noted before, that there is attention  
18 that is going on here. Will we be able to do  
19 so and graduate our students in four years?

20           Chapter 354 mandates that students  
21 cannot apply for admission to teacher-  
22 preparation programs until they've completed  
23 forty-eight credits and have a 3.0 GPA, yet we  
24 want them to decide their first course in  
25 there whether they are going to be education



1 majors, so even within the Chapter 354 and the  
2 new standards, there's a disagreement.

3 In addition, the field hours that are  
4 going to be required of our students, those  
5 colleges that are really in the rural areas do  
6 not have as many options where you're placing  
7 your students for field. And so we're looking  
8 at the various ways that students can do that,  
9 and what we are very concerned about is that  
10 we would have the control that we currently  
11 have with the existing number of field  
12 experience hours that our students are  
13 required to do.

14 Finally, that document that we  
15 received, and there are 19 single-page --  
16 single-spaced pages of competencies that are  
17 listed in the early childhood education, nine  
18 in the middle level. When we were looking at  
19 that, it is very difficult in terms of is  
20 there competencies. It says to us that it is  
21 supposed to guide our program, but we need to  
22 include it in the syllabi, we need to be able  
23 to show what we're teaching, we need to be  
24 able to show we're evaluating that, and it  
25 becomes very -- the mission becomes very



1 going to be a shortage there.

2 And just to make a comment on one of  
3 the previous speakers, not to keep going back  
4 to school board experience, but I know that it  
5 is very true when we had a special ed teacher  
6 that we had brought in, because they were  
7 almost the end of August before we're getting  
8 our positions totally filled, and as soon as a  
9 opening came along, boom, they were out of  
10 there.

11 And some of these things that we're  
12 looking to correct cannot be taught. I think  
13 they are learned in society. And my wife's a  
14 special ed teacher. And I -- we always have  
15 great summers, and the first week or two of  
16 school, it's a cringe, does she have good  
17 kids? And then if it's good kids, per se,  
18 not all kids are good, but I mean well  
19 behaved, you know, attentive kids, but it's,  
20 gee, does she have reasonable parental  
21 expectation for those children too? And so  
22 we're having a good year.

23 And so I don't know that you can  
24 teach that as an undergrad as much as you can  
25 in our profession in dealing with

1 constituents. There are all over the map.

2 To go back to Dr. Edmondson, you had  
3 asked for a lengthened extension period. What  
4 reasonable -- what are -- you have a date in  
5 mind or a time frame in mind?

6 DR. EDMONDSON: Right now, the  
7 extension that we have applied for, that gives  
8 us six months to revisit this, but I think  
9 overall it would be nice if we could have  
10 another year, have a group of teacher  
11 educators across the state to look at that and  
12 reevaluate and make better decisions about  
13 what's going to be happening both with the  
14 guidelines for teacher certification, and  
15 program review.

16 I think there needs to be revisions  
17 to what's in front us.

18 REPRESENTATIVE FLECK: And I would  
19 agree as far as the remarks of the new  
20 administration coming through. I think No  
21 Child Left Behind is going to be here in some  
22 format, but I think every administration has  
23 their little comments on what they want to  
24 change, and the implication -- ramifications  
25 could reverse.

1 Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Thank you.

3 Any other questions?

4 Just to be clear, in your testimony,  
5 Dr. DeBoy, you mentioned that the elementary  
6 certificate currently is K through six. So is  
7 there a separate six through nine certificate  
8 for middle?

9 DR. DEBOY: Currently, there is.  
10 It's early childhood or elementary, which is K  
11 through six, and then it goes to the secondary  
12 content areas, which is seven through twelve.

13 CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: So it's -- so  
14 you're talking what is now two and dividing it  
15 into three, is what we're doing?

16 DR. DEBOY: Yes.

17 DR. EDMONDSON: Sort of. We haven't  
18 had a middle school certification in  
19 Pennsylvania right now. Some people who hold  
20 an Instructional I certificate can take a  
21 middle-level Praxis test to be certified to  
22 teach middle school. But we haven't had  
23 certification for middle schools, and I would  
24 argue that four-eight certificate in front of  
25 us is really not a middle school certificate

1 because it prepares elementary and middle  
2 school teachers. And so there's a tension  
3 between preparing a generalist for fourth,  
4 fifth, and sixth grade and then the content  
5 specialist in seventh and eighth.

6 CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: I've never  
7 understood when I've seen teachers in the  
8 elementary school session as -- elementary  
9 school environment in Philadelphia, they're  
10 converting all elementary schools to K to  
11 eighth. If you're in first grade this year and  
12 eighth grade next year, what that does to your  
13 ability to be a good teacher. But --

14 DR. EDMONDSON: I don't disagree that  
15 that's a huge challenge. I think we need  
16 really thoughtful middle school preparation of  
17 teachers, and then you need thoughtful early  
18 childhood programs, the preparation of  
19 teachers. And I think what we have in front  
20 of us with four-eight certificate isn't that.

21 CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Okay. Thank you.

22 Thank you very much.

23 We come then to our final panel.

24 Dr. Garland.

25 DR. GARLAND: Thank you.

1           I'd just, like the predecessors, I  
2 will speak on some comments as participating  
3 in this hearing that I think will be helpful  
4 to the committee.

5           Again, my name is Peter Garland. I'm  
6 executive vice chancellor for the Pennsylvania  
7 State System of Higher Education.

8           As you probably know, this is core  
9 business for us in terms of preparing  
10 teachers. Approximately thirty thousand of  
11 our hundred and twenty thousand students at  
12 the undergraduate and graduate level are in  
13 some way majoring in education or education-  
14 related fields.

15           We have taken this incredibly  
16 seriously from day one, but I think there's  
17 some observations that perhaps I can give you  
18 that may be helpful in your debate over these  
19 issues.

20           First, as I've sat here today, I've  
21 noticed that a large amount of the  
22 conversation has been challenging whether or  
23 not Chapter 49-2, as it is currently the  
24 regulatory requirements in Pennsylvania,  
25 challenging the grade-level discrimination and

1 others. And I really thought that the purpose  
2 here today is really talking about the  
3 guideline or implementing that regulation,  
4 rather than, once again, challenging the grade  
5 levels that were determined in that  
6 regulation.

7 I understand the controversy behind  
8 those, but I think it would be helpful if we  
9 all sort of focus on the implementation issues  
10 in dealing with those individual certificate  
11 areas at the preK-through-fourth grade, four-  
12 through-eight level, and at the secondary  
13 level.

14 Also, I want to offer comment that  
15 many of my colleagues here who also  
16 participated in the Commission on Training  
17 America's -- Training Tomorrow's Teachers.  
18 I'll cite various portions of that -- that --  
19 recommendation from that report that challenge  
20 some of the current limitation.

21 I just want to remind all parties  
22 that one of the things we did say in that  
23 report was the fact that, as we look at the  
24 four-through-eighth-grade-level certification,  
25 that one of the strong recommendations in



1 there was that we currently do not have  
2 sufficient levels of content knowledge in the  
3 upper elementary years that will enable our  
4 student to be able to succeed in fields like  
5 math and science and other related fields.  
6 There was a strong call in that paper for  
7 adding the content in the fourth-through-  
8 eighth-grade levels that would help  
9 individuals as they move through the upper  
10 elementary years.

11 As a perspective, I'm going to offer  
12 really as a entity, the Office of the  
13 Chancellor, working with the fourteen  
14 universities on implementing this regulation,  
15 and what our experience has been today as we  
16 have worked very closely with our fourteen  
17 constituent universities.

18 You will have heard from at least two  
19 of our deans and others, and there certainly  
20 has been questions, concerns as we move  
21 through this process, but, again, since this  
22 is core business, we've worked very hard to  
23 make certain that the guidelines could be  
24 implemented fully, on time and on schedule, to  
25 meet the needs not only of our university but

1 of the thousands of students that they serve.

2 We have found, as we've begun to  
3 review preliminary documents coming from our  
4 universities, several of them have already  
5 submitted their proposed programs indeed to be  
6 reviewed by our office, approved by the board  
7 of governors before submission to the  
8 Pennsylvania Department of Education.

9 First, let me assure you that we have  
10 every anticipation that should those  
11 institutions that choose to follow the current  
12 time schedule without an extension or those  
13 that are prepared to meet the extension  
14 deadlines, we will be ready to -- prepared to  
15 enter our students in the fall of 2009 or the  
16 fall of 2010, as might be the institution's  
17 perspective.

18 We have found as those documents have  
19 come through, that, yes, there are additional  
20 credits that have reduced some flexibility in  
21 terms of what institutions may have  
22 constructed, but there is considerable  
23 flexibility, and not what many of my  
24 colleagues have said heretofore was no  
25 flexibility, just absolute lockstep,

1 standardized curriculum.

2 We have not found that in our review  
3 of those documents as we have worked with our  
4 universities.

5 Also, we have found that -- that the  
6 faculty matrix, which has also been a point of  
7 great concern here, is one that -- granted, I  
8 think as we all received that and began to  
9 work with it, was something that was very new  
10 to us. It is not necessarily new in other  
11 professional fields in other states, whether  
12 accreditation requirements to line faculty up  
13 with their experiences and their education, to  
14 make certain they have the content knowledge  
15 necessary to teach their areas.

16 We have found that -- we do not  
17 believe that there will be any faculty that  
18 are currently teaching for as adjunct faculty  
19 that are teaching that won't be able to,  
20 through a combination of education,  
21 experience, and prior teaching of courses  
22 specifically designed for them, that they will  
23 have problems meeting those requirements.

24 It's very new for us. It is  
25 something very different for all of us to go

1 through on this process, but we do not  
2 anticipate problems in implementing the  
3 faculty matrix. In fact, actually feel it  
4 will be a point of pride for our universities  
5 to be able to say to a discerning public that  
6 you need not question whether or not the  
7 faculty you have in the classes actually have  
8 the content knowledge, skills, and background  
9 to be able to teach their courses.

10 Those are general comments. I  
11 don't want to belabor things, looking at the  
12 late hour and three other people to speak, but  
13 I'd be happy to answer questions when we each  
14 finish our testimony.

15 CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Thank you.

16 DR. PATTERSON: Good afternoon. And  
17 thank you for giving me this opportunity to be  
18 here.

19 My name is Donna Patterson. I am  
20 associate dean and director of field services  
21 at the -- in the College of Education and  
22 Human Services at Clarion University of  
23 Pennsylvania.

24 And I'm pleased to be here today to  
25 testify in support of this implementation of

1 Chapter 49-2. This is a needed revision of  
2 the requirements for teacher education  
3 programs in Pennsylvania.

4 I am going to stick somewhat to my  
5 written testimony, because, as I sit here  
6 today, I have not heard some comments that I'm  
7 about to make with regard to this situation.

8 My purpose today is to address my  
9 support for the inclusion of the faculty  
10 matrix and the credit requirements for the new  
11 certificate programs, precisely those areas  
12 that some of my colleagues have criticized.

13 First, let me preface my remarks with  
14 a brief overview of my own professional  
15 experience. This is my thirty-eighth year in  
16 public education in Pennsylvania, my first  
17 twenty years in a public school as a teacher,  
18 guidance counselor and administrator. My area  
19 of teaching was elementary and secondary  
20 special education.

21 I then moved into higher education at  
22 Edinboro University, first as a faculty member  
23 then into administration. And six years ago,  
24 I moved to my present position at Clarion  
25 University.

1                   One of my charges as the associate  
2 dean is to direct the Office of Field  
3 Services. This office is responsible for  
4 placement and supervision of all senior field  
5 and student teachers in all teacher-  
6 preparation programs in our college. We have  
7 similar offices throughout the 95 colleges and  
8 universities that have teacher-preparation  
9 programs in the state.

10                   Through this position, I communicate  
11 regularly with regional teachers, principals,  
12 and superintendents regarding the preparation  
13 of our soon-to-be teachers. I see the changes  
14 in curriculum at the public school level and  
15 try to help our curriculum, revised, to meet  
16 these changes at the higher ed level.

17                   And although we all like to think  
18 that we are always ready to change, it has  
19 been my experience that change only comes when  
20 it is required by higher authority.

21                   Let me turn my page. Here we are.

22                   Now, three years ago, let me start --  
23 we began in 2005 at Clarion University. We  
24 heard these discussions of change. We went to  
25 the meetings, those hundred-fifty-plus

1 meetings across the state. Both faculty and  
2 administration for my university attended  
3 these. We knew we were getting a lot of ideas  
4 about what the new guidelines would be, and  
5 realizing that change does take time in higher  
6 ed, we started our process, knowing that  
7 whatever was finalized would be close to what  
8 we were going to do.

9 Our initial steps were to align our  
10 curricula to national standards, and we, of  
11 course, looking at our four main professional  
12 accreditation bodies, the Counsel for  
13 Exception Children, Association for Early  
14 Childhood Education International, the  
15 National Association for the Education of  
16 Young Children, and the National Council for  
17 Accreditation of Teacher Education.

18 And we also aligned our curricula to  
19 the test topic for the Praxis II. What we  
20 found was more than surprising.

21 Our standards and curricula matrices  
22 shows that our curriculum included significant  
23 repetition in some standards across many  
24 courses. What this really meant is that we  
25 were spinning our wheels in too many

1 classrooms over multiple semesters. This  
2 exercise told us that we had to change,  
3 whether or not the new guidelines came into  
4 effect.

5 Thus, three years ago, we -- our  
6 faculty across the curriculum -- College of  
7 Arts and Sciences as well as the College of  
8 Education and Human Services -- at our  
9 university, we began to write new courses, and  
10 we began to align with both our national  
11 accreditation standards and the Praxis II test  
12 topics.

13 Writing new courses brought us to  
14 another realization. We did not have to offer  
15 as many professional core courses to meet the  
16 new standards. This was particularly helpful  
17 in our dual-major programs, like early  
18 childhood and special ed or elementary and  
19 special ed.

20 Prior to the changes in Chapter 49-2  
21 our dual-major programs often totaled as many  
22 as a hundred fifty credits and took a minimum  
23 of five years to complete. These new  
24 standards now easily fit into the new courses  
25 that we developed, and the dual programs come



1 in well within the hundred twenty-six to a  
2 hundred thirty credit range.

3 I'd also like to point out that in  
4 the past three years we have included  
5 undergraduate students actively in this  
6 process. We have an organization we call  
7 TESAC -- that's Teacher Education Student  
8 Advisory Council -- in our college made up of  
9 majors from across both colleges, I should  
10 say, arts and science, and education. But it  
11 includes the secondary ed, elementary, early  
12 childhood, special education majors.

13 That body averages at this time --  
14 this started about forty-three members. We  
15 are now about a hundred eighteen, and all of  
16 those students have been actively involved in  
17 various points in this process.

18 Our single majors fit into the  
19 hundred-and-twenty-credit, four-year plan,  
20 with room for course concentrations that in  
21 the past have been very unwieldy.

22 So when the new Chapter 49-2  
23 guidelines came out, we were pleased that our  
24 programs were already very close to the new  
25 regulations. The credit requirements for the

1 new certificate programs provided clear  
2 direction for how to structure the curriculum  
3 to meet the standards.

4 This specificity is quite helpful.  
5 If it had been present in the old guidelines,  
6 the duplication that I mentioned earlier would  
7 not have evolved over the years, increasing  
8 credit requirements and expenses in higher  
9 education.

10 As has been discussed in previous  
11 testimony about Chapter 354, Section 25,  
12 paragraph two, it does state that the  
13 preparing institution shall ensure that the  
14 preparation program curriculum does not  
15 include unnecessary duplication of course work  
16 and strives to create efficient professional  
17 educator preparation.

18 In my opinion, the new program credit  
19 requirements served to ensure that there is no  
20 duplication and that the standards are met.

21 Some say that these new guidelines  
22 are too specific and violate institutional  
23 autonomy. However, I sincerely disagree. It  
24 is important that these guidelines communicate  
25 clearly and detail the criteria against which

1 each program will be judged. This has not  
2 been the case for quite some time. Now that  
3 the credits are identified, programs can  
4 better identify the standard placement within  
5 course sequence.

6 Chapter 354 in the past has  
7 identified the number of courses in certain  
8 areas -- in related areas for program  
9 development. What we've done now is simply --  
10 instead of saying two courses, we're saying  
11 six credits, or twelve credits, instead of  
12 four courses.

13 So to look at the credits, to say it  
14 is so prescriptive I believe is not the  
15 problem that some people think it should be.

16 I strongly support the faculty matrix  
17 also in the program guidelines. Just as any  
18 job description identifies the qualifications  
19 needed for instruction, this matrix identified  
20 faculty qualifications needed for standards-  
21 based education.

22 Chapter 354 does require the  
23 university or college to hire qualified  
24 education faculty; however, in the past, the  
25 qualifications were not always as detailed as

1 they are now.

2 The matrix provides an objective  
3 structure through which faculty can meet the  
4 qualifications in several ways. For example,  
5 in the past, someone with a doctorate in  
6 curriculum and instruction may be hired to  
7 teach educational curriculum without any  
8 specific expertise in a certain curriculum  
9 area. Thus, faculty could be teaching  
10 specific grade level curriculum in which they  
11 themselves have never had actual experience.  
12 The matrix ensures that faculty will have  
13 related experience.

14 And I can testify that the adjunct  
15 faculty that we have that teach these courses  
16 actually have an easier time of meeting this  
17 faculty matrix than some of our tenured  
18 faculty because they come to us with  
19 certifications and vast numbers of years of  
20 experience and professional development.

21 Our public school teachers are  
22 required to complete professional  
23 development. And this matrix now provides a  
24 way for higher education faculty to show their  
25 qualifications through professional

1 development related to the teacher education  
2 courses.

3 Some may argue that faculty are  
4 required to do this evaluation or promotion in  
5 the institutions. But there are so many  
6 different ways to accomplish that, without  
7 direction, a professor may never get what is  
8 needed for the program. This matrix simply  
9 provides better direction through which to  
10 identify faculty qualifications.

11 And as I've said throughout this  
12 testimony today, we -- Pennsylvania does  
13 prepare teachers for the whole country, not  
14 just Pennsylvania. And I don't think that the  
15 new Chapter 49-2 guidelines are going to hurt  
16 that in any way.

17 As a matter of fact, I think it's  
18 going to prepare better teachers and that our  
19 Pennsylvania teachers are going to be even  
20 more in demand across the country than they  
21 are now.

22 And I'll be glad to take any  
23 questions you might have. Thank you.

24 DR. MCGOUGH: Good afternoon.

25 My name is Mike McGough. I'm the

1 chair of the Department of Education from York  
2 College of Pennsylvania.

3 York College, like other colleges and  
4 the universities in the Commonwealth, is  
5 currently seeking to revise our teacher-  
6 preparation program so as to align with  
7 Pennsylvania Chapter 49-2 program  
8 regulations.

9 We currently offer teacher prep  
10 programs in elementary education, dual  
11 elementary and special education, secondary  
12 certifications in biology, English, general  
13 science, math, social studies, and a K-12  
14 certification in music.

15 Our goal has always been, is now and  
16 always will be to provide programs that align  
17 with Pennsylvania Department of Education  
18 regulations, meet various certifying agency  
19 criteria, address the mission of York College,  
20 and focus on the contemporary needs of local  
21 education agencies in Pennsylvania and other  
22 states where our graduates enter professional  
23 practice. And above all, we want to do what  
24 we can to best serve our students.

25 Accomplishing all of these while

1 meeting the new requirements of Chapter 49-2  
2 is indeed a challenge.

3           As a department, we began our process  
4 more than three years ago with a careful and  
5 thorough mapping of our curricula, coupled  
6 with a redesign of our format and syllabus-  
7 development process. These initial steps,  
8 designed in anticipation of the release of  
9 Chapter 49-2, were undertaken so as to better  
10 position the college to meet the program  
11 revisions that were at that point just  
12 anticipated.

13           With the release of Chapter 49-2, we  
14 then began in earnest a careful process of  
15 total program review, research in various  
16 alternatives for updating and revising our  
17 programs, and implementation of necessary and  
18 advisable changes.

19           This process has involved all members  
20 of our department, chairs of various  
21 departments at York College, subject area  
22 coordinators, a host of interested professors,  
23 several advisory boards and committees, local  
24 school district and intermediate unit  
25 representatives, and the administration of our

1 college.

2 Thus far, ours has been a  
3 comprehensive initiative that has, by  
4 necessity, been long and at times a little  
5 tedious.

6 So as to support the efforts of our  
7 department while keeping all interested  
8 individuals and those with a vested interest  
9 engaged and informed, we have, for the past  
10 year, conducted regular meetings to share  
11 updates, apprise of changes and revisions to  
12 Chapter 49-2 regulations, shared input  
13 received from other colleges and universities,  
14 and provide individuals which the opportunity  
15 to question, suggest, and to share. We have  
16 one of those update meetings scheduled for 4  
17 o'clock this afternoon.

18 As a result, our process has  
19 progressed at a steady pace and has done so in  
20 what we see as a positive direction.

21 Throughout the process, we've had a  
22 positive and thorough level of support and  
23 guidance from the Pennsylvania Department of  
24 Education. We have taken part in meetings and  
25 seminars scheduled and offered by the



1 department.

2 In addition, we have availed  
3 ourselves of the opportunity to meet  
4 individually with the department's  
5 representatives to facilitate our efforts.

6 Specifically, we have met with  
7 Christina Baumer, Higher Education Program  
8 Manager; Joel Geary, Higher Education  
9 Associate; and Katherine Heeren, Higher  
10 Education Associate Liaison, all of the  
11 Division of Professional Education, Bureau of  
12 School Leadership and Teacher Quality. As  
13 needed, we have also worked with Clifton  
14 Edwards of the same division.

15 To the professional credit of these  
16 individuals and the department they represent,  
17 we have found this working relationship to be  
18 supportive, personable, professional, and  
19 extremely helpful.

20 Our meetings are highly purposeful,  
21 clearly focused, and we come away with the  
22 information needed to continue our work. The  
23 accessibility that we have found speaks  
24 clearly to the department's desire to support  
25 colleges and universities in their efforts to

1 make the changes mandated by Chapter 49-2  
2 while providing a level of flexibility to  
3 support our efforts to do that which is best  
4 for our students while preserving our  
5 institutional mission and providing excellent  
6 teachers for the 21st century.

7 Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Thank you.

9 DR. MCGOVERN: Good afternoon,  
10 Chairman Roebuck and members of the  
11 committee. Thank you for the opportunity to  
12 appear before this committee.

13 My name is Michael McGovern. I'm  
14 vice president for academic affairs at  
15 Northampton Community College in the Lehigh  
16 Valley, Monroe County.

17 And I'm here today to offer remarks  
18 on behalf of the fourteen community colleges  
19 and in support of the proposed 49-2 regulation  
20 regarding teacher ed programs.

21 I believe our perspective is a little  
22 different from other testimony presented to  
23 the committee today. Before I begin, I want  
24 to take a moment to offer a bit of a contest.  
25 As you know, in June of 2006, the legislature

1 adopted Act 114, providing for articulation  
2 and transfer between the community colleges  
3 and the PASSHE universities. Act 114 provides  
4 a framework to bring institutions of higher ed  
5 together to establish effective transfer  
6 arrangements for a minimum of thirty  
7 foundation credits.

8 While it's not yet the full faith and  
9 transfer of the associate degree that our  
10 community colleges support and continue to  
11 advocate, it is a good starting point,  
12 nonetheless. And we value the work of the  
13 state Transfer and Articulating Oversight  
14 Committee and hope that it can lead to the  
15 next phase, that being moving toward a fully  
16 articulate baccalaureate continuum.

17 I raise the issue of articulation and  
18 transfer because we believe the proposed 49-2  
19 regulations further the initial efforts of Act  
20 114 by providing for seamless articulation of  
21 early childhood associate degree programs into  
22 baccalaureate degree programs that lead to the  
23 preK-through-four certification.

24 This, among other current efforts  
25 around teacher ed, is an articulation model

1 that supports the development of well-  
2 qualified early childhood teachers.

3 The department has also emphasized  
4 the importance of articulation agreements by  
5 making them a condition of program approval  
6 under these proposed guidelines.

7 The Chapter 49-2 regulations before  
8 us today were developed by educators in  
9 Pennsylvania's public and private colleges and  
10 universities who have expertise in teacher ed  
11 directly related to the ages of the children  
12 who will be served at the various  
13 certification levels.

14 So the program guidelines and  
15 requirements are based upon research and are  
16 consistent with best practice and they're  
17 aligned with the alphabet agencies, the NCATE  
18 agency and the National Association for the  
19 Education of Young Children and their  
20 accreditation standards.

21 I'm not going to raise specifics with  
22 regard to the regulations. Much of the  
23 department's comments and those of other  
24 groups, such as the Pennsylvania American  
25 Associate Degree Early Childhood Educators, PA

1 ACCESS, and the Pennsylvania Association of  
2 Early Childhood Teacher Educators extensively  
3 addressed those areas of proposal.

4 The Pennsylvania Commission for  
5 Community Colleges offers its support for the  
6 49-2 regulation as proposed. The current  
7 guidelines represent research-based best  
8 practice and are developed in a way to ensure  
9 that future educators are provided content and  
10 methods that are best suited for teaching  
11 young children.

12 The use of the proposed faculty  
13 matrix will also help ensure that faculty  
14 members assigned to teach in the certification  
15 program have the breadth and depth of  
16 knowledge about the unique development nature  
17 of children in this age group.

18 Without the guidelines for both  
19 content and faculty qualifications, it will  
20 not be possible to ensure that the  
21 improvements that are the intent of the new  
22 certification areas will be achieved.

23 The true dilemma for us with the  
24 proposed regulations may be in the time line,  
25 not because the time line is not doable from

1       our perspective, but because of the need for  
2       alignment across the sectors. The  
3       universities are revising their existing  
4       programs to comply with the new regulations.  
5       However, before community colleges can align  
6       their curriculum with their transfer  
7       institutions, the four-year colleges and  
8       universities must obviously decide what their  
9       requirements are going to be.

10               Northampton and East Stroudsburg  
11       University, for instance, have already  
12       developed a program-to-program articulation  
13       model that we believe will be ready to go. We  
14       have also initiated conversations with other  
15       PASSHE universities, including West Chester,  
16       Millersville, and Kutztown.

17               In addition, because community  
18       colleges enroll students in the first two  
19       years of those programs, it is important that  
20       we be involved in the conversation at the  
21       front end of the curriculum changes so that  
22       our students can transfer efficiently.

23               The numbers of community college  
24       students that transfer into the education  
25       majors at our state's public and private

1 universities continues to be substantial and  
2 one that has steadily increased.

3 I can give you an example. At  
4 Northampton, for instance, in any given year,  
5 there may be a ballpark figure of some five  
6 hundred students enrolled in either the  
7 associate degree in early childhood ed or the  
8 broader program in pre-teacher education. We  
9 graduate about one hundred fifty of those  
10 students every year. Seventy-five percent of  
11 them transfer, and most of those students  
12 transfer to PASSHE universities.

13 Given this, the coordination of these  
14 issues among the higher education sectors is  
15 obviously vital. Community colleges have been  
16 and will continue to be an important pipeline  
17 for tomorrow's teachers.

18 We have much work to do within all  
19 sectors of higher education to bring programs  
20 into alignment with the new requirements. The  
21 commission urges the Education Committee to  
22 allow the Chapter 49.2 regulation to move  
23 forward -- we respectfully request that -- as  
24 proposed so that all institutions can engage  
25 in the dialogue that must occur, and sooner

1           rather than later, for the benefit of our  
2           students who will be seeking to enter these  
3           education majors in the next academic year.

4                       Thank you very much for your time,  
5           and like all the others, I'd be happy to  
6           answer any questions that you might have.

7                       CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Thank you.

8                       Questions?

9                       REPRESENTATIVE FLECK: Yes. Thank  
10          you, Mr. Chairman.

11                      I guess, Dr. Patterson, by the very  
12          size of your program, I mean the state system  
13          and such, you're not going to have the same  
14          issues as the independent and other  
15          universities; correct? I mean, it's just the  
16          nature, I mean --

17                      DR. PATTERSON: Are you talking --

18                      REPRESENTATIVE FLECK: For the vice  
19          chancellor.

20                      DR. PATTERSON: I'm not so sure at  
21          which point you're referring to. We graduate  
22          about four hundred teachers a year. And our  
23          enrollment is around seven thousand right now,  
24          about a thousand at grad level. And our  
25          College of Education and Human Services is the



1 largest of the three colleges on campus. So  
2 as far as --

3 REPRESENTATIVE FLECK: The new  
4 changes will be easier to implement, correct,  
5 based on sheer numbers of a smaller  
6 independent school where you have only a few  
7 dozen students?

8 DR. PATTERSON: I would say that we  
9 have a communication across the colleges  
10 within our university, which has made it  
11 easier. Also, we have a forty-eight-credit  
12 general education program and then seventy-  
13 two-credit minimum would give you a hundred  
14 twenty credits in your four-year doable  
15 program.

16 I would like to address that Dr. Shaw  
17 mentioned earlier about some of the education  
18 courses being allowed now to be in the general  
19 education side, as we call it, the left side  
20 of the check sheet. That has happened at our  
21 university and came on a couple years ago,  
22 actually.

23 This now gives the students an  
24 opportunity to try out education, to  
25 investigate the possibility of becoming a

1 teacher without having to come in on day one  
2 of their freshman year and say, I'm going to  
3 be a teacher, and then following through.  
4 They do have the opportunity.

5 And also, I was a guidance counselor  
6 at the secondary level for nine years before  
7 in my twenty-year span there, and I can tell  
8 you that, you know, students don't know what  
9 they want to do when they graduate from high  
10 school. But now, with these new guidelines,  
11 and then with our system being able to offer  
12 some education courses that are in general ed  
13 area, they now have an opportunity to explore  
14 what they did not have before.

15 I don't know that it's -- in our  
16 state system, we may have an easier time of  
17 it. I would say that maybe our communication  
18 structure gives us an opportunity to  
19 collaborate better across the system.

20 REPRESENTATIVE FLECK: Okay. Thank  
21 you.

22 And for Dr. Garland, does your  
23 marketing change for the universities that are  
24 on the perimeter of the commonwealth, I mean,  
25 Mansfield and others, where you're attracting

1 -- I assume you're attracting a lot of out-of-  
2 state students coming in for the teacher?

3 DR. GARLAND: Typically, they have  
4 marketed out of state for -- the perimeter  
5 institutions have marketed out of state so  
6 that the strength -- the existing strength and  
7 quality of our education program has always  
8 been something that's helped attract students.

9 We have worked very carefully with --  
10 we did work carefully to make certain that we  
11 have the reciprocity necessary for those who  
12 may come in from New York to attend school at  
13 Mansfield that want to return to a community  
14 in New York and teach and be able to do that  
15 kind of thing.

16 We have not typically run into those  
17 difficulties as we've moved along, and we  
18 don't anticipate difficulties.

19 REPRESENTATIVE FLECK: And just one  
20 follow-up question for the last two gentlemen.  
21 You had talked about the success of PDE in  
22 working with you in implementing these new  
23 guidelines and such, which is admirable, and I  
24 would hope that that's how it would go.

25 But did you have any issues

1           whatsoever as far as implementation that you  
2           went to them and said, Can you correct this or  
3           can we work on this, and that was addressed?

4                   DR. MCGOVERN: I think from the  
5           community college perspective, it's on a  
6           university-to-university basis. Because of  
7           the proximity and because of the number of  
8           students that transfer from Northampton to  
9           East Stroudsburg, the relationship there was  
10          very smooth because people know each other and  
11          they have been working on it for quite a  
12          while.

13                   With regard to the other  
14          universities, in some cases, they contacted us  
15          to tell us that they hadn't -- hadn't yet  
16          formulated their requirements. And in some  
17          cases we contacted them.

18                   I would characterize the  
19          relationships for our institution as being  
20          cordial, but a little bit inconclusive and has  
21          created an air of uncertainty among our  
22          faculty as to how far they can proceed until  
23          we get together with the universities.

24                   DR. MCGOUGH: I know at York College,  
25          our relationship with PDE has been extremely

1       supportive and excellent contact at any -- and  
2       we've taken quite a number of suggestions, if  
3       you will, to PDE. They've been extremely  
4       receptive to it and helped us to align what we  
5       want to try to do so that we can continue to  
6       represent our mission, represent our students,  
7       and be in compliance with 49.2 guidelines. So  
8       it's been very seamless for us.

9               DR. GARLAND: I'd also like to make a  
10       comment on that because obviously there's a  
11       strong interest for us today because we're  
12       representing fourteen universities. We had  
13       lots of issues and concerns and things we  
14       liked and things we didn't like, and were in  
15       constant communication with the department and  
16       found lots of changes and receptivity. Not  
17       everything changed that we liked, but it was  
18       an open dialogue and iterative process, both  
19       in public meetings as well as through e-mail  
20       exchanges, ideas, suggestions throughout that  
21       process.

22               DR. MCGOUGH: In fact, from York  
23       College's experience, we were in such close  
24       contact with PDE that they actually took it  
25       upon themselves -- they would take time to

1 bring a team down to the college and work with  
2 us. We then, for next meeting, would go up  
3 and work with them. So it's been --

4 REPRESENTATIVE FLECK: You didn't get  
5 their bill yet.

6 DR. MCGOUGH: Say it again? Say it  
7 again?

8 REPRESENTATIVE FLECK: You didn't get  
9 their bill yet, though, for that.

10 DR. MCGOVERN: If I can expand on  
11 that too, our relationship with the department  
12 was also extremely cooperative.

13 REPRESENTATIVE FLECK: That's all.  
14 Thank you for your testimony.

15 CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Thank you.

16 Representative McIlvaine Smith.

17 REPRESENTATIVE MCILVAINE SMITH: I  
18 just wanted to know, are you the three schools  
19 that had -- no. Just was curious. Thank  
20 you. Three out of ninety-four.

21 CHAIRMAN ROEBUCK: Other questions?

22 Like to thank our final panel.

23 And let me, just by way of making  
24 concluding remarks, note that testimony was  
25 submitted by PA ACCESS, Pennsylvania American

1 Associate Degree Early Childhood Educators,  
2 and by Kent Chrisman, chairman of the  
3 Pennsylvania Association of Early Childhood  
4 Teacher Educators.

5 I'd certainly like to thank all of  
6 our presenters for providing us with a wealth  
7 of information and stimulating a very lively  
8 discussion.

9 I'd like to thank our audience for  
10 being here and particularly thank our  
11 students, who just disappeared.

12 I'd like to thank our members of our  
13 committee.

14 And, finally, want to thank as always  
15 our recorder for her excellent service.

16 The meeting stands adjourned. Thank  
17 you.

18 1:07 p.m.

19

20

\* \* \* \* \*

21

22

23

24

25

## WRITTEN STATEMENT

1  
2  
3 PA ACCESS statement in support of  
4 maintaining the current preK-4 guidelines and  
5 program approval process, presented to the  
6 Pennsylvania House Education Committee,  
7 November 13th.

8 PA American Associate Degree Early  
9 Childhood Education (PA ACCESS) with  
10 representation from Pennsylvania colleges  
11 offering associate degrees in early childhood  
12 education, including the fourteen community  
13 colleges, is writing in support of  
14 Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE)  
15 current preK-4 certification guidelines,  
16 program approval process and faculty  
17 qualification matrix. The guidelines were  
18 developed by Pennsylvania college educators  
19 from public and private institutions who have  
20 expertise in teacher education directly  
21 related to the ages of children who will be  
22 served in the preK-4 certification area. It  
23 is evident that the current guidelines are  
24 based upon research and are consistent with  
25 best practice and aligned with National



1 Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education  
2 (NCATE) and the National Association for the  
3 Education of Young Children (NAEYC) Associate  
4 degree accreditation standards.

5 We believe it is imperative that the  
6 guidelines maintain specific emphasis on child  
7 development, age appropriate content,  
8 methodology and assessment that support best  
9 practice for all children in the preK-4 age  
10 level. In addition to the developmental  
11 emphasis, content that is focused on the  
12 dynamics of the family is essential to  
13 providing a framework to support all families  
14 and children in the Commonwealth. It is also  
15 imperative that pre-service teachers be  
16 exposed to experiential learning within the  
17 context of all age levels and program types  
18 within their area of teacher certification.  
19 These experiences should be offered often,  
20 early and applied systematically to theory  
21 taught in relevant course work.

22 The current preK-4 program guidelines  
23 for seamless articulation of early childhood  
24 associate degree programs into baccalaureate  
25 degree programs that lead to preK-4 teacher

1 certification. This articulation model  
2 supports the development of well qualified  
3 early childhood teachers, follows the PA Early  
4 Learning Career Lattice and builds quality  
5 education for all young children in  
6 Pennsylvania. Allowing institutions to  
7 eliminate credit requirements and rely solely  
8 on a competency framework will jeopardize this  
9 seamless articulation and impact the depth of  
10 knowledge and skills of teachers.

11 Additionally, the work of the PA Office of  
12 Child Development and Early Learning (OCDEL)  
13 in the area of early childhood career  
14 preparation and workforce development; as well  
15 as program to program articulation in ECE will  
16 suffer serious setbacks if the current  
17 framework is revised.

18 In addition to maintaining the credit  
19 and competency framework of the preK-4  
20 guidelines it is essential to uphold the use  
21 of the Faculty Qualification Matrix. The  
22 purpose of this matrix is to ensure that  
23 faculty preparing preK-4 teachers have the  
24 theoretical, pedagogical and experiential  
25 expertise specific to the content and

1 competencies of the courses they teach.  
2 Modification and adjustments to the matrix  
3 criteria would impact the knowledge base and  
4 outcomes for teacher preparation. The current  
5 framework and recommended process of Chapter  
6 49.2 guidelines sets forth expectations for  
7 teachers of young children regardless of the  
8 location of the teaching to support the  
9 promise of high quality education for all  
10 children in the Commonwealth.

11 PA ACCESS recommends that the House  
12 Education Committee retain the current  
13 guidelines and program approval process as  
14 written. The current guidelines represent  
15 research based best practice and are developed  
16 in a way to ensure that future educators are  
17 provided content and methods that are best  
18 suited for teaching young children. The use  
19 of the faculty matrix will also ensure that  
20 faculty assigned to teach in the preK-4  
21 certification curriculum has the deep  
22 knowledge of the unique developmental nature  
23 of children in this age group. Without the  
24 guidelines for both content and faculty  
25 qualifications it will not be possible to

1 ensure that the improvements that are the  
2 intent of the new preK-4 certification areas  
3 will be achieved.

4           Respectfully submitted on November  
5 13, 2008, by: Robin Eckert, President,  
6 PA ACCESS, Associate Professor/Coordinator  
7 Early Childhood Education, Reading Area  
8 Community College; Cyndi Syskowski, Treasurer,  
9 PA ACCESS, Associate Professor, Family and  
10 Child Studies/Education and Child Development,  
11 Community College Allegheny County; Jacque  
12 Black, Assistant Professor Early Childhood  
13 Education, Community College, Beaver County;  
14 Amy Saia, Professor Early Childhood Education  
15 Program, Community College of Philadelphia;  
16 Judith Wadding, Professor/Coordinator Early  
17 Childhood Education, Butler County Community  
18 College; Jean Allison, Professor Early  
19 Childhood Education, Delaware County Community  
20 College; Judy Sherwood, Professor/Campus  
21 Assistant-Lancaster, Harrisburg Area Community  
22 College; Melanie Wursta, Teacher Education  
23 Coordinator, Lehigh Carbon Community College;  
24 Lynne Pabst, Early Childhood Education  
25 Coordinator, Luzerne County Community College;

1 Rebecca Gorton, Director Early Childhood  
2 Education, Northampton County Community  
3 College; Debbie Levin, Professor/Coordinator  
4 Education, Montgomery County Community  
5 College; Barbara Albert, Professor Early  
6 Childhood Education, Penn College of  
7 Technology; Barbara Mitchell, Vice President  
8 PA ACCESS, Professor Early Childhood  
9 Education, Penn Highlands Community College.

10

11

\* \* \* \* \*

12

13

## WRITTEN STATEMENT

14

15

16

17

18

19

Statement in support of maintaining  
the current preK-4 guidelines and program  
approval process, presented to the  
Pennsylvania House Education Committee,  
November 13th.

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you for the opportunity to  
provide a written statement in support of  
Pennsylvania's cutting edge work to revamp our  
teacher preparation programs that were  
re-designed to strengthen and make them more  
accountable so that our children can get more

1 out of their experience in our public schools.  
2 My name is Kent Chrisman and I am the  
3 President of the Pennsylvania Association of  
4 Early Childhood Teacher Educators (PA AECTE).

5 I was privileged to have served as a  
6 member of the P-4 Guidelines Committee where I  
7 spent many days reading, reviewing, writing  
8 and discussing current research, national  
9 standards and documents from professional  
10 associations. Based on this work, the  
11 committee recommended what I believe, to be a  
12 framework that will best serve the needs of  
13 children in the Commonwealth in the p-4th  
14 grade age span. The components that include  
15 requirements for content in family  
16 involvement, child development and age  
17 appropriate content are consistent with  
18 current best practice and are grounded in  
19 evidence-based teacher education. The  
20 committee spent considerable time in  
21 referencing each professional association in  
22 reading, mathematics, science and social  
23 studies to gather their recommendations and  
24 standards. The guidelines committee also  
25 spent hours gathering research to support the

1 need for expanded field experiences for  
2 undergraduate students in teacher preparation  
3 programs.

4           The program, as it is currently  
5 designed and being advanced by the supportive  
6 work of the PA Department of Education, also  
7 supports the transfer and articulation of  
8 credits from 2 yr. institutions to 4 yr.  
9 institutions. This is particularly important  
10 for career and workforce development for those  
11 working in early childhood education. Through  
12 the competencies, found in the Program Review  
13 Guidelines, programs can easily transfer  
14 coursework from institution to institution  
15 without loss of credits. Additionally, the  
16 credit concept, as advanced in this initiative  
17 is helpful and useful, as we seek to assure  
18 sufficient local flexibility for the  
19 institutions of higher education. However,  
20 all institutions must contain sufficient  
21 commonalities that provide assurances that  
22 higher education can be counted upon for its  
23 important preparatory role in a fair and  
24 fundamental way throughout the Commonwealth.

25           The current guidelines and program

1 approval process as they are written are  
2 helpful and essential. I note in particular  
3 three aspects of this work that I believe are  
4 helpful: the competencies, the course  
5 credits, and the faculty matrix. The  
6 competencies and the course credits are  
7 essential to the integrity of the outcomes of  
8 a professional educator who understands the  
9 age level, content and methods for teaching  
10 young children. This is bolstered by the  
11 creation of the faculty matrix, which is  
12 designed to assure that those faculty members  
13 have devoted time to professional development  
14 in the area that they are teaching, have an  
15 extensive understanding of this content and  
16 are prepared to provide meaningful pedagogical  
17 experiences to teacher candidates. Without  
18 these assurances the outcomes of the teacher  
19 preparation cannot be guaranteed. We have all  
20 worked hard, in a thoughtful, disciplined  
21 process that has been organized by the state  
22 staff, to have a comprehensive approach to our  
23 needed overhaul of teacher preparation.

24 Submitted by: Kent Chrisman, Ed.D.,  
25 President, PA Association of Early Childhood



- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

Teacher Educators.

\* \* \* \* \*

## REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I was present upon the hearing of the above-entitled matter and there reported stenographically the proceedings had and the testimony produced; and I further certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of my said stenographic notes.

---

BRENDA J. PARDUN, RPR  
Court Reporter  
Notary Public