

2/21/08

CA Meeting - notes – morning meeting

Guiding Concept:

- We are attempting to do something that has never been accomplished in the field of Education of DHH...
 - The collaborative design of an innovative, effective and efficient model of doctoral student preparation for the field of Deaf Education
- While we are very fortunate to be guided in our efforts by the similar work that has been done in the field of Visual Impairment, we are faced with some unique challenges...
 - As a field we have many well established and firmly held “beliefs,” unfortunately we often lack sufficient data to substantiate those beliefs.
 - ... = we are much more a community of believers vs. learners
 - ...it is time to change
 - ...it is time to design and carry out studies to inform teaching and learning
 - ...it is time for ALL of us to become learners
 - ...this collaborative effort gives us ALL both the opportunity and the responsibility to work not only better, but differently
 - ...a difference that values learning over believing
- The opportunity represented by this collaborative effort is not simply to produce more faculty so that existing deaf education teacher preparation programs can survive...
 - ...our opportunity is to design a “community of learners” in which doctoral students and existing faculty at universities and colleges throughout the nation can design, fund and carryout research that is desperately needed to enhance teaching and learning with infants, toddlers, young children, K-12 students and adults who are Deaf/hard of hearing.

Individuals Present:

Grant CoPIs:

- Shirin Antia/University of Arizona: ph: (520) 621-0944 - santia@email.arizona.edu
- Harold Johnson/Michigan State University: ph (517) 432-3926 - hjohnson@msu.edu - video ph 35.8.171.220

Moderator:

- Kathleen Huebner/Pennsylvania College of Optometry: ph: (215) 780-1360 - Kathyh@pco.edu

Initial Planning Group (Most of these individuals represent universities that have doctoral programs).

- Jean Andrews/Lamar 409-880-1848, jean.andrews@lamar.edu
- Cindy Bailes/Gallaudet University: cynthia.bailes@gallaudet.edu
- Susan Easterbrooks/Georgia State University: ph: (404) 413-8040 - seasterbrooks@gsu.edu
- Bob Kretschmer/Teachers College: ph: (212) 678-3867 - kretschmer@exchange.tc.columbia.edu
- Susan Lenihan/Fontbonne College: ph: (314) 889-1461 - SLenihan@Fontbonne.edu
- John Luckner/University of Northern Colorado: ph: (970) 351-1672 - john.luckner@unco.edu
- Don Moores/University of Northern Florida: ph: (904) 620-1824 - donald.moores@unf.edu
- Claudia Pagliaro/Michigan State University: ph: (517) 353-5400 - pagliaro@msu.edu - video ph 35.8.174.160
- Peter Paul/Ohio State University: ph: (614) 292-8059 - paul.3@osu.edu

These individuals formed working groups. During this meeting they reported on the results of the working groups. Each group presented the work completed to date. Discussion followed.

Presentations & Major Decisions:

- **Data sets** – Harold Johnson
 - Key Information
 - Sharon Baker has data regarding faculty diversity – the working group should obtain these data from her.
 - AAD & GRI data is available but not complete as it does not count many students who are receiving services in school districts and students who spend most of their time in general education.
 - We need to obtain faculty survey information from Karen Dilka (and work with her to develop the questionnaire about faculty needs).
 - The doctoral students will need to combine their teacher preparation role with a researcher role. The teacher as researcher is a key concept that unites the teacher preparation & researcher roles. All faculty should contribute to the knowledge base. Faculty should not be only one or the other.
 - Future tasks
 - The group voted for the committee to continue with the following tasks
 - designing a data collection process regarding needs data on dhh teacher preparation programs

- Search for data sources about DHH children 0-21.
- Conduct phone interviews or use other methods of contacting program faculty nationwide to obtain the needed information.
- Develop system for follow up on doctoral graduates, i.e., where they go and what they do
- Contact Carol Erting to work with GRI
- Don Moores will contact Gallaudet Press

- **Enrichment Activities** – Susan Easterbrooks

- Key Information
 - See handout from Susan Easterbrooks (Susan will send this to me electronically)
- The working group voted to include the following enrichment activities as part of doctoral student programs. It is important to note that some of these activities will occur in consultation with the student's advisor. Thus the acceptance of this list does not imply that every student participates in every activity. This is a list of accepted enrichment activities.
 - Teaching
 - 1.1 offer inservice or pre-service presentations online and offline
 - Important to make sure these are accessible
 - 1.2 opportunities to offer Continuing Education Units (CEU) through ACE-D/HH
 - 1.3 opportunities to offer CEU through other agencies
 - Research (with own or other university faculty)
 - 2.1 engage in joint research
 - 2.2 present at research conferences
 - 2.3 involvement in grant proposal writing
 - Service
 - 3.1 engage in internships (externships) at national research labs,
 - Learning
 - 4.1 resources to allow doctoral students to get together face-to-face at the ACE-D/HH, AERA or other appropriate conference,
 - Provide support for several doctoral students from a variety of universities to visit specific research or best practice sites (nationally)
- Future tasks
 - The committee was charged with working on ways for students to share course content across universities

- **Public Advisory Group** – Claudia Pagliaro

- Key Information

- The committee had compiled a list of organizations involved with deaf individuals. This list will be available. A chart representing the main constituencies, goals etc. was prepared.
 - The key decisions that will have to be made here are :
 - Criteria for selection?
 - What is a manageable number?
 - What would be the goals for the group?
 - Future tasks
 - The committee will develop criteria to decide who should be asked to be on the public advisory group
 - The planning groups will place additional groups to be considered on the wiki

- Critical Outcomes – John Luckner (no time for presentation in the a.m.)
 - Key Information
 - Future tasks
 - Timelines for tasks
 - Involvement of larger planning group
 - Other

- **Criteria for voting membership in the university consortium** – Peter Paul
 - The group voted that in order to be a voting member of the consortium the university must meet all of the following (voted ‘yes’) criteria
 - 1. Prepare Teacher Educators
 - 2. Prepare Researchers
 - 3. Grant the EdD or PhD degree
 - ...The degree emphasis should contain a concentration in education of deaf/hh
 - 4. Have strong support among faculty, Department Chair, Dean, Provost (if necessary)
 - need a letter of “commitment” vs. simply “support”
 - 5. Have at least ONE full-time faculty (100% FTE) member in program able to advise doctoral students in the area of education of DHH
 - ...individual must be approved by their university to direct dissertation research
 - ...individual should be responsible for preparing educators of students who are d/hh, i.e., a deaf educator
 - 6. The individual should be willing to participate in external DHH doctoral committees
 - 7. The individual should be willing to provide at least one enrichment activity for students in the project
 - The group voted to table the idea of adding non-university representatives to the voting membership of the consortium. The purpose of having non-university representatives would be to add or to ensure diversity. Discussion included :

- concern expressed whether non-university voting members should be voting on decisions that the universities have to carry out.
 - The consortium is made up of universities, not individuals. Individuals represent universities, not themselves. Thus universities that do not meet the criteria do not have representatives.
 - The consortium should not control who the university representative is (so cannot request a person who represents a group other than the university).
 - Should such diverse representation would be better obtained through the Public Advisory Group (PAG)? This would depend on the role of the PAG.
- Future tasks
 - The committee should work on the issue of additional representation. is needed, not sure...at this time...how this will be accomplished....ask the committee to explore this issue further and bring back a reco to the group...vote: AGREED
- Key components for collaborative agreements – Shirin Antia (no time for presentation in the a.m.)
 - Key Information
 - Future tasks
 - Timelines for tasks
 - Involvement of larger planning group
 - Other
- Suggested strategies for working with deaf education teacher preparation programs – Susan Lenihan (no time for presentation in the a.m.)
 - Key Information
 - Future tasks
 - Timelines for tasks
 - Involvement of larger planning group
 - Other