1. Minutes from October 23, 2002, meetings one and two were approved with the following amendments for meeting two: Bruce Bobick, Bob Hilliard (chair), and Scott McBride agreed to serve on the subcommittee for Professional Education Faculty Recruitment.

2. Dr. Tim Hynes discussed the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia Feedback on Institutional Report of Progress Towards Meeting Regents’ Principles for the Preparation of Educators for the Schools. Dr. Hynes’s comments were as follows:
   a. On the first page, last paragraph, consistency is important. The emphasis will be for each institution to provide evidence to support the ratings. Focus has moved from inputs to documentation of outputs and will affect how TEAC moves forward.
   b. Generally, the report is positive; the Board of Regents staff concurred generally rating the criteria with the same numeral as State University of West Georgia (UWG).
   c. There are grounds for improvement to move forward. Differences in ratings were where UWG thought that the standard was met but the Board of Regents wants more documentation. Dr. Hynes referred to the comment at the bottom of page 2.
   d. For Area II-A, Dr. Hynes stated that he believes that if UWG accomplishes what we say, the final report will be positive.
   e. Dr. Hynes’s recommendation is to contact other institutions that have made progress to see how it’s been done and if it can apply to UWG.
f. For Area II-B, we need to systematically use data and be persistent in finding out how to measure the students of student teachers. In other words, how to identify what students in schools need to know and be able to do. Students must demonstrate that they know things. Include this in the syllabi.
g. For Area III-D, work and evidence needs to be forthcoming for partner schools.

Dr. Hynes concluded that the issue is can our students bring their students to demonstrate that they know and can do. Dr. Hynes then addressed questions from TEAC. The first question concerned response time. The answer: Next May-June 2003 when the next set of reports are required.

Dr. Kent Layton made one observation for I-A where the score from the Board of Regents was zero. He did not want it to be perceived that no progress had been made in that area.

3. Dr. Judy Butler began the discussion of the content for the Professional Educational Seminar (SEED 4289). The Board of Regents Principles should remain. How the objectives were written and/or adding another objective was discussed. Secondary education faculty being more involved in the seminar and where the involvement would be most productive was discussed. Dr. Butler noted that the problems tend to be classroom management, not content since the GPA was raised to 2.7.

The discussion also included whether outcomes require involvement of the Professional Education Faculty. The question is how to make student teaching better. Dr. Denise Overfield summarized the discussion by asking the question: What will student teacher and their students be able to do at the end of their internship.

4. The next order of business was discussion of the Professional Education Faculty Subcommittee report draft. Questions that needed clarity are as follows: (a) How to define the faculty so that appears inclusive rather than exclusive. For example, faculty who teach in Area F and/or are involved in teacher education would want to be a part of the Professional Education Faculty Subcommittee. Denise and Brent will work on clarification for #1 and #5 of this draft. (b) A unified front should be presented. In other words, those on the Professional Education Faculty Subcommittee must “buy into” the conceptual framework. (c) The definition and nomination procedures must be ready for the December 4 meeting.

5. The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted, Alexa North
Acting Secretary