

MARYLAND STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
200 West Baltimore Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND TEACHER EDUCATION BOARD

June 6, 2019
Minutes

The 436th meeting of the Professional Standards and Teacher Education Board (PSTEB) was held at the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), 200 West Baltimore Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21201 on June 6, 2019. Ms. Maleeta Kitchen called the meeting to order at 9:35 am.

The following members were in attendance: Dr. Mae Alfree, Mr. Peter Baily, Ms. Jennifer Berkley, Dr. Debi Gartland, Mr. Charles Hagan, Mr. Darren Hornbeck, Ms. Maleeta Kitchen, Ms. Kelli Midgely, Ms. Karen Saar, Sarah Spross and Dr. Winona Taylor.

The following members were absent: Ms. Linda Chinnia, Mr. Christopher Lloyd, Dr. John Mayo, Dr. Kindel Nash, Ms. Debra Poese, Ms. Sandra Skordalos, Kris McGee and Ms. Geralda Thompson, Dr. Miya Simpson.

The following Maryland State Department of Education staff members were present: Ms. Tiffany Clark, Ms. Alexandra Cambra, Ms. Kelly Meadows, Ms. Pamela Darien (recorder) and Mr. Derek Simmons, Esq., Attorney General's Office.

PRELIMINARY ITEMS

Recognition of Guests

Geraldine Duval, MSEA

Public Comments

None

Announcements

None

State Board Update (Attachment I)

Ms. Sarah Spross presented a summary on the amended regulatory language for teachers certified in Blind Visually Impaired.

Legislative Update

Ms. Tiffany Clark presented a summary of two bills (Senate Bill 1030 and State Board of Education (SBOE) Membership Bill which now includes one teacher) which have been fully funded by the State of Maryland (Governor) and the State Board of Education.

Question: Are the monies associated with the Blue Print grant in addition to what the local schools systems are getting or is the concentration on just poverty?

Answer: Yes the monies are in addition.

Question: Could we (PSTEB) at some point get a more detailed summary of the SBOE's regulation discussion so that we can see some of the concerns that were raised? I am curious to find out if we are looking at the same issues and the summary doesn't really tell us anything about the discussion that occurred.

Answer: There are always official minutes available from the meetings. You can also, at any time that you want, go on line and cue it up because while it is live streamed during the presentation it is also recorded so you can go back and listen to those discussions. Minutes are posted once they are approved.

Question: Can the PSTEB meeting minutes be posted on the website once they are approved so that the educators can see how they are being represented?

Answer: The PSTEB meeting minutes are posted on the web-site but they are not listed in the same format as the SBOE's meeting minutes. They are posted where the items of each meeting are posted. Questions asked in the PSTEB meetings will be included in the minutes of each meeting.

ACTION ITEMS

Approval of May Minutes

Ms. Maleeta Kitchen entertained a motion to approve May 2, 2019 minutes.

MOTION: Dr. Debi Gartland/Ms. Jennifer Berkley To approve the May 2, 2019 minutes.

Approval of Proposed Agenda Items for July 2019

- Approval of the Minutes that will now have questions and answers in them
- State Board Update
- Complete set of Regulatory Language for Certification
- Complete set of Regulatory Language for Program Approval

There will not be a Legislative Update. The session is over and Ms. Tiffany Clark briefed us of what was funded. However, Ms. Sarah Spross will be happy to answer any question about grants.

Question: Will the regulatory language for certification and program approval be for discussion or votes?

Answer: We will be looking for permission to publish.

The July PSTEB meeting will be held on July 11, 2019.

Ms. Maleeta Kitchen entertained a motion to adopt the items on the July's agenda.

MOTION: Ms. Jennifer Berkley/Dr. Mae Alfree To approve the July meeting agenda.

DISCUSSION ONLY

COMAR 13A.07.06 Programs for Professionally Certificated Personnel Regulations (Attachment II)

Ms. Alexandra Cambra provided a presentation on the fifth installment of these regulations.

Comments: Dr. Gartland wants more clarity on Section .02 Definitions.

1. Question: Is the review period for 7 years?

Answer: Correct, when reviewing 5 of the states that Maryland is frequently compared to, review periods ranged from 2 years to as long as 7 years. Seven years seem to be a long time period between reviews. Maryland is somewhat in the middle with the 5 years from the date of the review.

2. Question: Will programs be allow to ask for an extension?

Answer: Yes, it is built in where they can request an extension.

The way the statute is written now, programs will not be required to hold both the state review and national accreditation. Once the regulations go through, the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) and MSDE will work together to recognize any national accrediting body that wants to apply to Maryland to be recognized. Those organizations will have to meet the same standards that are in these approval regulations and schools will have the opportunity to choose either national accreditation or state approval. If they are seeking Council for the Accreditation Educator Preparation (CAEP) preparation, they will be on CAEP's cycle and if they are doing state approval, they will be on the MSDE's cycle.

3. Question: What is the required time line for the "Satisfactory Progress" and who set that up? Please give us more clarification (definition #22)?

Answer #1: We will need to clarify the language on this to ensure it is clear that this is at the discretion of the school.

Answer #2: This is a good discussion point. The regulations include a yearlong internship. The timeframe for the candidate to demonstrate satisfactory progress within their program requirements may vary, some programs may be 4 years and 120 credits and some programs may be 4 ¼ years and 132 credits. I think that we do not want to say that it have to be done in 1 year, because that would constrict schools' abilities to make each program individualized.

4. Question: Is there any movement about the national standards? Is the SBOE recognizing the importance of InTASC? (definition #23).

Answer: The SBOE included InTASC, the way the language is written, you should have a national pedagogical set of standards and InTASC is incorporated by reference.

5. Question: Did they change the testing to professional teaching?

Answer: No, InTASC standards are the pedagogical standards across the board. The PSELs are for Administrators.

6. Question: “Supervising Teacher” there was a question about meeting the regulatory requirement set forth in COMAR 13A.07.01.06. Who monitors those requirement that they will meet? (definition #24).

Answer: The local school system has to assure that the mentor teachers and the supervising teachers meet the standards. But when MSDE does program reviews, we will also look at it to see that the supervising teachers meet the requirements.

7. Question: Regarding .03 State Consent to Offer Programs, is this going to be retroactive for all institutions?

Answer: At whatever point in time the regulations are adopted, it would be from that point. Question: Is there any grants pursuits going on? Answer: No, when we move forward with the regulations, institutions will have to choose if they are going to be accredited by a national organization state approval. Presently there are 36 programs and we cannot do all of them at once so a schedule will come out. We will work with that and we recognize that there has to be time in order to move forward with whatever that decision is.

8. Question: Regarding .04.B. National Accreditation, what does this mean? Are you saying that the provider would have to let MSDE know if they are asking for State vs. national accreditation?

Answer: Yes

9. Question: Does it mean that the program can apply with both state and national?

Answer: I don't think that the regulation preclude you from applying for both. I will be happy to take the question to the SBOE. Practically speaking we do not think that it is a problem, if an institution has gone through the national accreditation they probably don't want to have to go through the State, but there should be no reason they couldn't ask to have both.

10. Question: It seems that if we are a part of the State and we have national accreditation, our state should accredit us also.

Answer: The State would not accredit you, we would approve you. The national accreditation bodies will be equivalent the State approval.

11. Suggested a time frame be offered for a response like a 60 or 90 day notice/turnaround time. Regarding .05 Application for State Approval, item G. Noted

12. Question/Clarification: On the GPA, Do you have a census to .07.A. Program Requirements: (1) are they asking for the most recent two years' worth of either secondary or post-secondary college courses?

Answer: Yes

13. Question/Clarification: .07.A. Program Requirements (2)(b) when it talks about a bachelor's degree or higher with a major related to the program licensure area. Do you have a sense of what majors would lend themselves to early childhood or the degree program?

Answer: That would be something that we would want to put out in guidance. Thanks, that is a good question for early childhood.

14. Question: for C. (2) does the minimum of 12 semester hours include method courses?

Answer: Those are all content aren't they? Yes, and the minimum means that we can also add methods.

Question: 12 semester hours in each?

Answer: Yes, you have to have 12 semester hours in English Language Arts, Social Studies, and Math. Applying in Science and Math there's no requirement for Social Studies.

Question/Comment: That's 48 credits?

Answer: There was significant concern that there was no constructional requirement of Social Studies.

15. Question: C. (3) (a) Did we choose to take out Maryland approved reading courses in our last discussion?

Answer: PSTEB recommended to take them out, the SBOE likes them. It was shared that it was felt to be very specific and more general the state board like the specificity around literacy because of the concerns with our early learners not having all the skill sets.

16. Question: I think one of the things we noted is the specific mention of learning disabilities (that is Dr. Gartland's area).

Answer: The specifics mention of learning disabilities was corrected by the SBOE.

17. Question: (c) (i) (d) we have another reference to this model code of ethics, can you go over the adoption review process for what that's going to look like. If it's mentioned in here, it holds the weight of regulation but we have no oversight over that?

Answer: You do not. Just like you do not have oversight of the national standards that are written by each of the content areas. The model code of educator ethics, is a national model code. It's been developed by NASDTEC, it has been adopted in several states. I don't have my cheat sheet on that, it's a fairly comprehensive document I know that there are already instructions of higher learning that are using it in this state and teacher towards it and it will be recorded by reference.

18. Question: Clinical Experiences D. (3) (d) Can you clarify how they are responsible?

Answer: They have to take the lead of teaching.

19. Question: G. Credit Requirement, the program that Dr. Gartland put together is not 120 credits, so with its dual certification is it going to be grand-person in because this will affect dual certification?

Answer: The understanding is that this is based on the recommendations that came of the Kirwan Commission that all comprehensive graduation requirements and state institutions have to be within the 120 credits, that they cannot go over 120 credits.

Comment: So that is where Dr. Gartland's program falls in and obviously it doesn't. Question: You don't go over 120 credits? Answer: Dr. Gartland-we differ in my major, Elementary EDU-Special EDU? Question:

How has that been handled? Ms. Spross's understanding is that MHEC regulations require that all institutions have that choice in programming and state institutions programs are within 120 credit hours and cannot exceed 120 credits hours. Question: Is it a 4 year program? Answer: Yes it is. Comment: Then it is

going to be an individual piece. What Kirwan has said, which why there is a section (2) is institutes of higher education said I don't know if I can do all of these new requirements within 120 credit hours and I don't want to be held to that 120 credit hours so we what to be able to do it in a longer time and the Kirwan Commission said the program can go up to 12 additional credits, on top of that 132 credits and no more than 4 ½ years. So that is why 2 is here, that providers can expand their programs. So that is like an exception.

Question: Are dual certifications frequently across the state more than 120 credits? How many credits would that type of certification be?

Answer: Dr. Gartland would have to look it up, but it is in the ball park of 130ish. But it is done in 4 semesters, it just means however long it takes a teacher candidate to decide that they want general education and special education. They have no electives and maybe they take 2ish years to get their general education requirements out of the way but when they come to us (Goucher College) it's a 2 year cohort program no wiggle room and some of the semesters are 18 credits. If they are secondary they have to maintain their content and take the education courses separately. So that would put those students well over 120 credits.

Comment: Ms. Spross will be happy to look at it, but this came from the higher education community and during the Kirwan Commission and programs that are state, not the private programs are mandated to stay within 120 credits. She will be emailing to find out how they handle it because that's a MHEC requirement so we mirrored it.

Ms. Spross confirmed the location of the July 11, 2019 PSTEB Meeting will be held in the 7th Floor Board Room

COMAR 13A.12.02 Teacher Licensure (continued discussion from May's PSTEB meeting)

1. Question: What is the difference between a semester hour, credit hour, and a clock hour? Please define.
Answer: A semester hour of credit is 15 clock hours. One Professional Development Point (PDP) is one clock hour. 90 clock hours would be equivalent to 6 semester hours of credit.
Question: Is a clock hour 60 minutes? Answer: Yes. A clock hour may also be referred to as a contact hour.
2. Question: Who is responsible for tracking these points?
Answer: Ultimately, the educator is responsible for tracking their PDPs using the Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP). Depending on whether the educator is employed, the supervisor may be involved. If employed with a local school system or a non-public school system approved by under COMAR 13A.09.10, or a state institution, the supervisor, or designee, would work directly with the educator to develop the IPDP. If an individual who is not currently employed would like to keep their license up to date, they would be responsible for creating their own plan.
3. Question: So what I am hearing is all of the LEA's are going to hold a professional development when this rolls out so that the current teachers know that their responsible for tracking their points?
Answer: I can imagine the amount of technical assistance that will come with an entirely new set of regulations will be substantial. Currently educators must have a Professional Development Plan and that has been in regulation for years and is required once a SPC II is issued. Given this is similar, we are changing the name of the plan purposely to avoid confusion. Although not entirely new, the IPDP will be different from the existing Professional Development Plan.
4. Question: Obviously there are lots of way to get PDP's. If I decide to submit something that I've done, who is the ultimate person that decides if that is approved? Current level it usually is the principal that give the signature for an alternative, is that still the case?
Answer: Yes. Local School Systems may work out what that approval looks like.
Question: Since we are opening the doors to so many different avenues through which people can get their points and 90 points are required, does that explode the workload of the principal?
Answer: I do not believe so, but I do not work at the local level. Currently almost every single local system in Maryland has what is called an equivalent credit policy. The equivalent credit policies are unique to the each of the 24 school systems. MSDE's goal is to standardize acceptable experiences so that all educators have the flexibility to submit a multitude of experiences regardless of where they work. Right now flexibility boils down to where you work in the state. You will not see the ability for local school systems to have an equivalent credit policy in these new regulations.

Mr. Hornbeck expressed concern that currently, in Maryland local school systems, the infrastructure required to implement the proposed professional development plan may not be in place given the workload of school administration.

Question: Some of these have very specific professional development points and other don't was that purposeful?

Answer: Yes, there are some we felt that we differently had to define and there were some that we wanted to purposely leave a little more flexible, for example professional development activity that could be so many different things that we didn't want a pigeon hole there. If you see one that you think needs to be defined your feedback is welcome.

Question: Why does number 7 say for each mentorship the educator would be rewarded 30 PDP's?

Answer: That has come out- you are looking at the version shown to the SBOE. We have already removed this.

Question: Is there a minimum vs. a maximum number of points that the teacher(s) could receive for mentoring?

Answer: That would be up to the supervisor that signs off on the PDPs.

Question: Does an educator applying to renew their certificate have to complete all 90 PDP's?

Answer: Yes.

Question: With the renewal requirement, are there certain contents that must be obtained even if/when you meet the 90+ hours?

Answer: Yes, there is certain content that every teacher will have to embed somewhere in their professional development. Now whether that is embedded in the 90 contact hour mentorship, it will depend on how the mentorship looks and it will be up to the supervisor to decide whether that's appropriate for the particular teacher based on their needs. So it should really be custom to the individual.

Question: Is there going to be some type of material or suggestion to supervisors that the PDP's are going to be reviewed with the teacher?

Answer: There will be technical assistance and a form template.

5. Question: What are we doing with the senior exemption?

Answer: It will be in Chapter 1, General Provisions. This exemption is in statute and must be included in the new regulations.

6. Question: If I get my National Board Certification, does it satisfy the renewal requirements?

Answer: Yes, it is actually in regulations that when you complete or achieve your National Board Certification you are entitled to 6 Continuing Professional Development (CPD) credits. It would depend upon the process of certification to determine if it covers all of the areas required to renew.

7. Question: If an educator took a CPD workshop on math but it targeted working with English learners and students with disabilities, would that count?

Answer: Absolutely.

8. Question: If an educator takes a course in math online, what evidence do I bring back? That's what teachers want to know.

Answer: It depends on what your local requires. MSDE will not look behind a signature on a plan. We don't know what that would look like on the local level and what the checks and balance will be. Professional Development that is not traditional in nature (college course, CEU, CPD) needs to be approved by the local.

Question: What have they said when you brought it back to them?

Answer: We have not had conversions about PD. Each local school system will have the flexibility to determine what is best for that system. We strive as a locally controlled state for this balance.

Ms. Maleeta Kitchen entertained a motion to vote to combine B(3) and (4) in the Professional Development Points regulation into 1 area, B(3).

MOTION: Ms. Kelli Midgely/Dr. Winona Taylor To combine to combine B(3) and (4) in the Professional Development Points regulation into B(3). Motion passes: 7 for & 6 against.

9. Question: Can we change the word approved to offered in (9) professional development activity?

Answer: It will be taken to the State Board and they will be shown both versions of the language.

10. Question: Can we have a time to discuss graduate course and credits for leadership?

Answer: Yes, we will discuss in the July's meeting.

11. Question: Is it feasible to use people first language and change Severely and Profoundly Disabled to individuals with Severely and Profoundly Disability

Answer: We will take a look at it; however, the endorsement is called Severely and Profoundly Disabled because that is the population that the certification holder is eligible to teach.

COMAR 13A.12.03 Professional and Technical Education & Specialized Areas

1. Question: These license would be granted under these conditions and are nontransferable?

Answer: They are transferable.

2. Question: Could they teach Fine Arts in a regular school once they get their certification?

Answer: No, they would have to stay within a specialized program because the license is program specific. It is only for specialized programs/schools. It is the nature of the program that drives the certification.

COMAR 13A.12.04 Specialists

1. Question: Have we not practiced using the terminology English Learners as opposed to using English Language Learner?

Answer: Noted

2. Question: Why has the semester hours gone from 24 to 15 for Reading Specialist?

Answer: The credit have been reworked. The total credits is the same; however, they are divided differently.

3. Question: Will we look at these again or is this our final time looking at this chapter?

Answer: No, we will discuss all 7 chapters next month, only 2 of the chapters will be new: General Provisions and PSTEB.

4. Question: While reviewing these documents at our leisure, if there are any additional questions can they be brought up in the July's meeting?

Answer: Yes, every time they are on the agenda they are open for discussion whether there's an action or not.

Meeting Adjourned

Ms. Maleeta Kitchen motioned to adjourn/Dr. Winona Taylor.

Meeting adjourned 12:42 p.m.