

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

**PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND TEACHER EDUCATION BOARD**

**May 5, 2016  
Minutes**

The 406<sup>th</sup> 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 March 3, 2016. Mr. Darren Hornbeck called the meeting to order at 9:40 a.m.

**The following members were in attendance:** Ms. Merlyn Bell, Ms. Jennifer Berkley, Ms. Louise DeJesu, Mr. Charles Hagan, Dr. Kandace Hoppin, Mr. Darren Hornbeck, Dr. Alyssia James, Mr. Philip Kauffman, Mr. Christopher Lloyd, Dr. Barbara Martin-Palmer, Ms. Dawn Pipkin, Ms. Debra Poese, and Ms. Sarah Spross.

**The following members were absent:** Mr. Peter Baily, Dr. Lorraine Cornish-Harrison, Ms. Kathleen Kelbaugh, Ms. Maleeta Kitchen, Dr. Mary Ellen Lewis, Dr. Donna Newcomer, 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. Amanda Conn, Ms. Mary Voorhees, Ms. Linda Bongiovano, 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, provided a summary of the April 26, 2016 meeting of the Maryland State Board of Education.

The following actions were taken:

- Granted permission to publish Graduation Assessment Regulations;
- Granted permission to adopt COMAR 13A.08.02 Maryland Student Records Manual;
- Granted approval of the use of the data collection methodology presented in the Student Arrest Data Collection; Manual to fulfill the mandate set forth in COMAR 13A.08.01.12 – Arrests on School Premises.

The following information items were presented:

- Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation (DLLR) Summary Report
  - Update on GED testing and National External Diploma Program;

- ACHIEVE Presentation
  - Overview of the organization’s annual report on *The College and Career Readiness of U.S. High School Graduates* and summary data for Maryland;
- Assessment and Accountability Update
  - Update on the progress of the implementation of the College and Career Readiness and College Completion Act of 2013 by the local education agencies;
  - Information on a waiver of the Speaking and Listening requirement under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) that the MSDE is requesting from the United States Department of Education.

The Board also heard one oral argument, one draft opinion, four appeals and two requests for stays.

Meeting materials and opinions are located at [www.marylandpublicschools.org/stateboard](http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/stateboard).

The next meeting of the Maryland State Board of Education will be held on Tuesday, May 24, 2016, at the Nancy S. Grasmick State Education Building, 200 West Baltimore Street, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor Board Room, Baltimore, Maryland 21201.

### **Legislative Update**

Ms. Amanda Conn gave a brief legislative update to the Board.

### **House Bill 617, Anne Arundel County Public Schools – Adjunct Instructor Program.**

this bill did not pass. This is the second year in a row that the legislation has addressed local bills attempting to create local teacher certification programs. If this bill had moved, other public school systems would have tried to be amended on this bill.

### **Senate Bill 493 – Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016 (July 1, 2016 effective date)**

**Senate Bill 493** has four (4) separate provisions. Two (2) of the provisions are related to PSTEB.

- Establishes a voluntary Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Program for first-year teachers who participate in the program to be afforded at least 20% more time than other teachers to be spent on mentoring, peer observation, assistance with planning, or other preparation activities;
- Costs for the Program to be borne 80% by the State and 20% by the local board of education;
- Mandatory appropriation of \$5 million annually for the Program through FY 2022;
- Increases the maximum State matching stipend for teachers who hold National Board Certification (NBC) from \$2,000 to \$4,000;
- Establishes a pilot teacher incentive grant program of up to \$1,500 in Anne Arundel county for teachers in certain economically disadvantaged schools for academic years 2016-2017 and 2017-2018;
- Required funding for the stipends in the budget for FY 2017 through FY 2019;
- MSDE must convene a workgroup composed of stakeholders from primary and secondary education, higher education, and other education policy experts to determine how to:
  - recruit, retain, and promote quality teachers at all levels of education in the State; incorporate and interweave the principles of NBC with the Advanced Professional Certificate, Master of Education programs, and other teacher preparation programs;
  - make the teacher recertification process more valuable, including an exploration of how to link recertification to career ladders and content or high-need area specializations;
  - link loan forgiveness to teaching in high-need schools; and incorporate induction best

- practices into professional eligibility certificates;
  - o existing State laws and regulations impact teacher recruitment, retention, and promotion for specified areas; and
  - o evaluate whether the stipend for specified Anne Arundel County Public Schools. teachers were effective in retaining effective teachers in schools with a critical mass of economically disadvantaged students
- Workgroup must make recommendations regarding;
  - o its findings;
  - o legislative changes that will ensure that teacher preparation academics, as authorized under the federal Every Student Succeeds Act, will be of the highest quality and rigor if they are implemented in Maryland, and the individuals that participate in these academics will be fully prepared and trained to be in a classroom in Maryland;
  - o a coordinated statewide strategy for recruiting, retaining, and promoting quality teachers at all levels of education by specified stakeholders; and
  - o the best methods of incentivizing effective teachers to choose to teach in low-performing schools and schools with a critical mass of economically disadvantaged students in light of federal regulations that require the equitable distribution of effective teachers.

**House Bill 921 – Primary and Secondary Education – School Personnel – Training Program.**

This bill requires the State Board of Education to require certain school personnel to complete training in, by a method determined by the State Board after consultation with the Professional Standards and Teacher Board, certain knowledge and skills required to understand and respond to the social, emotional, and personal development of students.

Ms. Conn stated that this is a new bill that has not been seen before. The bill has not moved out of the House.

**COMAR 13A.12.01.05C (3) Acceptable Credit**

Ms. Sarah Spross introduced Ms. Kelly Meadows to discuss the proposed changes in Acceptable Credit, COMAR 13A.12.01.05C (3) for publication. Ms. Spross stated that there was not a handout for COMAR 13A.12.01.05C (3). It was noted that there was not a request for publication. Ms. Meadows provided the explanation.

She stated a proposed change to this regulation had been discussed at the meeting in April. The Board had suggested bringing it back for permission to publish. Ms. Meadows stated that after a lot of discussion internally with the regulatory review committee members, as well as the certification staff, it became clearer that this was going to mean significant change in Praxis. She asked to hold off on COMAR 13A.12.01.05C (3)-Acceptable Credit until June or possibly July to make sure everything has been considered and ironed before changes on this regulation go forward. Ms. Spross reiterated what Ms. Meadows had previously said, as you know, we had talked about acceptable credit before and acceptable credit would be valid for five years before the course is taken. We have to be sure logically how we can track that this for a reinstatement.

Ms. Meadows stated that it is a programmatic issue. What we want to make sure of, is, that they completely understand the effect that this changes will have on all renewals and reinstatements, because everything points back to this regulation. Therefore, we want to take a deep dive into what this Praxis is going to look like. What are the logistics and is there a way to craft the verbiage in such a way that it has as little impact on logistics as possible.

Mr. Hornbeck asked if there were any questions. He stated he was appreciative of the slowdown approach, because when you are thoughtful and you recognize that more time is needed, that is a great thing. As oppose to rushing and bringing things that have not been thought through.

Ms. Spross stated that as we discussed for reinstatement, we know that this is the right language for reinstatement, but because of where it is located in the regs, renewal points back to it and we do not want the same credits to be reflected. We may have to change where it is located. We do not want to us the same credits.

## **BREAK**

### **COMAR 13A.12.02.27 – Specialized Professional Areas (Grades 7-12)**

Ms. Sarah Spross introduced Ms. Kelly Meadows to discuss the proposed changes in Specialized Professional Areas (7-12)

#### Purpose:

Ms. Meadows stated the purpose of this item is to provide the opportunity for discussions regarding the difficulty Local Schools Systems are experiencing finding qualified individuals to teach specialty area courses (i.e. Nanotechnology and biomedical engineering), as it relates to the certification of these individuals. Currently, COMAR 13A.12.02.27 Specialized Professional Areas (Grades 7-12), would apply to this group of individuals; however the requirements are often a deterrent to hiring these teachers.

#### Summary:

There is a growing need for teachers who possess highly specialized skills to teach a variety of hard to fill positions in our local systems. Currently, the certification regulations appear to be a barrier to recruiting highly motivated career professionals who are interested in teaching.. As such, we bring this issue to you for discussion.

Ms. Spross proposed that since several definitions have been reviewed thus far, we should pull them all together into what a formal definitions section would look like in regulations, and highlight the definitions that have been approved so that the Board does not revisit them.

#### Action:

This item is presented for discussion only.

Ms. Spross stated that the board received a memo from her in regards to this issue. She stated that today is about what is required in regulations and how are we going to address the impending on slaughter of legislation about certifying and hiring individuals that have highly specialized skills to come into our specialized schools. Ms. Spross stated that it is not just about Anne Arundel County and a part-time instructor for nanotechnology. It is not just about why this specific regulation COMAR 13A.12.02.27 Specialized Professional Areas was written. It is not just about the violinist from the Baltimore Symphony Orchestra coming into the Baltimore School for the Arts to teach violin to the students. The question is, “What are we doing across the board as a whole to recruit, train, and fill our classrooms with individuals that maybe coming from another profession that maybe leaving from other organizations and they want to give back? How do we balance bringing in that highly specialized experience with what is the fundamental foundational requirements to be a teacher? How do we balance it, because we do not know that part-time is true? There are people who want to come to the teaching profession that have these skills, but not pedagogy and the basic skills, who want to teach full-time as a second career. How do we make sure that we do not water down the expectations from what we teach in our teacher preparation programs, while also not being prohibitive and overly cumbersome? Ms. Spross stated that as a board we have a very difficult challenge ahead of us. There are people that are pushing for the Board to look at certification and how we certify people and what is truly essential. There are questions about not only what goes into a teacher preparation program, but also what makes a good teacher preparation program. Another question is, “what test should we be using to measure that the teacher is ready to go into a classroom? For example, when I shared with the board last year, that State Board had only approved two new tests for two years only. Ms. Spross continued that it was her first time at the table, with a question presented to her “Why hasn’t Maryland done anything like Massachusetts has done? What Massachusetts has done is to create their own teacher licensure test and it is very

specifically aligned with what the teacher preparation programs are doing and very specific to the Massachusetts curriculum. Why can't we just bring in these adjunct professors and give them a few things that are specific to our counties?

Ms. Spross stated the board will be presented with a number of questions going forward, from the institutes of higher education, CAEP and NCATE. What is this going to mean, because CAEP standards are different from the NCATE standards. Ms. Spross reminded the board about the conversation they had in April regarding the four workgroups that had been created and would be looking at specific areas. She stated to the board that they have many factions coming from many directions, with many different agendas and it is significant for the board to think about what is best for the Maryland students. Ms. Spross stated that she does not think that this will be an easy discussion and that she should have put Senate Bill 635 in the workgroup for Conditional Certificate, because it all forms around Conditional Certificate. Do we want to lower the standards or does it mean we are lowering the standards? I think it means that we are recognizing how difficult it is that first year of teaching.

Ms. Spross noted that what she and Ms. Meadows have brought to the Board for discussion is the Specialized Areas and while it was written to capture the specialized people. The language in it needs attention. It is the basics of what we say you need to have for teaching. However, if you look under special provisions, the regulation is talking about that they can only be used for instruction in specialized programs or at specialized schools. Ms. Spross noted the importance of this topic. In addition, the need for the Board to offer suggestions on dialogue.

Mr. Christopher Lloyd stated that there clearly is growing concern when talking to Annapolis legislators about hard to fill areas in the area of career and technology education., The number times that we have experienced folks who came from outside the profession and seek to do the right thing, may not have the pedagogy struggle with it. He has had principals come before the PAR Panel and say, please do not dismiss them. There is no one else and this is a graduation requirement. . Mr. Lloyd stated there is a huge need and those in technology education know that. Mr. Lloyd noted he is very much in favor of looking at establishing a workgroup as the Board looks at and discusses the Specialized Areas. In addition, at the end of the day for many of the specialized areas, it does come down to an issue of what the kids need and what they are not getting now. Therefore, if Career and Technology education is a significant area of need for children and we are not giving it to them, then shame on us and we should develop a much more rigorous piece. He also stated that it was part of a larger national problem, where we have 30% fewer folks going into education to start. He agreed that convening a workgroup to start to have conversations about how do we meet the needs of these hard to staff areas.

Ms. Dawn Pipkin agreed with Mr. Lloyd. She felt that this presented two problems that the workgroup definitely needed to discuss. She stated that they had hired a retired military pilot who had gone through the test pilot training school with a wealth of knowledge about that field. One day she stopped by to see him and he was sitting at his computer at 6 o'clock working on his coursework to be certified. They had a conversation regarding the connection between the coursework that he was teaching. Ms. Pipkin asked if literacy and requirements for Praxis I, the basics (reading, writing, and math) are something that we want and are not doing enough because we certainly know that often time's people go into these non-traditional areas. These career paths are highly skilled at what they do and probably were attracted to that piece because maybe reading, writing and math were not their strength. Ms. Pipkin asked, so how do we support that and make sure they have what they need if they cannot pass the Praxis, because we want that to be a model for that literacy piece. Ms. Pipkin definitely thinks that a workgroup is needed, because this is not going to go away and something needs to be done about it.

Dr. Alyssia James asked Ms. Spross if there were some ideas about what areas, if a workgroup was convened, that the Board would want to make sure that they addressed

Ms. Spross stated that Dr. James raised that question that she, Ms. Meadows and her team have been struggling with, because the conversation really originated around career and technology. This field is one of the most difficult to fill, but she felt that they would be narrowly focused if they only looked at career and technology.

The legislation that is coming to the board is talking about any position that is considered a critical need, not just on the state critical need list but as the county is identifying critical needs. Ms. Spross agreed with what Mr. Lloyd had stated that Maryland is attracting 30% less teachers to the profession. Whereas Maryland has always been an import state because we do not produce enough of our own teachers. She feels that the workgroup has to look to the need, which everyone is screaming career and technology. The conversation always starts around career and technology positions and then as people get, a little bit deeper math is included as well. We are having trouble recruiting our top high-level calculus teachers. Next people ask about foreign languages that we now want to recruit and now we have adopted the Korean Axel test because we have programs for Korean now. Ms. Spross stated, as we become a more diverse educational system, we have to be positioned to open our arms for broadening what we offer. The school systems today are looking at how we put in top- notched specialized programs that meet the needs of all of our children. Ms. Spross stated that she thinks that as the Board should start to talk about it, and it is going to come back to career and technology. But, for those professionals that are coming into the field from a career whether they get into an alternative preparation program or come through the most difficult route to obtain certification, which as we know is credit count and is not a cohesive program of study. I think that is what becomes so daunting

Mr. Charles Hagan stated that it is a daunting task and he knows that in Pennsylvania for Career and Tech Ed the teachers have to take 76 credits in Career Technology Ed. Most career and technology teachers have never gone to college and the last time they were in school was 20 years ago. In the past six years, he has had two teachers who have lost their certification. Mr. Hagan stated that they have kept the teachers on long- term pay and they have lost all of their benefits because they really want to teach while they struggle to pass the Praxis, not the college classes. He stated that every tech principal has lost multiple teachers because they could not pass the Praxis. The Praxis is killing off a number of Tech teachers. Mr. Hagan stated that not long ago he was told that they use to have four years or that they could get a second conditional 2-year certificate to get the Praxis and other things done. This makes quite a bit of difference.

Mr. Hornbeck asked who sets the cut scores on the Praxis. Is that something the State Board does, or is that PSTEB?

Ms. Spross state that the State Board sets the cut scores and MSDE works very closely with ETS. When a test is developed, ETS puts together two multi-state standard teams. Maryland is very active in that process. We nominate up to five or six individuals from the local school systems that have knowledge in that test area and from our higher education community. The individuals participate on the panel and out of that process, ETS sets the norm. What has happened historically is that Maryland adopts what is the norm. We do not adopt something that is higher or lower than most. The last two tests that were taken to the Board, we adopted the norm. We recommended the adoption of the recommended score. For Early Childhood, all the states that were using the same score, so we put ourselves at the same as the other states. For Computer Science, which we know is not a widely popular test, we adopted the same as four or five other states, except for those who had a higher cut score and we did not adopt the higher cut score.

Mr. Hornbeck stated that we are seeing the problems that we see from teaching students, that high stakes standardize testing produces enormous problems, especially for students who learn differently. We teach them on the basis that kids learn different ways than just the basic cookie cutter test, but this can also cause problems for some of the most creative adults. He stated that it does not surprise him, that it shows up there as well as it show up here, and it will probably be the focus of the workgroup. In his mind, it would also be driven by philosophy as well. PSTEB's job as a board is to make sure that we have the minimum standards that a teacher has to have in order to do their job in front of our most precious asset, which are our children. Therefore, we set the minimum of what a teacher has to have and that is the focus. That minimum training does not go up and down based on the number of people we have to do the job. The minimum training is what they need to have. Mr. Hornbeck thinks that this will drive a good portion of the discussion even though it is a very important factor. The fact that we might not have somebody in a classroom is not the focus of what we do. The focus of what we

do is to make sure that whoever is in front of the classroom is adequately able to deal with those students and the needs that they bring. If there is a shortage and people do not want to do that, then that is for someone else to try figure out. This Board makes sure that every parent who gives us their children has a teacher who is trained to deal with not just a few conflicts, but all the kids who walk through their door including proper content knowledge and proper pedagogy. So the philosophy often is in their mind, is that we can do it within 12 hours. Maybe we can, but we have to figure this out. If we put certain supports in place, maybe we can produce a little bit of a fast track. The politics and the environment of why teachers, or why people, may not want to become teachers and how it fits into their life, are some of the issues we have to be mindful of, but it should not cause us in any way to lower the standards. He stated that is what he sometimes fears and that is not what you are saying or anybody else is saying, but it is often what the conversation evolves into. Maybe the scores are too high because it is a cookie cutter test and maybe we need to adjust that. However, if it is not then, the score stays where it is, because that is what you need to teach. If not then maybe only the kids who do not have any special needs, are the only ones signed up for technology but I doubt that is the case. If you start thinking and saying that regular classroom teachers have to have so many set hours and not technology teachers, then what you are really saying is that you are not going to have kids who have any reading problems, who are ADD, ADHD or who have emotional disorders. If that is the case, why aren't different kids taking those kinds of courses? They is good too and now you have a gap in achievement. Mr. Hornbeck stated that he goes back to the idea that the standards are the standards unless we are going to subdivide kids and create another achievement gap by which we do not need to train some people just other. He goes back to the idea that this Board has a responsibility to the public to make sure every teacher has what they need.=There might be some creative ways to do it. He stated that there are roadblocks to it, and then we need to fix them. He suggested that this has to be kept in mind with the workgroup formed.

Mr. Hagan stated that if he used this question to ask the Tech Principals around the state, “would you be okay with going back to being able to have one additional 2-year conditional certificate for your tech teachers to get that minimum certificate? He did not think any principal would say lower the certification standards, but would agree that this would give the teachers a little bit longer. Mr. Hagan stated that he does not think that it is going to solve the problem, because there is always someone who cannot pass the test. He does think that it will alleviate many of the terminations of good people who are willing to use their craft to teach young people.

Ms. Spross stated that this Board’s responsibility is to set minimum qualifications for all teachers and to determine what are the minimum standards for all teachers. Every teacher in Maryland should have minimum set of standards that have to be met. Ms. clarified that in current regulations, it is a 2-year certificate renewable once. In old regulations, she believed, it was a 4-year certificate non-renewable. The certificate is renewable but the test is required.

Ms. Meadows stated that a basic skills assessment, in which we accept several is due at the end of that two years in order to get the renewal. The individual does need 12 credits. The individual can take the Praxis Core, the ACT or the SAT. We accept any of the three tests.

Dr. James asked if we know what areas of need have more people with the highest turnover rate? In regards to the people who received a conditional license one year and how we terminate them. Do we really know if Praxis is the reason or if there are some people who are terminated because of credit count?

Ms. Spross stated that she would have to research the fact in regards to the turnover rate. In regards to teacher termination, that is an employment decision and MSDE does not look at employment decisions.

Dr. James asked that as we are looking for a workgroup, what are the action items that we are going to task them to look at.

Mr. Hornbeck stated the Board was thinking of forming a workgroup to look at the specialized areas of COMAR



Mr. Darren Hornbeck entertained motions to approve the permission to publish COMAR 13A.12.01.14B.

**MOTION:** Mr. Charles Hagan/Mr. Phil Kauffman To approve the permission to publish COMAR 13A.12.01.14B.

**VOTE:** UNANIMOUS

**Alternative Certification Program Workgroup**

Ms. Spross stated that this workgroup is for the conditional certificate. It is specifically looking at the conditional certificate and what is required. This is a recommendation that came out of a workgroup formed from the 2015 legislation. It is a little bit misleading but what the title is. The legislation was called the Alternative Certification Program.

Ms. Spross stated that she is asking for two representatives from PSTEB to serve on the workgroup to look at the conditional certificate requirements. Mr. Charles Hagan and Dr. Alyssia James both agreed to serve on the workgroup.

**Approval of April Minutes**

Mr. Darren Hornbeck entertained a motion to approve the April minutes.

**MOTION:** Mr. Christopher Lloyd/Ms. Jennifer Berkley To approve the April 7, 2016 minutes.

**VOTE:** UNANIMOUS

**Approval of Proposed Agenda Items for June**

- Approval of May Minutes & SBOE Updates;
- ETS Information Session;
  - Note System
  - Pro-Ethica
- Update on Work Groups.

Mr. Darren Hornbeck entertained a motion to approve the June Agenda.

**MOTION:** Dr. Alyssia James/Ms. Dawn Pipkin To approve the June Agenda.

**VOTE:** UNANIMOUS

**July Meeting**

Mr. Darren Hornbeck entertained a motion to cancel the July meeting.

**MOTION:** Ms. Debra Poese/Dr. Kandace Hoppin To approve the cancellation of the July meeting.

**VOTE:** UNANIMOUS

**Meeting Adjourned**

Mr. Darren Hornbeck entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting.

**MOTION:** Mr. Charles Hagan/Ms. Merlyn Bell

To approve the adjournment of the meeting.

**VOTE:** UNANIMOUS

**Meeting adjourned 11:55**