



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

**PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND TEACHER EDUCATION BOARD**

**December 1, 2016  
Minutes**

The 412<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 December 1, 2016. Dr. Alyssa James called the meeting to order at 9:45 a.m.

**The following members were in attendance:** Dr. Mae Alfree, Ms. Jennifer Berkley, Mr. Darren Hornbeck, Dr. Alyssia James, Ms. Maleeta Kitchen, Mr. Christopher Lloyd, Dr. Kristine McGee, Ms. Dawn Pipkin, Ms. Debra Poese, Ms. Karen Saar, Ms. Sarah Spross, Ms. Geralda Thompson and Dr. Jamey Tobery-Nystrom.

**The following members were absent:** Mr. Peter Baily, Ms. Louise DeJesu, Mr. Charles Hagan, Dr. Kandace Hoppin, Mr. Philip Kauffman, Ms. Kathleen Kelbaugh, Dr. Mary Ellen Lewis, Dr. Barbara Martin-Palmer, and Dr. John Mayo.

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

Ms. Michelle Dunkle, Ms. Mary Voorhees, Ms. Ruth Downs (Recorder), and Mr. Derek Simonsen, Esq., Attorney General's Office.

**PRELIMINARY ITEMS**

**Recognition of Guests**

Ms. Geraldine Duval, MSEA  
Barbara Donick, Right-to-Read – Maryland  
Lisa Hendrick, ETS

**Public Comment**

Ellen Stein, Right to Read - Maryland

My name is Ellen Stein is a member of Right to Read-Maryland, a coalition of educators and organizations who have the common goal of improving teacher preparation as it specifically relates to reading skills acquisition for all. In Maryland, both the NAEP and the PARCC testing results showed that approximately 60% of our 4<sup>th</sup> graders are not proficient in reading.

I am addressing this board because the Maryland State Board of Education along with the Professional Standards Teacher's Board controls through regulations the certification and preparation of Maryland's teachers. Last year we introduced House Bill 763 Task Force to Study Effectiveness of Teacher Education Programs in the Instruction of Reading when this bill reached the Ways and Means Committee in the House of Delegates, MSDE opposed it because they were planning to create a work group to study and revise the four reading courses required for teachers. This work group is now in progress. These four courses were designed in 2004 with the assistance of Dr. Louisa Moats a national expert who has been involved in the field of reading research, clinical practice, classroom teaching and teacher training for over four decades.

We want to ensure that this work group leads to the improvement of reading instruction based on sound policies. Dr. Moats has provided a road map to “ensure that anyone bent on finding programs that truly work can do so with confidence.” The following are some her suggestions.

1. Teachers licensed for elementary school be required to complete a course of study in reading research, including scientific findings about how children learn to read, why some children fail to learn to read, and what instructional methods have been validated.
2. All teachers of reading and related language skills should be given ready access to models of effective teaching.
3. Continuing education for the teachers of teachers, certified by a respected and independent body, will be needed before colleges of education will change.
4. Teacher testing must be calibrated to measure knowledge of scientifically-based research and disciplinary knowledge base required for effective instruction. The majority of today’s teacher licensing tests are irrelevant for predicting teacher competence and do not have content consistent with scientific based reading research (SBRR).
5. School Boards must support the necessary conditions for instructional improvement in reading including professional development time and leadership training for principals among others.

The development of reading skills serves as the major foundational academic ability for all school based learning. We appreciate your time and attention to this critical issue.

\* <https://edexcellence.net/publications/wholelanguage.html>

## **DISCUSSION**

### **State Board**

There was no State Board Report. The Board does not meet in November.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **PROETHICA FOLLOW-UP DISCUSSION**

Ms. Sarah Spross did a follow-up discussion on the presentation that was done in October from ETS on the Proethica. She stated that the discussion was very positively received by the Board and that there was a lot of discussion at the time of the presentation and that the Board had asked her to put this on the agenda with for a follow-up. Ms. Spross stated that she has some ideas of how she wanted to proceed, but wanted to know if the Board had some ideas as to how they want MSDE to move forward with Proethica? Ms. Spross stated that Dr. Troy Hutchins was a dynamic speaker and she could not match how he presented. As you recall, Proethica is a new tool through ETS that really talks about the ethics behind teaching. Dr. Hutchins talked about the number of decision points a teacher has in a day. Not almost all of the decision points are clear-cut. For example, “Can I go to the bathroom?” It is not a yes or no answer. Dr. Hutchins also talked about the model code of ethics that has been developed by NASDTEC (the National Association of State Directors of Educators) and this is being integrated into some states. Ms. Spross asked the Board what is their desire and how would they like to move forward with the information they received?

Dr. Jamey Tobery-Nystrom stated that she took the discussion back to her graduate students as a lesson. She stated that the conversations have been fascinating over the code of ethics and what teachers need. Should there be a code of ethics? She asked them if they knew what the code of conduct was in their schools. Dr. Tobery-Nystrom stated that everybody knew that there was some level of code of conduct and thought they may have signed something like it when they were hired, but had no idea what it was. The students were overwhelmed by the number of indicators in the set of standards (there was something like 84). Dr. Tobery-Nystrom stated that the program was very thorough, that it was not user

friendly. Another issue that Dr. Tobery-Nystrom had with Proethica was that Dr. Hutchins stated that no teacher educators were involved with putting together this code of ethics. Dr. Hutchins rationale was because teachers are not practitioners. Dr. Tobery-Nystrom felt that this was a topic that PSTEB should be discussing and it is very timely. She does not want the Board to disguise themselves in the code of conduct and ignore the conversation that needs to be about civics and social justice.

Ms. Maleeta Kitchen stated that she randomly brought the subject of ethics up in the staff lounge at work. She stated that it was very interesting to her that her co-workers were very familiar with the student Code of Conduct and what was in those verses their own Code of Conduct as educators. Ms. Kitchen stated that she would like the Board to further look into this and have some type of follow-up. Ms. Kitchen stated that PSTEB should look at other professions. In addition, down the road is this something a teacher will need for re-certification?

Mr. Christopher Lloyd asked Ms. Spross if the State Board has had conversations on this subject or has expressed an interest in it.

Ms. Spross stated that she would have to research to see if the State Board has had any discussions in regards to Code of Ethics. Historically there was a discussion about a Code of Conduct/Code of Ethics at PSTEB. Ms. Spross stated that she does not know if the discussion started with PSTEB or at the State level.

Dr. Alyssa James stated that with the climate that we are in right now, she wondered if there are more counties having this difficulty where they have employees on administrative leave because of a gray area and they do not know what they are doing until an investigation is done.

Mr. Darren Hornbeck stated that he remembered two discussions historically at PSTEB. The locals were thinking about sharpening their Codes of Conduct or spelling them out more specifically and they were looking for some sort of instructions from MSDE, as to if there should be some uniform code. He stated that as a Board, PSTEB was very concerned about creating some kind of master list and that faded. PSTEB decided that we really did not want to get involved in something like that. That was not ethics, but a code of something. He stated that was a discussion about if a teacher was under investigation for something, they come up for certificate renewal, and we give them their certificate. The teacher could have well committed some type of criminal act, but still receives their recertification. Mr. Hornbeck stated that there was a discussion that PSTEB should flag the teacher's records until the matter was sorted out. The Board was very concerned about doing that because sometimes teachers are accused of something that they did not do. Mr. Hornbeck said that the presentation was so refreshing in its design, because it admits that teachers have to make decisions where there frankly are not clear-cut wrong answers. He asked Ms. Spross if the Department of Certification or the State decided what they would like to do.

Ms. Dawn Pipkin stated that the presentation raised many concerns. She asked if PSTEB needs to do something to assure this up.

Ms. Karen Saar stated that professional development would really be a perfect fit. Should this be done either in the renewal of teacher certification process or in the initial college training? Ms. Saar asked if ETS is the only company doing ethics for teachers or are there other companies offering this type of program.

Ms. Spross stated that this is really a gray area. How do we incorporate that? We hear repeatedly that teachers are not prepared for the diverse populations that they are faced with in our schools. Is that the ethics training that goes behind that on how to work with different populations? Ms. Spross stated that she would purpose if the Board wishes that a small group of Higher Education representatives and HR representatives be put together to really look at what the model Code of Conduct/Ethics is.

### **ESSA UPDATE**

Ms. Mary Gable, Assistant Superintendent for Academic Policy and Innovation did an update on the "Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) for the PSTEB Board.

## **Objectives:**

- ESSA
  - Review
  - Focus on Accountability
- Maryland's Consolidated State Plan
  - Timeline
  - Consultation
- Gather feedback and input on Maryland's Consolidated State Plan

## **Timeline and Implementation for ESSA**

- Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) 1965
- No Child Left Behind (NCLB) 2001
- ESSA was signed into law on December 10, 2015
- ESEA Flexibility waivers expired August 1, 2016
- School year 2016-2017 is a transition year
- New ESSA provisions go into effect for 2017-2018 school year
- Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2016 competitive and formula funding will flow through ESEA construct for school year 2016-2017; FFY 2017 dollars will flow through ESSA construct (in schools for 2017-2018 school year)

## **ESSA Highlights**

- ESSA is designed to create a long-term, stable federal policy that gives states additional flexibility and encourages innovation, while at the same time holding states accountable for results.

## **ESSA Highlights - Standards**

- Maintains requirement for academic content standards in English/Language Arts, Math, and Science
- "Challenging State Academic Standards" aligned with State's higher education requirements for credit-bearing coursework and state career and technology standards.
- "States must simply assure that they will meet the requirements of the statute and any applicable regulations" in regards to Standards. (USED Final Regulations on Accountability and State Plans, 11/29/16)

## **ESSA Highlights - Assessments**

- Maintains annual assessment for grades 3-8 and once in high school for ELA and Math (grade bands in Science)
- Local Education Agency (LEA) can use nationally recognized tests at the high school level with State approval – must meet assessment and accountability requirements. Maryland is a PARCC state.
- States are still required to meet a 95 percent participation rate, but participation rate, but State determines consequences for not meeting 95 percent for LEAs/schools.

## **ESSA Highlights - Accountability:**

- States choose their own **ambitious, long-term, and interim goals** addressing proficiency on assessments, EL proficiency, and graduation rates
- Must include three academic indicators which include achievement, another academic indicator (graduate rates at HS level possibly student growth at Elementary School/Middle School), and EL proficiency; plus, a fourth "non-academic" indicator measuring school quality or student success
- States determine the weight of each indicator although academic indicators must carry "much greater weight" than non-academic
- ELA and Math weights must be equal
- Indicators will be disaggregated by subgroups

## **Goals:**

Maryland is considering a proposal to implement long-term ambitious goals by reducing non-proficient students by a certain percentage (still to be determined) by the year 2030. These goals will be calculated for all students and for each of the ESEA student groups.

### **Non-Academic Indicator**

ESSA requires state to measure School Quality or Student Success for all public schools

- Indicator(s) must be disaggregated by student group
- Indicator(s) may differ by each grade span.
- Indicator(s) may include one or more measures of:
  - Student access and completion of advanced coursework
  - Postsecondary readiness
  - School climate and safety
  - Student engagement
  - Educator engagement

During ESSA Flexibility, Maryland has used for high school a College and Career Preparation (CCP) component in the accountability system.

Measures included:

- AP Assessment score of 3 or better or IB score of 4 or better
- Career and Technology Education (CTE) Concentrators
- College Enrollment
- Note: could add Dual Enrollment

### **Options for Non-academic Indicators**

- School Climate (based on surveys to be phased in)
- School Facility Quality
- Chronic Absenteeism/Attendance
- Suspension/Expulsion Rates
- College and Career Readiness
- Achievement Advancement (PL1-2 and PL4-5)
- Access to a full curriculum – including science, social studies, arts, health, and physical education, as well as reading and mathematics
- Availability of and participation in rigorous course (AP/IB)
- Surveys to measure engagement
- Teacher Qualifications
- Teachers – access to and participation in PD
- Teacher Attendance

### **ESSA Highlights – Teachers and Principals**

- Gives states flexibility to work with local stakeholders to develop educator evaluation and support systems
- States can use Title II funds to implement teacher evaluations
- Title II, Part A allows states to fund their priorities in attracting, preparing, supporting, and retaining effective teachers and leaders to serve high-poverty, minority students
- Authorizes new allowable funding for states to develop and implement
  - Teacher and School Leader Academies
  - Activities to support principals (new 3% Title II set-aside)
  - Educator training on use of technology and data privacy
  - Reform of state certification, licensure, and tenure systems
  - And others....

### **Supporting Excellent Educators – Systems of Educator Development, Retention, and Advancement**

Maryland has a single-tier certification process with five pathways leading to an initial professional certificate

- a traditional Maryland teacher education preparation program;
- an out-of-state education preparation program;
- the experienced professional route;
- transcript analysis allowing the potential educator to fill in any content gaps and obtain the sequence of professional education courses necessary for certification in that specific area; or
- a state-approved alternative preparation program.

### **Supporting Excellent Educators – Support for Educators (DRAFT)**

- Professional Development and Support:
  - Develop a statewide definition of teacher leader that:
    - defines leaders both emerging and established and
    - outlines characteristics of effective teacher leaders.
  - Create a teacher leadership framework that:
    - develops pedagogy, content, community, and collaboration; and
    - capitalizes on established teacher leaders
  - Develop resources i.e. toolkit, online courses to support teacher leaders.

### **Supporting Excellent Educators – Equity (DRAFT)**

- Maryland measures across quadrants, by income and race, to determine the rate at which students are taught by:
  - Ineffective teachers;
  - Out-of-field teachers;
  - Inexperienced (first year) teachers, and
  - Inexperienced (first-third year) teachers
- Root causes include, but are not limited to:
  - Insufficient supply of well-prepared teachers;
  - Geographic location of some LEAs;
  - Teacher Attrition; and,
  - Shortage areas.
- Sample Strategies:
  - Collaborate with LEAs and their national, local, and IHE training partners to expand alternative programs to assist in placing qualified teachers in hard-to-staff positions in all regions of the state.
  - Encourage online and digital preparation programs in partnership with rural counties both on the Shore and in the western part of the State.
  - Continue to establish cohorts of classroom teachers to facilitate courses and other requirements for completion of English for Speakers of other Languages (ESOL) and Special Education endorsements.
  - Investigate possible recommendations for revision to the teacher quality stipends for teachers.

### **ESSA Highlights – School Improvement**

- States must use evidence-based interventions
- Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) Schools
  - Lowest performing 5 percent of Title I schools on state accountability system;
  - All high schools with graduation rates less than 67 percent; and
  - Title I schools with subgroups chronically underperforming that do not improve after a state-determined number of years (example – 3 years)
- Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) Schools
  - Schools with consistently underperforming subgroups, as defined by the state
- State approve and monitor LEA plans for **Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) schools**
  - School plans must be informed by all accountability indicators; include evidence-based interventions; be based on school needs assessment; identify resource inequities; and be approved by the school and the LEA
- LEAs approve and monitor school plans for **Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) schools**
  - School plans must be informed by all accountability indicators; include evidence-based interventions; Result in additional action if implementation of the plan is unsuccessful after a number of years to be determined by the LEA
- States determine exit criteria, timeline (less than 4 years), and additional action for CSI schools

### **Well-Rounded Education**

- The term “well-rounded education” means courses, activities, and programming in subjects such as English, reading or language arts, writing, science, technology, engineering, mathematics, foreign languages, civics, and government, economics, arts, history, geography, computer science, music, career and technical education, health, physical

education, and any other subject, as determined by the state or local educational agency, with the purpose of providing all students access to an enriched curriculum and educational experience.

### **Additional Reporting Requirements for State Report Card**

- For all students and disaggregated by each subgroup of students, **homeless status**, status as a child in **foster care**, and status as a **student with a parent who is a member of the Armed Forces on active duty**, information on student achievement on the academic assessments at each level of achievement. Graduation and other academic indicator for **homeless** and **foster care** must be reported.
- Per-pupil expenditures of Federal, State, and local funds**, including **actual personnel** expenditures and **actual non-personnel** expenditures of Federal, State, and local funds, **disaggregated** by source of funds, **for each local educational agency and each school** in the State for preceding fiscal year.

### **Consolidated State Plan**

- Consultation and Coordination
- Challenging Academic Standards and Assessments
- Accountability, Support, and Improvement for Schools
- Supporting Excellent Educators
- Supporting All Students

### **ESSA Timeline Review**

- Revised Regulations (11/29/16) determined submission dates are April 3, 2017 and September 18, 2017.
- State Board will review revised information at the December 5, 2016 State Board Meeting.

### **Tentative Timeline – April Submission**

- January 24, 2017 Final Draft to State Board
- January 27, 2017 Submission of Plan to Governor, Legislative Policy Committee, and Public Comment (30 days)
- March 28, 2017 Final Approval by the State Board
- April 3, 2017 Submission to U.S. Department of Education**

### **Tentative Timeline – September Submission**

- June 27, 2017 Final Draft to State Board
- June 30, 2017 Submission of Plan to Governor, Legislative Policy Committee, and Public Comment (30 days)
- August 22, 2017 Final Approval by the State Board
- September 18, 2017 Submission to U.S. Department of Education**

### **Consultation**

- Over 60 meetings/focus groups
- External Committee-representing Governor, Board of Education, LEAs, teachers, principals, teacher unions, other school leaders, charter school leaders, parents, families, community-based organizations, civil rights organizations, and institutions of higher education, employers, and the public.
- Seven workgroups led by Internal MSDE staff with external stakeholders
- To come:
  - ESSA Listening Tour-January 2017
  - Public Survey

### **Input**

- Guiding Questions:
  - What recommendations do you have in any area of ESSA?
  - What recommendations do you have for goals and interim goals, multiple measures, and accountability?
  - Concerns that you wish to have addressed.

**BREAK**

**Elementary Reading Update – PRAXIS Reading Test 5203**

Ms. Michelle Dunkle gave a brief update on Elementary Reading and Praxis Test 5203 for Reading. Ms. Dunkle informed the Board that the second literacy is complete with rubric. The group is working on the four (4) elementary school courses. Almost all the Math that pertains to Elementary Education is done. There have been eight (8) meetings since October. The next workgroup meeting is scheduled for January 19, 2017. Ms. Dunkle stated that once the courses are complete, they would set about the writing of the framework. The goal is to complete this by the end of 2017 and to be as transparent as possible. They are looking at the content for Praxis 5203.

**ACTION ITEMS**

**Permission to Publish - COMAR 13A.12.02.21 (Deaf and Hard of Hearing [Hearing Impaired])**

Ms. Alex Cambra asked for permission to publish COMAR 13A.12.02.21-Deaf and Hard of Hearing [Hearing Impaired]. Amendments were purposed to update the language in this regulation, to identify content-specific coursework and in particular removing the Special Education certificate requirement in order to open this up to increase the number of educators that are available to teach this population.

Dr. Alyssia James entertained a motion to approve the permission to publish COMAR 13A.12.02.21.

**MOTION:** Dr. C. Mae Alfree/Ms. Debra Poese To approve the permission to publish  
COMAR 13A.12.02.21.

**VOTE:** UNANIMOUS

**Approval of November Minutes**

Dr. Alyssia James entertained a motion to approve November minutes with the one change.

**MOTION:** Ms. Geralda Thompson/Ms. Jennifer Berkley To approve the November minutes.

**VOTE:** UNANIMOUS

**Approval of Proposed Agenda Items for January**

- o Approval of December Minutes
- o SBOE Updates
- o Testing Commission Update
- o Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016 Workgroup Update

Dr. Alyssia James entertained a motion to adopt the items that Ms. Spross mentioned for the January Agenda.

**MOTION:** Ms. Dawn Pipkin/Mr. Christopher Lloyd To approve the January Agenda.

**VOTE:** UNANIMOUS

**Meeting Adjourned**

Dr. James entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting.

**MOTION:** Ms. Debra Poese/Ms. Geralda Thompson To adjourn the meeting.

**VOTE:** UNANIMOUS

**Meeting adjourned 11:55 a.m.**