

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

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND TEACHER EDUCATION BOARD

**August 1, 2019**  
**Minutes**

The 438th 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 August 1, 2019. Mr. Christopher Lloyd called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m.

**The following members were in attendance:**

Ms. Jennifer Berkley, Mr. Charles Hagan, Mr. Darren Hornbeck, Ms. Maleeta Kitchen, Mr. Christopher Lloyd, Ms. Kelli Midgley, Dr. Kindel Nash, Ms. Debra Poese, Ms. Karen Saar, Ms. Sandra Skordalos, Ms. Sarah Spross, Dr. Winona Taylor and Ms. Geralda Thompson.

**The following members were absent:**

Dr. Mae Alfree, Mr. Peter Baily, Ms. Linda Chinnia, Dr. Debi Gartland, Dr. John Mayo, and Dr. Kris McGee.

**The following Maryland State Department of Education staff members were present:**

Dr. Miya Simpson, Ms. Alexandra Cambra, Ms. Kelly Meadows, Ms. Ruth Downs (recorder) and Mr. Derek Simmons, Esq., Attorney General's Office.

**PRELIMINARY ITEMS**

**Recognition of Guests**

Tina Dove, MSEA  
 Jennifer Frank, MICUA  
 Rebecca Sieg, Urban Teachers

**Public Comments (Attachment I)**

Ms. Tina Bjarekull, MICUA  
 Dr. Joann Boughman, USM  
 Dr. Gilda Martinez-Alba, Towson University

**Announcements**

None

**State Board Update (Attachment II)**

Dr. Miya Simpson presented a summary of the July 23, 2019 Maryland State Board of Education meeting.

**ACTION ITEMS**

### **Approval of July Minutes**

The minutes were not available for approval at the meeting. The minutes will be sent out in draft for approval to put on the website temporarily until they are approved at the September meeting. Ms. Spross stated that Mr. Derek Simonsen informed her that we could send the minutes out via email to the members to give permission to post the draft of the minutes, publicly, and then at the September meeting, the full vote will be taken and any identified changes will be made. The draft minutes would be removed and the approved minutes would be posted.

Ms. Kelli Midgley asked that since the minutes were not ready, how our comments were transmitted to the State Board. What kind of update did the State Board get about PSTEB's last meeting?

Ms. Spross stated that there was no agenda item for any of the regulations because no action was taken at this meeting.

Mr. Lloyd stated that without objection, we will post the minutes from the July meeting in draft form, come back together at our September 12, 2019 meeting, make any revisions that need to be made and approve the minutes formally. He asked if anyone objected to this process. No objection was received. The minutes will be posted in draft form. Once they are up on the website, the PSTEB members will be informed.

### **Approval of Proposed Agenda Items for September 2019**

- Approval of the July and August Minutes
- State Board Update
- Regulations as Appropriate

Mr. Lloyd informed the members that PSTEB would not meet the first Thursday of September, which is usually the norm. Because it is the first week of school it is problematic for many members to miss work on that Thursday, so we have traditionally held our meeting on the second Thursday in September for that reason.

Mr. Lloyd informed the members that part of today's meeting is related to the two pieces of Code of Maryland Regulation (COMAR). He asked Ms. Spross if there was anything else that he was missing in terms of regulations. Ms. Spross stated no. At the present time, the only regulations that are in play under the review of both the State Board and the Professional Standards Board are the certification or licensure regulations for professionally certified individuals which are the Higher Education regulations.

Mr. Lloyd asked if there were other agenda items that the Board members wish to have on the September 12, 2019 agenda. Seeing none, he entertained a motion to approve the agenda.

Mr. Christopher Lloyd entertained a motion to adopt the September agenda as printed.

### **MOTION:**

Dr. Winona Taylor/Ms. Maleeta Kitchen to approve the September meeting agenda.

Mr. Lloyd informed the board members that before they move on to the two COMAR regulations, he felt that it was prudent to make sure that everyone at the table has the materials that were at the last meeting about which we had some discussion and thought that it would be helpful to this board to solicit input by the organizations represented by the

members of this board to be able to have that to read. As chair, Mr. Lloyd appreciated that people were able to submit comments and feedback so that the board could have that to read. He informed the Board that he just wanted to make sure that they all had what they needed to have. Each member should have a letter from MABE (easily identified by their logo at the top of the sheet); letter from PSSAM; letter from MCATE and MATE. There are public comments from BTU; MSEA; the Education Deans, USM and one public comment from last time Dr. John O'Flahavan. Mr. Lloyd suggested a couple of things in terms of the process for today's meeting to lead to an objective or outcome for today. First, he would suggest that they divide the conversation into the two pieces of COMAR as listed on the agenda, talk about them separately and divide them with equal time. It was Mr. Lloyd's understanding from the last meeting that the Board would have a desire to establish a conference committee with the State Board to have a discussion around some of the issues. He stated that he had spoken to Dr. Simpson and also briefly to the new incoming President of the State Board to ask if that could be possible? Dr. Simpson and the President felt that they needed to have that conversation at the State Board to determine if in fact they wanted to establish a conference committee. The thinking was that they would do that at the regularly scheduled state board meeting. Mr. Lloyd stated that he hoped that they would agree to a conference committee meeting. He suggested that if the State Board agreed, that it would be valuable for the PSTEB members to be able to have a common understanding of what they would want to bring forward. He stated that the discussion today would be on what is the State Board's and PSTEB's common agreement. If the State Board deliberated and felt like it was not prudent at this time to establish a conference committee, then I think that we have an opportunity to make some decisions at the September meeting about if the Board could put forward its own language and start to move its own language. The Board could act upon the publication of the State Board language. He informed the Board that it is a little outside of the 60 day window. It is 61 days from the time of our July 11, 2019 meeting. He said that as he stated to Dr. Simpson and the State Board President, PSTEB has the desire to try to have a conversation and dialog related to this rather than have different language crossing and if we could have that it would be valuable.

Mr. Lloyd informed the members that what they need to do is reach a consensus as a board about what their interests are related to the two pieces of COMAR. If the conference committee is established, we would want to know that is focused on the things that are really important to us as a board related to this and how could we have that conversation with the State Board and their interests.

Ms. Spross stated that she just needed some clarity because no vote was taken at the last meeting to request a conference committee. Historically when a conference committee is requested there is a formal vote and there is a letter that goes from the Chair to the President or from the President to the Chair. So she stated that PSTEB needs to follow that process. She confirmed this information with Mr. Derek Simonsen.

Mr. Lloyd stated that they would take care of that item of business first related to the formal request for a conference committee. Then the state board could act upon it in August and then we will move forward through these two pieces of COMAR.

Question:

Chris we never had a vote on whether we would approve or disapprove the regulations. (Debra Poese)

Comment: Mr. Lloyd stated that was correct and that last month the Board stopped and he had asked if anyone had a motion. No one had a motion last month and he could confer from the no motion that the Board did not want to take action upon this but needed more time to consider and contemplate. If the Board takes action one way or the other for publication or not. If it is published, then it goes out. If it is not published, then it goes to the State Board and they would

vote rather or not to override that vote with a 75% super majority. We were hopeful that the State Board would want to have some dialogue around this. That is kind of where the Board ended up. PSTEB could today take a motion to act upon the regulations as written. The Board could go forward with the process at the point.

Question: Wouldn't that decision fall outside of the 60/61 days before the decision could be made? If we don't get any lead way on the 60 days, then the decision is made for us. Is that true? (Charles Hagan)

Comment: Mr. Lloyd stated that the Board could convene a meeting by telephone for the purpose of a vote on September 10, if we so desired and that would meet within the 60 day window. The Board could wait for the State Board response as to a request if we make a request for that and we could see if the request was one way or the other then we could vote on the 10<sup>th</sup> to fit in the 60 day window. Mr. Lloyd asked Mr. Simonsen what happens if the Board fails to act within the 60 day window.

Mr. Simonsen stated that they did some thinking about this. It is not spelled out, but this Board's approval is required to move regulations forward. So the Board's simply not taking action within the 60 days, I think would be essentially treated as a disapproval and so in that sense if the state board would want to move forward then they would need to have a three quarters majority of the Board to approve it. Ultimately, if this Board just didn't take any action and 60 days expired, it would not automatically be treated as a yes. So it would have to go back to the State Board and they will need to have the three quarters majority.

Mr. Lloyd stated that the State Board's regular meeting is on August 27 and it is within the 60 day window. The September State Board meeting is close to the 60 day window.

Mr. Simonsen stated that PSTEB's next meeting in September is close to the 60 days and is scheduled as of now. He told Mr. Lloyd that he was correct and that he could at any point schedule an additional meeting between now and the September meeting.

Question: Does this information answer your question Charles? (Christopher Lloyd)

Comment: Yes, because the confusion last time was that 60 days meant YES. But if 60 days means NO, then I am good.

Mr. Lloyd stated that according to his understanding, it takes an affirmative vote from PSTEB to publish. An absent and an affirmative vote is the equivalent of a failed motion.

Mr. Simonsen stated that is essentially yes. The regulations and the statue do not specially represent it, but I think that it is the only far way to read it. Because I can't see reading this Board's silence would be the same as approving something. I think it only can be read as a disapproval. So in that sense, the State Board would need to vote with a super majority if they still wanted to move something forward.

Ms. Spross stated that she just want to make sure of that piece. So if it is no vote or no action, it cannot be published without an affirmative vote. Clarifying that it can be published by the State Board with a super majority vote.

Mr. Lloyd said correct. He stated that his question was really more around parliamentary procedure and that is, it is my understanding that in order for this Board to act it would require an affirmative vote.

Mr. Simonsen stated that he thinks that you would want to clarify out of this meeting whether or not this Board is planning to meet between now and the 60 day deadline. He thinks that the PSTEB would want to make that clear to the State Board, so that they don't treat no action as a "NO". So that they could understand that this Board is still going to meet and they may take action. So at that point then, assuming that there is a "NO" vote here, the State Board would act on it at the September meeting. Mr. Simonsen stated that if there is a "NO" vote today, it would likely go to the State Board August meeting. If this Board is planning on meeting in between that time period, then I think it would go to the State Board at their September meeting.

Question: So the State Board's next meeting is before the 60 days are up? So can they take action we have a meeting within that 60 days? So no action means that they cannot do anything in their August meeting?

Mr. Simonsen stated that if PSTEB is still considering it and you have additional meetings planned, then he would say "NO". If PSTEB has taken a vote and made its position clear then "YES". He thinks that the State Board could move forward. It does not have to get to the 60 day period. They could certainly act before hand, but PSTEB would need to have taken some action.

Ms. Spross stated that as long as PSTEB plans to meet again before the 60 days expire. Correct?

Mr. Simonsen stated "Yes". He said that he thinks if this Board had decided that they are just not going to take a vote on it. We are just going to have it be our message to the State Board. We are not planning any additional meetings, then the State Board would likely take it up at their August meeting because this Board has indicted that you are not going to do it. I think that really the biggest piece is to clarify it. You made clear at the beginning that if it was a "Yes" that it would move on for publication after today. If it is a "No" or no action, I think it would be made clear whether the Board actually it taking a position today or you are trying to schedule additional time to consider it or have another meeting.

Question: So I am going to try this one more time to clarify. So action taken today if we were going to vote "Yes" we would not be talking about this. If we then voted "No" today, it would then immediately go to the State Board's agenda on their August meeting. If we don't take any vote at all and have intention to make a final vote at some point before the end of the 60 days, then that would cause them to wait until we finish that discussion and that would give us the opportunity to reach out and ask for a conference committee on this action. (Debra Poese)

Mr. Lloyd stated that is what he would interpret. So I want to be clear Derek. So if we reached out for a conference committee with the intent of receiving an answer and then acting upon that answer at our next regularly scheduled meeting, that is too late and the State Board would therefore act upon it in their August meeting?

Mr. Simonsen stated that procedurally, if you were asking for a conference committee, that usually comes from a "NO" vote from this Board. I think the last time we did it was the superintendent regulation. There was that idea here, that there was kind of a disapproval here. So why don't we put a conference committee together to see if we could iron it out. It usually comes with that idea that there is not an approval from the Board, so I think in theory you could send that letter out but I think it would be just a little unusual without a "NO" vote. Because part of the idea is that the State Board has to have a three quarter majority to approve it, they would have the "NO" vote and whatever additional information you want to send with that. It does not mean that the State Board has to approve the regulation. They can decide that they are not going to publish or have enough votes to publish it and in some cases we have had a conference committee and in other

cases the regulation has gone through additional revisions and come back again. So it does not mean necessarily that if it goes to the State Board that it will be automatically published. The State Board will have plenty of options to decide what to do from there.

Question: Is it our current understanding and this may be the wrong question to ask, that the State Board would have enough votes for a super majority to over-ride whatever decision that we make? (Charles Hagan)

Mr. Lloyd stated that we could not ask staff to predict a State Board vote. So I think that we have to go with what we know in terms of the process. So I think that it was the intent of this Board to try to build language together that would allow us to act together and the “NO” vote moves the process into a different position and maybe there is none. We were trying to figure out a way to do that without that “NO” vote.

Question: My question was more around the fact, correct me if I am wrong but we sent out two letters to State Board asking them to have a conference and meet with us and to my knowledge we have received no response to that. So I am not against that because that is the right way to go. We have had good success doing this before when we have hit an impasse. But what I am asking is, given that we have had no response to the previous attempts we had around these issues to reach out to them, are we believing that they are going to be more inclined to say yes now. Considering the amount of public opinion that has come in.

Mr. Lloyd stated that the last letter that the Board had formally sent was related to the superintendent regulations. That is the last formal letter we had. All the other conversations have been conversations that we have had relayed from conversations at this table, through the Chair to the President of the Board. Those are the conversations that we have had. So we have not had a formal request since the superintendent regulations, because there has not been any formal language in front of us.

Question: But given that this wasn't even on their agenda at their last meeting, are they fully aware of the concerns that this Board has expressed? (Kelly Midgley)

Ms. Spross said that what she can share is that the next time that this would be on the State Board agenda is after this Board takes either an action or sends something back like a request for a conference committee. A vote of what the message is to send back. Just like at the May meeting, this Board really had concerns with the language pertaining to the certification regulations and voted on a language change that was taken back at the June meeting to the State Board with what was in current regulation and with what PSTEB voted on for action. They took action on that. So when this Board takes official action and has a vote that is when it goes to the State Board for discussion.

Question: My concern was that because our minutes have not been published, there is no way for anyone on the State Board to understand what the discussion of this Board was like at that meeting and why we took no action at that meeting. (Kelli Midgley)

Ms. Spross stated that the minutes would not have posted anyway before today, because they have to be voted on. Which is why we have the option of putting them through as a draft. They cannot be posted until this Board has approved them. But they are posted through June on the website, so they are available for review. As far as public comment, it has been received by the State Board. Public comment was given at the June State Board of Education meeting from both Dr. Joann Boughman, who we heard from today, and Ms. Tina Bjarekull, from MICUA, who we heard from today as well.

There was also some written testimony that was submitted to the State Board as well and I believe that that was from PSSAM. Public comment was discussed when the regulations came up and the decision was made to grant permission to publish with the understanding that while opening it up, that yes there are some issues. There are things that may change but that they needed to get public comment from everyone and just not one group. That conversation is on the website.

Mr. Lloyd informed the members that they need to identify who they want to speak at the September State Board meeting.

Mr. Lloyd stated that he was going to propose the following motions in this order. He gave context so the board members would know.

1. The first motion will be to table the action on COMAR 13A.07.06 and COMAR 13A.12 before the Board today.
2. The second motion would be for PSTEB to move its September meeting from the 12th to the 9th. He cautioned the members that they would have to achieve a quorum on that day. He stated that everyone will have to change their calendars to be at the meeting on that day.
3. The third motion will be to modify the agenda that was approved earlier for the next meeting to include a review of a draft of a letter that would be sent to the State Board, draft of public comment that will be provided to the State Board and also need to determine who would provide that comment to the State Board at its September meeting. So the letter and public comment would be provided at the September meeting after our action on the 9<sup>th</sup> of September.
4. The fourth motion would be for the members to identify who they want to speak at the September State Board meeting.

Mr. Christopher Lloyd entertained four (4) motions.

The first motion was to table action on COMAR 13A.07.06 and COMAR 13A.12.

**MOTION:**

Mr. Darren Hornbeck/Dr. Winona Taylor to approve the action to table COMAR 13A.07.06 and COMAR 13A.12.

The second motion was to move the September 12<sup>th</sup> PSTEB meeting to Monday, September 9<sup>th</sup>.

**MOTION:**

Ms. Geralda Thompson/Ms. Kelli Midgley to approve to move the September 12<sup>th</sup> meeting to September 9<sup>th</sup>.

The third motion was to modify the agenda for the September 9, 2019 meeting to include a draft of the letter and a draft of public comment.

**MOTION:**

Dr. Winona Taylor/Ms. Sandra Skordalos to approve the modification of the agenda for the September 9<sup>th</sup> meeting.

The fourth motion was to approve the appointment of Mr. Christopher Lloyd to testify at the September State Board meeting on behalf of PSTEB.

**MOTION:**

Dr. Winona Taylor/Ms. Kelli Midgley to approve the appointment of Mr. Lloyd to testify on behalf of PSTEB at the September State Board meeting.

**BREAK until 11 a.m.****COMAR 13A.07.06**

Programs for Professionally Certificated Personnel Regulations: Repeal and Replace – Permission to Publish

**COMAR 13A.12**

Educator Licensure: Repeal and Replace – Permission to Publish

**Discussion**

Mr. Lloyd stated that in order to draft the letter and public comment, he would like for the Board for the rest of meeting to talk about the areas of concern to them related to each section of COMAR. He opened the meeting up for discussion. He asked each member to state what they think are common themes that we find and areas of interests. At the end he would summarize everything and a vote will be taken as to whether or not to include all of the items.

**Comment:** I suggest that we use Dr. Taylor's July 22<sup>nd</sup> letter for discussion. The letter in its entirety does express rather well the totality of the concerns that have been expressed without the details. The red lining gives us the specific language that they want, but this letter does nicely summarize the areas of concern that have been brought before us by our honored guest and esteemed colleagues. There are concerns on the action research in the privacy of data. The regulation as it is stated is asking for information that may or may not be possible to obtain. So I think we need to do a lot more work before we mandate that.

The flexibility of the clinical experience. Clearly we have heard a lot of commentary about that. We would love to see our preservice teachers in the classroom more. If the idea of mandating a year does not fit, we have already acknowledged with our schedules that each program needs flexibility to make it work.

We have had a lot of conversation about the amount of teachers in the pipeline, particularly the trouble we are having recruiting teachers from the state of Maryland who are actually more responsive to our children in Maryland schools. We definitely are interested in raising the level of those programs and making sure our teachers come out of them. We want to make sure that the teachers will be well prepared. There is certainly an interest in removing obstacles for people who are interested in joining the teacher profession coming into those programs and teacher certification in the way of potential qualified applicants. So we want to make sure that there is more flexibility. (Kelli Midgley)

**Shared Interest:** We all want to work with the Kirwan Commission to redesign preparation programs to be more effective and rigorous. Organizations that support professional preparation programs are in full agreement that teacher preparation programs need to be more rigorous which involves the induction program and the internship program. This needs to be integrated systematically with teacher preparation. This connects to the Kirwan Commission that is recommending these comprehensive reforms and raised standards.

The documents from MABE and PSSAM are helpful, as well as, public comment from this morning, for identifying concerns and shared interests. The MABE document points out an issue that almost everyone has echoed. The point is the personnel cost arising from new and mandated staffing roles. The cost is borne solely by local school systems unless



new state funding is provided. The reference to the 50/50 workload providing requirements for the teachers and the responsibility of training supervisors which would rest on institutions of higher education. An additional concern about the personnel cost is the responsibility of tracking the graduate data. The Kirwan Commission recommendation about the teacher leadership track. There has been discussion about it but it is not in place. I am not sure if that goes with the Kirwan Commission or somewhere else.

(Dr. Kindel Nash)

**Concern:** Major capacity issues for all stakeholders that are involved. (Maleeta Kitchen)

**Concern:** Training – I don't know how it can be revised and reviewed, but start the process. (Gerald Thompson)

**Concern:** The other thing is whether the regulations took into consideration the institutes of higher education when they talked about the clinical experience. The academic calendar for the institutes of higher education is not prepared by the college of education for the entire university. They would have to discuss it with institutes of higher education administration in regards to changing the calendar. (Dr. Winona Taylor)

**Concern:** Make some type of exception to the rules and look at what other states are possibly doing with the teacher pipeline. (Maleeta Kitchen)

**Concern:** Discussed the issues of all the competencies. Demonstrated why we are in a hurry. Maryland state competencies for teacher preparation is a critical element. (Debra Poese)

Ms. Spross stated that the statute changed during the 2017 legislative session. CAEP is still not recognized by the Federal Government (USD). MSDE does not have sole responsibility to recognize an accrediting body. MSDE and MHEC do it together. Ms. Spross stated that these recommendations came while the regulations were being developed.

**Concern:** Did we put down the concerns of Higher Education with credit count? (Charles Hagan)

**Concern:** In the BTU in the city, the master's degree does not carry the weight that it does in other jurisdictions and the regulations that are proposed are more in line to what Baltimore City is actually doing. This is where you end up with 24 LEAs around the state and each one is doing something different. That is exactly what we should capture. (Gerald Thompson)

**Concern:** We have also had discussions not just about the masters but also about the usefulness of the master's equivalent for certain educators as well. (Darren Hornbeck)

**Concern:** Assignment – 02.07B

Teachers should not be assigned to teach more than two classes outside of their teacher's licensure. It does say should, but in small high schools a lot of times that is a huge problem, because you have to split. You do not have a full health teacher or French teacher because you are only having one or two periods of that. Many times you have to have a teacher teach outside of their certification area. It has to be more than 50%. I don't know if that is a Harford County thing. (Charles Hagan)

**Concern:** The red line language in that section just gives more time for the teacher who has been assigned out of their licensure area to earn credits toward that license without requiring them to. I think that it is important that we keep that language, to buy time for teachers who are assigned. (Kelli Midgley)

**Concern:** The other concern is how you are observed and evaluated. I think that it is important. I think really the spirit of that comment is about making sure it is not punitive and also is it just that a principal that assigns you and then you are required to take credits to become certified? So buying time is good, but also best not to be put into that situation where you are being required to take classes that you had no intentions of taking if you want to keep your job. (Karen Saar)

**Concern:** Under initial professional, there was the concern about how long an individual can hold that license. (Sandra Skordalos)

**Concern:** BTU and MSEA both have the concern about what happens to the teachers who already have certain certification. I believe that Jennifer brought this up earlier. What happens to the teacher that has the masters or APC? It seems like both groups have that concern. (Maleeta Kitchen)

**Shared Interest:** I heard a shared respect for the value of our teacher education programs and our graduate programs around the state. We all believe that higher education is valuable and we would like to keep encouraging teachers to continue seeking out not only rigorous programs once they are actually in the profession. So that is what's driving the interest for some of us in keeping the master's degree as a crucial piece here of career advancement. (Kelli Midgley)

**Shared Interest:** I also think a shared interest is in acknowledging the multiple ways in which teachers grow professionally from different opportunities. Acknowledging the multiple pathways that teachers use for professional learning and finding ways to give them credit for that. That is something that is welcomed across the board.

Mr. Lloyd stated that the obvious on shared interests would be that we have a desire to have an effective and productive pipeline of high quality teachers who are entering our classrooms. We would like people to go into teaching as a profession.

**Concern:** We have problems with retention. That is one of our biggest issues and if we can produce a better professional learning experience, the higher our chances are that the teachers will stay because they are getting the tools they need to do an effective job. (Darren Hornbeck)

**Concern:** The tenure portion. I know that it is three years for some and five years for others. (Geralda Thompson)

**Question:** I thought it was five years for everybody?

Ms. Spross stated that tenure is not a licensure or preparation issue to be covered under this Board. I think professional development, which is a good conversation, we will have to look at those professional development requirements as they relate to teacher licensure or to educator preparation, not to continuation. They are under a completely different set of regulations. You can require professional development for renewal, but it is from that perspective. No induction, you have to remember that induction happens when you are hired. Yes, I think everybody agrees that there should be linkage and continuation. One is dealing with the preparation and one is dealing with when you are hired. For some organizations, it is three years and for some it is five years.

### **Interests Shared**

- Effective professional development aligning with teachers.
- Shared value – in having effective Higher Education programs in the state.
- Share interested in acknowledging multiple ways in which teachers grow.
- Effective teachers within state.

### **Related Professional Development**

- Accountable – administrator of points.
- Around the mandated inclusion of all five areas with desire the more flexible.
- Concern about the approval of plans and the need for this.
- Concerns about the initial license period.
- Basic skills test for career changers. Test bias. Might have coursework equivalent in lieu of test.
- Master’s degrees based on where LEAs are.

### **Summary: Christopher Lloyd**

1. So there is a shared interest in effective professional development and aligning that professional development to actual classroom experience with teachers so that students benefit.
2. There is a shared value in higher education in having effective higher education programs in the state. Rigorous programs that build a profession for entering teachers, as well as, existing teachers in their recertification journey and higher education playing a significant role in that.
3. As a professional there is a shared interest in acknowledging the multiple ways that teachers grow professionally, how they grow and how people are provided credit or how it works toward a recertification process.
4. There is a shared interest in an effective pipeline of effective teachers within the state.

### **Concerns expressed by the Board**

1. Related to professional development, there are some concerns about the accountability of the points and the accumulation of the points from an administrative point of view. The remaining concern in professional development is around the mandated inclusion of all five areas, with the desire to be more flexible in that area. We saw that in some of the testimony and letters.
2. Concerns about the timeline for approval of professional development plans and the process needed for this. An example: the need for principals to approve by a deadline and the difficulty sometimes with everything on a principal’s plate to do that.
3. Concerns about the transition period of existing certificated staff to the new certification areas and how we might handle that effectively. The example that was provided was from an APC to a Professional License.
4. Concerns about the initial license period and the desire to potentially limit the initial license period.
5. Concerns about the basic skills test as a potential obstacle to many career changers. We have also heard testimony that there are concerns related to candidates of color. Whether the test is in fact bias (that is not what is noted, but we have heard that concern), and the idea instead that we might have a MSDE coursework equivalent to allow a candidate to meet that requirement in lieu of the test.
6. Had a discussion around the master’s degrees with different points of views based on where LEAs are? A concern expressed about the demolition of the master’s degree within the context of the state certification

regulations as proposed and in addition some concern about the demolition of the master's equivalency. That concern is not equally shared across all the LEAs in the state. As in some LEAs, the regulations as proposed are more in line with what the reality is for systems and the concern for a master's degree might in fact create complications in those LEAs. What I also noted under this master's degree conversation, was that the Board felt that more time to discuss this as a Board would be valuable given the significance of the conversation.

7. I also captured concerns in regards to 02.07B. Concerns about teaching outside the areas of licensure especially in small schools. You may have to allow for a longer period and concerns related to the proposal in order to gather credits in that area. Concerns about teacher assignments there. As Sarah talked about, we will have to frame the professional development within the context of teacher licensure or certification or recertification as the case may be. As a separate conversation from some of the language of professional development that does not relate to licensure, certification or recertification.

Dr. Taylor stated that we mentioned something about paraprofessionals. Wouldn't we put that somewhere as maybe as an endorsement? Where would that fit in, because it crosses both regulations? There are no red lines in the teaching endorsements. What do we mean by teaching endorsement?

Mr. Lloyd stated that the idea is the pipeline from paraprofessional to teacher. We want to have regulatory language that allows for a pipeline where non-certified have a process by which they can achieve certification. The discussion I heard earlier was a monetary and economic discussion about what people could afford. We want to make sure that the regulations allow for that. This is the intention that I have heard from this board and the State Board expressed and Kirwan expressed in regards to the tension between wanting to raise teacher standards in the state in opposition to the dire need for teachers currently. How do you manage that through a phase-in period where one incrementally raises standards and doesn't inadvertently cut off a supply of teachers? We have heard that if you raise the standards too quickly you have inadvertently cut off the supply of teachers. That would be something that would not be beneficial. If you don't raise the standards enough, then you have too many people over here defeating the role of what Kirwan has talked about. So how do you do that?

Ms. Midgley wanted to make sure that when we frame this discussion idea of moving dedicated paraprofessionals who have already shown a commitment to education, and that is not lowering the bar at all. It is suggesting that their work in the classroom is far more rigorous than what many teacher candidates are walking into our doors with. So we are respecting the fact that there are people who have dedicated themselves to working in the schools. The value and wealth of the experience is actually more valuable in some ways than a clinical teaching experience. We want to acknowledge that. Secondly, our suggestion is that coursework itself is more valuable to many of us than a test and so we can then honor the fact that through rigorous coursework we can certainly identify those basic skills in a way that is both fair and culturally competent. So the tests have proven to be too problematic over the years. The suggestion is that we are not lowering the bar at all. We are actually asking for a higher standard.

Ms. Spross asked for clarity. Are you recommending language that is different for the licensure of paraprofessional? That they would not get the same license as every other teacher?

Ms. Midgley stated no. She is suggesting that in the pathway towards teaching, what we are looking at is that clinical experience that doesn't reflect that wealth of knowledge that the paraprofessional gains in the classroom through years of experience. So we want to acknowledge that.

Ms. Spross stated that it makes sense. Glad that she asked for clarity of that.

Ms. Skordalos stated that she was just curious, in the conversation about the master's degree, will there also be a conversation about the National Board certification?

Mr. Lloyd stated that he had not captured that, but he will capture that.

Ms. Spross asked what your concern with National Board is. Just the requirement to obtain it?

Ms. Skordalos stated that she felt like in the original, it was a replacement for the master's so that they can co-exist.

Ms. Berkley stated that instead of saying "raising the standards", can you say "improving the standards"? It sounds like you are saying that I am working below my standards as a teacher.

Mr. Lloyd said yes, he agreed. I think that is a good way to state that. Mr. Lloyd felt that the Board has captured this in the two areas. The Board should be able to summarize this in a two paragraph letter. His goal is to create the letter based upon notes from public comments. The letter reflects the Board's opinion in lieu of public comment. This can provide to the Board at the next meeting. It will not be point by point but will be along the broader categories, such that it accompanies a letter and refers to the foundation of PSTEB's comments.

Mr. Hagan asked that with the people who are not here, is there any kind of way that we can say that we talked about this? We talked about sending a letter? These are the pluses and minuses, so when they get the information and when we come to the meeting on September 9<sup>th</sup>, that they can hit the ground running as well and so we are not trying to catch anyone up.

Mr. Lloyd stated that he would be happy to provide that context as he did after our last meeting. The context of what the Board did and what we needed. He felt that it was helpful to the Board and the smooth operation, after all.

Ms. Spross stated, as a procedural thing, we can send the letter and the bullets from public testimony. Since the meeting is on Monday, September 9<sup>th</sup>, she was thinking about getting them out to everybody by Wednesday, September 4<sup>th</sup>. This means that she would need them by August 30.

Mr. Lloyd stated that if we send it out on September 4<sup>th</sup>, does it allow people the opportunity to look at it? Prior to that, I will take the suggestions and communicate to the Board about the process and what we are doing. Then I will remind the Board here and when I send out the letter, not to comment all. In this particular case, I would prefer that we hold the conversation until the meeting on September 9<sup>th</sup>.

### **Adjourned**

Mr. Lloyd adjourned the meeting without objection at 12:29 p.m.