

MARYLAND STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
200 W. Baltimore Street
Baltimore, MD 21201

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND TEACHER EDUCATION BOARD

August 4, 2016
Minutes

The 408th meeting of the Professional Standards and Teacher Education Board (PSTEB) was held at the Maryland State Department of Education, 200 West Baltimore Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21201 on August 4, 2016. Mr. Darren Hornbeck called the meeting to order at 9:40 a.m.

The following members were in attendance: Mr. Charles Hagan, Dr. Kandace Hoppin, Mr. Darren Hornbeck, Dr. Mary Ellen Lewis, Dr. Barbara Martin-Palmer, Ms. Dawn Pipkin, Ms. Debra Poese, and Ms. Sarah Spross.

The following members were absent: Mr. Peter Baily, Ms. Jennifer Berkley, Ms. Louise DeJesu, Dr. Alyssia James, Mr. Philip Kauffman, Ms. Kathleen Kelbaugh, Ms. Maleeta Kitchen, Mr. Christopher Lloyd, Dr. John Mayo, Dr. Kristine McGee, Dr. Donna Newcomer, Ms. Katherine Saar, Ms. Geralda Thompson, and Dr. Jamey Tobery-Nystrom.

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

Ms. Kelly Meadows, Ms. Jessica Bancroft, Ms. Miya Simpson, Ms. Mary Voorhees, Ms. Michelle Dunkle, Ms. Ruth Downs (Recorder), and Mr. Derek Simmons, Esq., Attorney General's Office.

PRELIMINARY ITEMS

Recognition of Guests

Ms. Geraldine Duval, MSEA
Jerry DeLuca, ETS

Public Comment

None

DISCUSSION

State Board

Ms. Miya Simpson, Executive Director was unable to attend the meeting, so Ms. Sarah Spross presented the report of the July 26, 2016 meeting for the Maryland State Board of Education.

The following actions were taken on July 26, 2016:

- Held the annual election of officers and elected Andrew R. Smarick President of the State Board. Dr. S. James Gates, Jr., was elected Vice President for a second term;
- Considered the Commission on Assessments' recommendation to change the HSA biology assessment from a high school graduation requirement to a participation graduation requirement for school year 2016-2017 because the biology HSA was not aligned to the curriculum currently being taught. The State Board voted to include the change in the graduation requirements regulations that were pending publication in the Maryland Register. A draft of the regulations reflecting the change to the biology assessment requirement is attached. They will be published in the Maryland Register for public comment in late August or early September;
- Granted permission to publish amendments to Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) 13A.05.01, Provisions of a Free Appropriate Public Education. The amendments provide updates to: (1) terminology; (2) statutory or regulatory citations; and (3) cross references to the regulations that govern Maryland Infants and Toddlers Programs;

- Granted permission to adopt new regulations under a new chapter COMAR 13A.05.12, Hearing Aid Loan Bank (HALB). The purpose of HALB is to lend hearing aids on a temporary basis to a parent or legal guardian of an eligible child (under age 3) to ensure he or she will have maximum auditory input during the critical period of language learning;
- Approved the discontinuation of school building projects to comply with the *Maryland Public School Standards for Telecommunications Distribution Systems* because the *Standards* have become outdated. The wired and wireless technology currently being installed by school systems supersedes the requirements and nature of the *Standards*;
- Approved changing the August State Board meeting dates. The State Board will now hold an informational/study session on Monday, August 22nd, and the full day monthly meeting on Tuesday, August 23rd.

The following Opinions and Orders were rendered on July 26, 2016:

- *Eudaimonia Foundation Corporation vs. Baltimore City Board of School Commissioners* – nonrenewal of charter school – Opin. No. 16-31;
- *Anna and Gary H. v. Anne Arundel County Board of Education* – two-day student suspension – Opin. No. 16-32;
- *Janet Winter v. Anne Arundel County Board of Education* – coach position – Opin. No. 16-33;
- *Shannon and Dennis P. v. Dorchester County Board of Education* – student suspension – OR16-11;
- *Josette Williams and Lashawn Jackson v. Dr. Kevin Maxwell, Chief Executive Officer of Prince George’s County Public Schools* – school closing/consolidation – OR16-12.

Meeting materials and Opinions can be found at: www.marylandpublicschools.org/stateboard

The next meeting of the Maryland State Board of Education will be held on Tuesday, August 23, 2016, at the Nancy S. Grasmick State Education Building, 200 West Baltimore Street, 7th Floor Board Room, Baltimore, Maryland

DISCUSSION

Secondary Literacy Report

Ms. Michelle Dunkle from the Program Approval Branch of the Division of Educator Effectiveness, gave a report on Secondary Literacy. Dr. Debra Miller from McDaniel College was scheduled to co-present with Ms. Dunkle, but was unable to make it. Ms. Dunkle stated that Dr. Miller’s name is a name that you will see all across the literacy work they have been working on for the last two years and the work that they will continue to do with elementary literacy.

Ms. Dunkle stated that as you might remember, they had begun revising the work of what was called “Reading in the Content – Part I and Reading in the Content – Part II in the spring of 2014. The secondary reading courses had not been revised, and have not been looked at since 1999. The elementary literacy had been looked at because of the Reading First initiatives in which the state participated in the early 2000’s, but we knew that it was time to look at the secondary program. Ms. Dunkle stated that they knew that they had to move away from just the idea of reading to a total concept of literacy. What has emerged is Literacy in the Content Areas part I and II.

Ms. Dunkle stated the she only wanted to give a report on the highlighted and significant changes. She stated that the reading requirements for secondary teachers/candidates actually are in line with renewal. What is required is one 3-hour course in reading (think literacy) for initial preparation and one 3-hour course in reading by the time renewal (think literacy) is required.

Ms. Dunkle noted that the committee contained some of the best experts that we have in the field, seen when you review the list. A number of the committee members are highly published and practitioners in the field. She stated that they had a very good work group, and the recommendations and discussions that came out of the group was that they would abide by the regulation that only requires 3-hours initial preparation and move the requirement for the second 3-hours to the renewal cycle. The rationale for this was from back in 1999, that the first of these courses should deal with theory, how we should deal with the chooses on how to implement that theory, and the opportunities for field experience might be limited at the undergraduate level or at the initial preparation level. The second of the courses was to take the theory of what you have learned in the first of the courses and put that into practice where you would have field experiences built

in. Therefore, the committee agreed that there was no regulation change and nothing needed to happen except the Program Approval Branch of Educator Effectiveness would simply remove that requirement for the second reading course at the initial preparation from the institutional performance criteria. Institutions would no longer be held to that requirement, to have that literacy course in their initial preparation program. That does not mean that folks who are preparing teachers that have programs must take it out. So many institutions are already teaching that in their 6-hour block. Many have the course in their program and will not make any changes. Ms. Dunkle stated that it simply says that the requirement moves it to renewal rather than initial preparation. That is one of the recommendations, which was accepted by Dr. Salmon. We will be removing that piece, which was one of the main guiding factors for the revision, to bring this into the world of global literacy and to acknowledge the new literacies that now exist, but did not exist in 1999. Also, to make them very clear, apparent, and non-negotiable that they do have to appear in these courses.

The second piece is that the demographics of the state of Maryland and in fact the country have changed since 1999. The workgroup felt that we had not necessarily put an emphasis on every teacher being able to teach every child. So part of the focus was to ensure that as you see, one of the standards is “The Learner and Learning”, that those children who may have difficulty in reading and those things that are necessary to be a literate person in dealing with the Maryland College and Career Ready standard content areas and which all teachers need to be prepared to do at some level with those children, as well as with students for whom English is not a primary language. Ms. Dunkle stated that these two very important components were front and center in this revision process. It took 2½ years to do this. Last summer, a small group wrote what is the framework. The information was sent back and forth between the group, collected all the comments, incorporated all those comments, and made the necessary changes, which took a great deal of time. She stated that when you have a large group of folks, you have to have their input. She stated that the framework was released in April of this year and you will see the design of the framework as you look on page 2. As you look at the framework, you will see it is as if you are looking at both courses together and the standards, as they would play out in Literacy I and as they would play out in Literacy II, so that the two are connected. Keep in mind, that it works nicely if you are a 4-year Higher Ed Institution that intends to keep both courses in the undergraduate preparation program, this works beautifully, because your outcomes can really exist along the way in the continuum. However, we just do not have these courses for people who have those programs, so we had to write them so that either they could be put together as two courses that are being offered inside a program, or they could be stand-alone programs. Therefore, the workgroup worked very hard to ensure that we could do that, and that is the framework you see before you. Ms. Dunkle stated that you would also see, if you were familiar with the guidelines for Entex, that it follows them as well as you look through what will be offered. What is happening right now is that we sent this framework out to Deans and Directors, to our Alternative Preparation people, and to anyone who will be redeveloping their reading into literacy courses for submission to MSDE for approval. What the workgroup has not sent and are in the process of developing, is an assessment rubric. Therefore, there again is a small group of folks working on this right now. There have been a number of meetings so that the assessment rubric can be developed, so it can be sent as well. This will help those people who are developing courses. They will see what the state is using in order to say “yes”. This meets the requirements of the courses outlined. The rubrics are going to be flexible. If you look at page 6 and at the long list of activities, possibilities or theoretical concepts for comprehension and for pedagogy, there is no expectation that every single course is going to meet every single one of these in exactly the same way. The rubric will allow some flexibility, particularly depending on who is writing the course. Our goal is that everything will be redesigned, resubmitted, and the required revised courses along with the requirement expectations will be complete by the fall of September 2018.

Ms. Dunkle stated that they are in the process of revising the four elementary reading courses as well. Dr. Mary Ellen Lewis is the co-chair of that committee and they are hard at work there as well. There is not as total work from the ground up because they did engage in Reading First. There was alignment with Common Core, and there are some good literacy markers rights inside the Maryland College and Career Ready standards, but again this is a large group and it is a huge stakeholder group. Ms. Dunkle stated that she is also working on looking to see what the math curriculum looks like at the elementary level, so that it can align with new standards and the College and Career Ready standards.

Dr. Martin Palmer asked that if a university maintains the two courses and the graduates have their six hours at the time of renewal, does someone look to see that they already have the second course, and they do not need to take it again.

Ms. Dunkle stated that they would not have to take the course again. Ms. Spross told the board that certification

marks on the certificate how many reading credits have already been taken. We are not in the business of making people take a course twice. In other words, if someone only has one of the reading courses as part of their initial certification, so for their six hours of renewal, three of those hours then would be required to be the second reading course in that first renewal.

Ms. Debra Poesse stated that she was assuming that what Ms. Dunkle told Dr. Martin Palmer is also true for MAAPP programs, even though we might have in our approval all six hours.

Ms. Dunkle stated that that has to be rewritten. That was the point of releasing it the information in April, so that the people who knew that we were doing this could make the change. The information was sent to MAAPPs, but Ms. Dunkle stated that she has not gone directly to them to say that she sent this information directly to them for changes

Mr. Hornbeck asked if there was any kind of discussion as to any kind of way to measure the efficacy of what we have done in the last 10 years with these programs. Is it helping in any way? Did it seem to be helping to close the achievement gaps? Is there a way that we can determine how effective it was? He told Ms. Dunkle that it may not have been of her charge, but he was just wondering.

Ms. Dunkle stated that it was not her charge, but it was a significant question. How do we know that what we did do was any good to promote the ability of children to read? Secondary literacy is a different animal than elementary literacy. There are skills involved that are very different from the five-year old who is just learning for the first time. Ms. Dunkle stated that what upset her most is what Dr. Lewis said, that we do not seem to be very strong still in teaching the child where a story is read every night and English is the primary language or for children who have some level of disabilities in acquiring early language. The focus of developing these elementary courses is to assure that every teacher graduating from an elementary program has at least the initial ability to teach all children in the classroom. So every teacher should be able to have some competency in the acquisition and kids that have some literacy skills, where English is not the primary language, and for students who may have some language processing difficulties and disabilities.

Ms. Dunkle explained the process of getting individuals involved in the workgroup, by sending out requests to several different organizations to submit nominations. As requested, if any one of the members should ever see this request come across their desk to please recommend candidates. She stated that this is very important work as is having important discussions about the future of our kids. Ms. Dunkle addressed several more questions in regards to receiving feedback from the teachers/candidates about the effectiveness of the courses. Ms. Spross stated that getting feedback about the effectiveness of the courses really has to go directly to the institution of higher education; because what it comes back to is, did the instructor do what the rubric stated? We as a state, set a standard that is held to all institutions of higher education for program approval, through the committee work. So we have said that these are the standards that we want to see, and this is what we are checking curriculums to have, and that ideally everybody is teaching exactly what we have said in that course.

BREAK

Proethica and National Observational Teaching Exam (NOTE)

Ms. Spross stated that Ms. Kelly Meadows would be doing a brief follow-up on the two ETS presentations that were done at the June meeting.

Ms. Meadows stated that in June the Board had the opportunity to hear from ETS on two different accounts. The representatives previewed their Proethica assessment and their assessment on National Observational Teaching Exam (NOTE). She stated that she knew that originally, we had run out of time for the Proethica presenters and that the NOTE presenters did use their entire time allotted. Ms. Meadows wanted to know if the Board was interested in any further information for either of the two assessments.

Mr. Hornbeck stated that the presentation on ethics, that the board was very intrigued and impressed by it. He felt that the board was less impressed with the android teaching model. He stated that the board did not have a negative reaction to NOTE, but does not think that they had the same positive reaction to it as they did to Proethica. He stated that there was some concern about the cost and if it truly did match a teaching environment. Mr. Hornbeck felt that the Proethica presentation was right on the money and seemed to be missing. Even though the board saw a partial presentation, he felt

that what they did see of the presentation matches the challenges that we have particularly now so to speak, of meeting the needs of students and were sometimes there are not the correct answers to questions. The presentation seemed as true and matching of our experiences as classroom teachers, educators, principals, and supervisors.

Ms. Spross stated that what she is hearing is that the board is interested in more information on Proethica. She stated that the entire discussion around ethics in the profession of teaching is a national discussion that is occurring right now. You asked if it was more towards the responsibility of higher education to be incorporating something like Proethica into their teaching programs, or a certification requirement or a local school system. She stated that she knew historically that the board had dabbled in the idea of ethics, and what role does it have in certification or not have in certification. She felt that this was very timely and would be happy to bring back the people from ETS to talk more about Proethica, and how it is being utilized in various states. She stated that we would table NOTE for now and if it continues to develop and become more of a topic, then we will bring it back.

Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016 Workgroup

Purpose:

The purpose of this item is to inform the members of PSTEB about the Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016 Workgroup. As you may recall, Senate Bill 493 required the Maryland State Department of Education to convene a workgroup composed of stakeholders to determine how to recruit, retain, and promote quality teachers at all levels of education in the state.

Historical Background:

On May 27, 2016, Senate Bill 493-Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016, became law. This bill establishes a Teacher Induction, Retention and Advancement program for participating first-year teachers that afford them at least 20% more time for mentoring, peer observation, and assistance with planning or other preparation activities. It also increased the maximum State matching stipend for teachers who have national board certification and teach in comprehensive needs schools.

This bill further required the Maryland State Department of Education to convene a workgroup composed of stakeholders to determine how to recruit, retain, and promote quality teachers at all levels of education in the state. Specific topics to be addressed include, but are not limited to, incorporating the principles of National Board Certification, teacher recertification, linking loan forgiveness to teaching in high needs schools, and linking induction best practices into professional certification. This work will culminate in an interim report submitted to the Governor by November 1, 2016, with a final report due in 2017.

In response to the bill, Dr. Karen Salmon, State Superintendent, established the stakeholder workgroup to participate in the review of the new law and the subsequent development of Maryland's Teacher Induction, Retention and Advancement Program recommendations.

Summary:

MSDE has convened the stakeholder workgroup and has begun the discussions regarding the development of Maryland's recommendations of teacher recruitment, preparation, induction and retention. The purpose of this presentation is to provide members of PSTEB with an update on the workgroups progress.

Action:

This item is for discussion only.

Ms. Spross began the discussion by stating that the bill passed on the last day of the 2016 legislative session, late in the afternoon. When the bill passed, it was heavily amended on the second cause, which was only for Anne Arundel County. The bill passed, but went into law without Governor Hogan's signature. The Governor included a letter as to why the law went in without his signature.

Governor Hogan supported many of the tenants about providing new teachers with mentoring opportunities and more time for planning and preparation. But he spent a sizeable amount of time in the letter talking about individual counties' issues

should not be played out in legislation and that to put something in a bill that does not benefit the entire state, he opposed.

Ms. Spross stated that four main components came out of this bill.

The first component focused on the Quality Teacher Incentive Act of 1999. It amends the language that pertains to the stipend that is available for teachers that hold national certification and choose to teach, or are placed and teaching in a comprehensive needs school. Under the current law, that stipend amount is up to \$2,000, and it is a matched stipend from the county. The bill changes that amount to \$4,000, which is the state's part that we will match up to. Another part of the first component was to put national board certified teachers in a leadership role within the school. There were different opinions to this. It is now changed to the extent practical to use their exact line. It does not require a school system to put national board certified teachers into leadership roles; it is encouraging that to occur.

The second component of this bill is the part that was amended at the very end and it is on page 4. The part applies to a county grant program just for Anne Arundel County teachers. This program is to allowed for classroom teachers both at a standard professional certificate and an advanced professional certificate that are in a public middle or high school in which 30% of the students qualify for free and/or reduced priced meals. This is different from the identification of comprehensive needs. This is specifically only for those middle and high schools that 30% or more of their students get free and/or reduced meals in Anne Arundel County only.

The third component or the big piece of this is called the "Pilot Program." This is of particular interest to many of our local school systems and to each of the counties' local boards. It is up to the county board of a system to decide whether or not to participate in the pilot program that is written in here and is about giving priority to teachers who teach in schools or a cluster that are high needs or a Title I school. It is affording those first- year teachers 20% more time for mentoring, peer observation, and lesson planning. It is also very clear that it appropriates \$5 million to be utilized as a budget line item to go towards this program. While \$5 million is certainly a lot of money, it does not cover the needs or cost of every first- year teacher, and the statue is very clear in stating that it was not intended to apply to every single first- year teacher. It is a shared responsibility also with the state assuming 80% of the cost and the locals assuming 20% of the cost. The bill also requires the department to put together criteria for how we will evaluate and choose which programs will go forth with the pilot. The pilot program is in place until 2021, with a report due December 1, 2021.

The fourth component of this workgroup is, the Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016. The bill requires the department to put together a diverse workgroup of stakeholders to look at how to recruit, retain, and promote quality teachers at all levels of education throughout the state. Including but not limited to, incorporating and interweaving the principles of national board certification with the advanced professional certificate, masters of education program, and all other teacher preparation programs in order to make the teacher certification process more meaningful, to incorporate induction best practices into the profession, and to really look at the state laws and regulations that impact recruitment, retention and promotion. Specifically, again, measurement in management, reward in recognition for excellent work that comes in for the stipend program.

Ms. Spross stated that there are two reports due from the workgroup. The first report is an interim report due on November 1, 2016, and the final report is due on November 1, 2017, for recommendations. The report has to include how if there a way for teacher preparation academies as is defined under ESSA to be incorporated and introduced in the state of Maryland. To have a coordinated strategy for recruiting, retaining, and promoting high quality teachers of education.

Ms. Spross stated that the workgroup has already had three meetings and the workgroup is made up of almost every representative on PSTEB. We have touched and incorporated somebody from every aspect of the community that prepares teachers, works with teachers, and represents teachers. Interestingly, while there is a representative on the workgroup, five sub-committees have come out of this workgroup focusing on recruitment, retention, induction, preparation. A fifth committee is regarding Education Article 11-208, which is the statute that affects the accreditation of Higher Education Institutions. Ms. Spross briefly talked about Education Article 11-208, and as it relates to the Council of Accreditation of Educator Preparation Programs, more commonly known as CAEP. Our current statute requires that all institutes of higher education be accredited, as well as state approved. Accreditation in our statute is defined as being a national accrediting body that is recognized by the United States Department of Education (USDE). A memorandum of understanding was submitted to CAEP stating that we needed it back by end of the week with no reply. We received a

survey about what are your state's requirements when it comes to accreditation. What was learned at that time, it looked as though CAEP was not going to have recognition from the USDE by July 1, 2017. We looked at our memorandum of understanding and it said it ends on June 30, 2017, and we were good to go. That was short lived, because it seems that CAEP's recognition from USDE ended on June 30, 2016, and CAEP no longer meets the definition that our statute requires.

Dr. Martin-Palmer stated that she believed that the statute indicates that there is an enrollment number of 2,000. If you do not hit 2,000, it is voluntary whether or not you pursue national. Is that part of the statute also being addressed?

Ms. Spross stated that that is a good question. To be exempted from being nationally accredited with a full-time equivalency of 2,000 or less, you do not have to do the national accreditation. However, those institutes still have to do state approval. Therefore, because it is now state approval or national accreditation, you do not need a waiver because we are not requiring one or the other.

ACTION ITEMS

September PSTEB meeting is scheduled for Thursday, September 8, instead of Thursday, September 1, due to that being the first week of school.

Approval of June Minutes

The June minutes could not be approved. Did not have a quorum.

Approval of Proposed Agenda Items for September

- Approval of May, June and August Minutes & SBOE Updates
- Continued Discussion – COMAR 13A.12.01
- Orientation for New Members

Mr. Hornbeck stated that the September Agenda could not be set, so assume what is written. Did not have a quorum.

Meeting Adjourned

Meeting adjourned 12:10 p.m.