

# **ABE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

## **Meeting Minutes 6/19/00**

**Members Attending:** B. Ash, H. Chernow, J. Koss-Cole, K. DeJesus, M. Forry, S. Martin, L. Soricone, P. Veysey, S. Waldron

**Members Absent:** D. Branco, J. McCarthy, J. McGovern, K. Skinner

**DOE Staff Attending:** B. Bickerton, R. Derfler, M.J. Fay

**DOE Staff Absent:** M. Gillon

**SABES Staff Attending:** C. Reid

**Minutes Compiled by:** M.J. Fay

### **Agenda Item #:**

#### **1) Meeting Minutes**

Motion to approve: Approved

Meeting minutes are a matter of public record: minutes will be posted on the web

#### **2) Revisit Competency #32**

- Both federal and state law prohibit discrimination on the basis of age, color, disability, national origin, race, religion, sex, or sexual orientation.
- It was noted that the non-discrimination policy does not extend to employers other than the State
- The ACLS grant package includes a statement of assurances that grantee may not discriminate on the basis of..., not only based on employment, but also based on services
- While there is no non-discrimination language on the current certificate application, we could add language. MJ to get language from MDOE legal department.
- Should we keep competency #32, in any form:  
Vote: 2-7 competency #32 is hereby deleted from the competency list

Committee would like the option of including a statement on the application that says that ABE practitioners understand the need to adhere to professional standards as determined by individual ABE programs and MDOE requirements.

#### **3) Initial Feedback from the Second Interim Report**

- Ruth relayed that within the new preK-12 regulations, the review panel process will no longer be part of the preK-12 certification. MJ confirmed that within the proposed preK-12 regulations, the alternative routes to preK-12 certification are to be the responsibility of the school districts and that the review panel that currently exists will no longer be in effect (unless the proposed regulations change as a result of public comment). What will this mean for this Advisory Committee's recommendations since the "alternative" process was to be the norm for ABE? Discussions with Deputy Commissioner Stotsky over the summer will help to clarify these issues.

- Summary report by Mary Jayne and Carey on the focus groups (see attached report)
- Additional feedback from individual practitioners is still coming in. A report will be prepared and sent to Committee members.

Questions/concerns raised in the focus groups needing further clarification by the Advisory Committee:

**1) Will there be a time limit on the streamlining options?** At the time of the vote, Committee members recall that the streamlining option was supposed to be only for practitioners currently in the field. The date that the certification goes into effect is the date that they must have met the time requirements (e.g. 480 or 2,400).

**2) Are the number of teaching contact hours appropriate?**

Practitioners questioned whether the number of hours proposed within the streamlining options was appropriate and whether they should include time spent preparing to teach and time spent teaching teachers.

Proposal:

1) All hours paid as an ABE teacher be counted toward the streamlining proposal (not necessarily contact hours), which would include prep time, tutoring hours, office hours, etc.

Vote: 4-4-1

2) All paid time for teaching, preparation, and professional development hours

Vote: 4-4-1

3) For every two teaching hours, practitioners will be awarded one hour of preparation time.

Vote: 6-1-2 Approved

**3) Do practitioners need to be proficient in English?**

A practitioner who teaches native language literacy voiced the opinion that NLL teachers should not be expected to take English proficiency tests because their jobs require fluency in learners' native languages.

**4) Issues of Appropriateness:**

Practitioners questioned the appropriateness of the subject matter requirements given the breadth of knowledge that an ABE practitioner must possess. Several practitioners felt that "habits of mind," e.g. as described in the Curriculum Frameworks, should be emphasized above subject matter.

The Committee discussed the possibility of reviewing the issue of subject matter within a year or two to determine whether the bar has been set too high, and whether it is too impractical with regard to the level of subject matter.

The Committee debated to what extent its recommendations should be parallel or not. The detail is in the competencies and until the level of proficiency is drafted, the Committee cannot respond.

It was suggested that we should compile information regarding courses, pilot courses, SABES and YALD course offerings.

Comments from two MATSOL board members were circulated supporting the DOE Communication and Literacy Skills Test as suitable and non-discriminatory for all ABE teachers. Recommendations on use of the 0-6 DOE Subject Matter Test were included. The Committee asked that Lisa Soricone, MATSOL rep to the committee, seek wider input from MATSOL on these recommendations.

**3) Future of Advisory Committee**

Members would like to follow through with the certification and meet again in September.

**4) Continue Discussion of Subject Matter Proficiency**

**Next Meeting:** Tuesday, September 19<sup>th</sup> from 10 a.m. – 2 p.m. at DOE in Rm. 3A