



**Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016
Workgroup
January 20, 2017 Meeting**

The 10th meeting of the Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016 Workgroup was called to order by Ms. Sarah Spross at 9:30 a.m.

In attendance: Sarah Spross (MSDE), Emily Dow, (Maryland Higher Education Commission), Jack Smith (Public School Superintendents Association of Maryland), Deborah Kraft (Maryland Independent College and University Association), Nancy Shapiro (University of Maryland System), Tess Blumenthal (Maryland Association of Elementary School Principals), Rowena Shurn (Maryland State Education Association),

MSDE Staff: Alexandra Cambra (MSDE), Kelly Meadows (MSDE), Jessica Bancroft (MSDE), Ruth Downs (MSDE), Karen Dates-Dunmore (MSDE), Tanisha Brown (MSDE)

Absentees: Marietta English (Baltimore Teachers Union), Laura Wheeldryer (Maryland State Board of Education), Linda Gronberg-Quinn (Maryland Association of Directors of Teacher Education at Community Colleges), Annette Wallace (Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals)

Administration

Ms. Sarah Spross called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m.

Ms. Spross noted that today is a work day. At the last meeting we discussed identifying the issues, aligning our findings and recommendations to the issue. All identified issues must address the components of the Bill. Our goal today is to identify the framework/parameters for the committees to move forward with.

Secondly, the Instructional Performance Criteria (IPC) has been broken down into a working document highlighting a Column for Areas of Change/Innovation. The goal is for the workgroup members to identify the four standards today. The charge to the committee will be to identify the element, indicator, and evidence for each standard. The workgroup encourages the committee to be bold and innovative with their recommendations.

Dr. Shapiro asked for an update on CAEP and State Legislation update.

Ms. Spross noted the legislation has not dropped due to questions surrounding funding. We anticipate seeing it released soon.

Ms. Spross provided an update on the ESSA listening tours. To date MSDE has conducted meetings in Dorchester County, Washington County, Baltimore City and, and Prince George's

County. The last event will be held next week in Calvert County. Our group has facilitated the discussion regarding two areas of the consolidated state application; g supporting excellent educators and equity. MSDE has over 500 respondents to the online survey and the listening tours have been well attended. Most respondents have been educators.

Comments have included: When teachers talk about teacher preparation we hear that the internship experience is not related to what it is really like to be a teacher. Ms. Spross told a story from a woman in Western Maryland that was about a teacher who was not prepared to teach people who did not look like her, sound like her, or grow up like her. This is something that needs to be looked at.

In Prince George's we heard about needing apprenticeships. We need to look at these issues. Is it a residence model, and is it about seeing different schools, doing coursework at night? We did not hear back as much about certification but the one thing we have heard from the survey is that the respondents do not think the tests are relative to what they are teaching. There are discrepancies about the testing issues. Is Maryland too hard or too soft? There is also disparity around being able to add a certification area by test. There are also responses to micro credentialing, but the focus is on the tests.

Professional Development was a big topic. The biggest thing is that we do not differentiate the professional development. Everyone has to do this class or that, but not always relevant. They want autonomy to choose professional development plans. They also want to see stronger mentorship models across the state. There needs to be a stronger pool of mentors with uniform standards. Professional Development should be from locals, IHE, or the State. It should be paid for by the State and all tie back to certification.

Fewer responses focused on equity but the State should mandate that those most qualified should teach in high needs schools. Could this be on a rotation? This has issues around being told what to do. The biggest take away is that we are not preparing our teachers in teacher prep or professional development for cultural competency. We need to pay attention to this.

Ms. Dow noted what stood out to her that we have not discussed are substitute teachers and what skills they should have.

Ms. Spross noted they also talked about the idea of growing your own. Those coming in do not know what Maryland norms are and we need to have supports in place for these people. Maryland needs to grow our own from our communities. There is some strong misunderstanding. They do not understand the State does provide Professional Development. One group talked about how Montgomery County does professional development and one participant asked about sister cities for support. They also talked about social media and technology to support professional development.

Dr. Shapiro asked if we can address these things and can we make changes. One of the approaches the University is addressing uses system-ness. If there is a good idea at UMES and Coppin is not doing it, we want to talk to the people at Coppin. We can help to make that connect. One of the potential drivers for MSDE should be systems.

Dr. Shapiro comments regarding the internship and that it is not enough. There have been recommendations around the internship. We know 100 days is not enough. We need to get behind the idea of a residency model. We are talking in IHEs that there should be multiple measures to qualify teachers and we should identify what they are. Next she addressed baseline measures. Professional Development in IHEs is not the same for all. We are reworking our advising systems and a meta-major. In Professional Development, can we create a meta area? For the equity topic, incentives are better than mandates to be in the challenging districts. Is it about money or about more time for mentorships? The schools should be structured differently. She continued with technology and social media. Our generation is feeling less competent and our organizations need to hire those who are competent. We need to think about who we hire into our organizations so we are more responsive.

Ms. Shurn noted disparity between young, and more seasoned, educators...don't need to push back on seasoned teachers, just increase collaboration. She proposed the idea of considering a 5-year track? Students do not feel ready.

Dr. Shapiro said there is not enough time in the program. Five years would be great, but it costs more. Ms. Shurn discussed the alternative pathways and how are those people being prepared. In secondary, you focus on content and not pedagogy. Elementary is the opposite. College and Career Readiness ask us to focus on this. Teachers need an in-depth knowledge. Do we need to shift from generalist in elementary to more specific?

Ms. Spross noted we have six months to make strong bold recommendations to overhaul what we need to do in Maryland. We can't be afraid to make recommendations regardless of money or if others will agree. Our recommendations should be based on what this group feels would be best for Maryland today.

Ms. Spross introduced the document that shows the recommendations that are in the report. They are not all measurable or deliverable. We need to bucket them into some big pieces like the residency model. This is a reformat of what we have.

Recommendations:

Ms. Spross noted we were missing the "what is the issue?" We learned it started with critical shortage and our certification regulations are a barrier. The law speaks about certification. How can we move forward and is certification something to fix?

Ms. Shurn agreed we should. There are areas in which you can get certified without taking coursework in an area where you have not taken any classes. This is of concern. Ms. Spross noted the requirements for transcript review is outdated. Ms. Shurn also noted you can test in. Ms. Spross reminded that these need to be aligned with what is right for Maryland. Dr. Shapiro spoke about the use of SPAs. Ms. Spross asked if we want to align to National Standards or what we are asking teachers to do in Maryland.

Dr. Shapiro noted everyone should be able to teach to Maryland College and Career Readiness.

Dr. Smith talked about the threshold of knowledge you need to have based on who you are teaching, something similar to Debra Ball at Michigan, with group work that leads to learning. Pedagogy is broader than this. Can the teacher apply what they know, not just knowing learning theory? If we do not go back to results in student performance we have issues that not everyone can respond to kids as a way to pull them back in, especially with cultural differences. We get hung up on tests and internship and we need to reach a threshold of competency in all the areas prior to or during initial teacher experience.

Dr. Kraft asked how can we capture this threshold?

Dr. Smith stated we can do a better job than we are doing now and it cannot be a binary system. We need to look at professional judgement and do quality control.

Ms. Spross noted we have five routes to certification. Maryland Approved Programs, Approved out of state, approved out of state administrative, approved out of state experienced professional, transcript analysis), and Maryland Resident Teacher Program. Are we limiting who we bring into the State? There is also the recommendation that National Board be considered a route.

Dr. Smith said he could support National Board in combination with something else. There is a level of evidence in National Board related to the threshold. National Board does not necessarily say you will get good student outcomes.

Dr. Shapiro said we should think of teachers as the highest level of profession like law and medical. Can we learn from how they qualify to come into the profession?

Ms. Blumenthal noted the experience does not necessarily produce teachers who have good student outcomes.

Dr. Kraft pointed out the issue is that the recommendations are going to greater limit certification.

Ms. Spross asked if there are other states that have different options for becoming certified to teach in there state. Also are there different models as opposed to a single tier system. Do we want to explore a different tiered system and not require a Masters, still requiring professional development? Georgia has a two- tiered system focused on outcome. We never differentiate high quality.

Dr. Smith asked what the flaws in our pathways are. Or where are the flaws where we have been ridiculous?

Ms. Shurn expressed frustration with pathways to certification for herself.

Ms. Spross agreed that MSDE sees flaws in the process all the time. We need to break down barriers. Transcript analysis was designed for those who did not go through a traditional route. We do need to think about minimum threshold.

Dr. Smith asked if you need courses AND Praxis.

Ms. Meadows commented on transcript analysis and the subjectivity of it. It is a complicated process with the certification specialist and educator.

Ms. Spross noted the test vs. the courses and we will have people who feel very strongly about this issue.

Dr. Smith offered that we need to change the conversation. One thing does not make you a teacher.

Ms. Spross noted a certification only means you have met the requirements to teach.

Dr. Shapiro commented on the threshold, can we make sure even brilliant people who are great with content but terrible with students are not in the classroom, there should be a do no harm threshold.

Dr. Smith noted that not all people should be teaching and counseling them out is a success.

Ms. Kraft said they should be counseled out in teacher education and currently we do not have a system of knowing if they would be good. We need an apprenticeship. Even the best may not make it. They need more support from everyone in teacher education.

Ms. Spross confirmed that as a workgroup we want to change the language around what is a certification, look at a minimum for do no harm, and we need to look at how to assess that. We need to look at other states to see what can learn from them. The group agreed that not all teachers need to go to Advanced Professional Certificate.

Ms. Shurn stressed the need for teacher leadership standards.

Ms. Spross reminded the group that PSTEB and the SBOE will need to review and approve regulatory language changes. Members asked are we answering the problem of not enough teachers and removing the barrier to staying in the profession.

Ms. Shurn noted there may be specialty programs where no Masters exist.

Dr. Smith pointed out the subset of the domain of teachers. If you are good at teaching students you may or may not be good at teaching adults. If you are not good at teaching any students you will not have the credibility to teach teachers.

Dr. Shapiro noted that not requiring the Masters has huge impact on higher education. Micro credentialing is possibly a new pathway in partnership skills. Schools see higher education as a resource.

Ms. Spross said the other barrier is the basic skills test. There are a significant group of educators who have difficulty with the math in CTE and work based study. This is a huge issue with CTE.

Ms. Meadows commented that currently you can renew a conditional certificate two times and someone does not need to submit their basic skills test at first and they can still teach for two years without the test and if they do not pass the test they are done.

Dr. Kraft has talked with faculty who said many students do not enter the profession because of the tests.

Dr. Shapiro noted that we should not lower the bar so low we do not have a way of ensuring we have qualified people teaching. There may be a way to make exceptions. If do not want to lower it to the point we get people we do not want.

Ms. Shurn reminded the group there was a time we took composite scores. She said we need to rethink the bands we are providing certification in.

Dr. Smith offered we should think differently about this. Think of it as processes, we could think about a different kind of certificate. You can teach literacy but maybe not math. But everyone needs to read and write at a threshold.

Ms. Spross reminded everyone there are multiple ways to do basic skills.

Ms. Meadows talked about the Praxis II and how it fits in with content.

Dr. Shapiro spoke about how people understand math and what the basic math includes. Tests should be modified if we ask students to go beyond Algebra I.

Ms. Spross moved the conversation into the need for incentives for our teachers to teach in low performing schools and we need ways to do that. Loan forgiveness only at the Federal level.

Dr. Smith talked about Pinsky's unfunded law from two or three years ago that is related to scholarship or loan repayment. This might come out of the Kirwan Commission.

Dr. Shapiro thinks we should think about school structure to reduce burnout. Working conditions need to provide support for teachers.

Dr. Kraft said the schools that pay the most are not necessarily where people teach.

Ms. Shurn thinks there should be support for National Board Certification and those that are not.

Ms. Spross noted the State does pay for 2/3 of National Board, but not all locals will pay for it.

Ms. Shurn talked about loan repayment and housing as well.

Ms. Spross noted MSDE looked at all 50 states to see what incentives they had in place.

Ms. Dow brought up the idea of a medical model for placing first year teachers, on a semi random match like a medical residency.

Dr. Smith noted it would need to include a large incentive for people to participate in this idea.

Ms. Shurn asked how students that do not have experience will know what they know.

Dr. Smith stated we need to change the internship model or apprentice.

Dr. Kraft asked if students are getting enough experience in other experiences.

Ms. Spross and Ms. Dow talked about staying in a district but maybe changing schools but having a specific mentor.

Ms. Shurn noted there are some issues with no fault leaving and performance.

Dr. Kraft said this might be able to start as a pilot.

Dr. Smith noted there is a difference between can't and don't want to.

Ms. Spross shifted the discussion to the about the internship and how does it align to real life classroom experiences. Teachers often do not get hired into school communities that reflect their internship placement.

Ms. Shurn asked if there is a definition of professional development. What is it and what is it not? We need to consider standards to plan what is appropriate. Schools need to know the difference between professional development and a meeting. The shift needs to be towards learning.

Ms. Spross noted we are hearing from teachers they need more supports.

Dr. Kraft noted new teachers want a safe environment to talk about things they need help on.

Ms. Spross asked if it is innovative and do we want to recommend a residency. Is there a system-ness of professional development in the State? This will lend itself most to the retention piece.

Dr. Kraft asked if someone needs to do this for three years.

Dr. Smith noted we need to create a sense of belonging with new teachers but we also need to build professionalism, depth of knowledge, skills and understanding.

Ms. Shurn noted teachers ask for non-instructional support. How do we create instructional and non-instructional communities?

Dr. Smith said what children learn needs to be the outcome.

Ms. Blumenthal said teachers should have ownership of their own professional development and this might not happen if a Masters is not required.

Dr. Shapiro noted there is a movement in IHEs that are college success courses, like an orientation course in the beginning.

Dr. Smith noted nothing is binary and we need to aim for the threshold level.

Ms. Spross said we should look at the renewal and we could rebrand it. Three buckets, reworking certification, incentives for working in high need schools, system-ness of professional development and induction, and the next bucket, how do we design teacher education and how we prepare teachers? Retention will be with mentoring.

Ms. Dow noted that there are leadership issues with retention. Not all leadership is principals. Ms. Shurn asked when the last time the leadership requirements were reviewed was and it was in the last few years.

The workgroup agreed that on the 31st we want to drive the conversation for the committees.

Ms. Spross introduced Ms. Dunkle and the changes to the Instructional Performance Criteria. This is not a time for debate, but instead a time to review what Ms. Dunkle has done. She has broken down the components of the IPC. The group needs to agree if they want to keep, toss, change, or innovate the components.

Ms. Dow asked if these standards for IHE and for alt. prep. Ms. Dunkle confirmed that they are.

Ms. Spross noted if CAEP wants to be an accrediting body in the State of Maryland they must meet these standards.

Ms. Kraft noted IPC is currently different from CAEP.

Ms. Spross continued that the workgroup needs to confirm each component.

Ms. Spross introduced Component 1: Strong Academic Background. She asked the group if they agree and they all agreed.

Dr. Shapiro wanted to know what strong academic background in elementary education is.

Ms. Dunkle explained there is literacy and soon to be math workgroups to look at the elementary requirements and we will be looking at the entire elementary program. Ms. Dunkle confirmed changes will be brought back to the workgroup. There are issues around elementary math and the core math class.

Ms. Spross noted different committees will need to keep in mind what other committees are doing. Component 2: Extensive Internship. Ms. Spross reminded the group that we all agree there should be an extensive internship.

Ms. Dunkle noted the research on the preparation of the initial teacher, says it should be extensive. There is room for, a call for, and innovation for change. One hundred days is an arbitrary number. The ESSA groups pointed out we do not know who we are talking about when we say first year teachers. We cannot ensure a diverse experience. The model needs innovation to meet the needs of student interns. Can we decided to keep idea of extensive internship we will be good.

Dr. Kraft noted we need to be careful around the language; it is about the spirit of internship.

Ms. Spross said we need to give the committee who will be working on this guidance. We need rebranding. We need to look at the 100 days.

Ms. Dunkle noted we have never taken anything away and the committees can look at this document and make the recommendations they want to make and the workgroup will then reconsider the recommendations.

Dr. Shapiro suggested changes to Component I and how it is structured and how we define the element of the component.

Ms. Dunkle suggested we consider adding more and keep in mind accountability.

Ms. Spross noted we should not be doing the work of the committees. Ms. Dunkle reminded the group this is the IPC and we should give the committees the opportunity to make the recommendations.

Ms. Shurn clarified that some of the elements are better as indicators. Considering the timeframe do we shift things around for the time to be more meaningful?

Dr. Shapiro wants the biggest box possible with multiple indicators.

Ms. Spross asked if we are allowing broader group to make decisions and recommendations. If we structure the elements you are telling them what they have to work within. Someone on the committee might feel differently from the workgroup. We need to reshape the committees and there could be a workgroup member that is part of the committees.

Ms. Dunkle suggested you can put everything in the column of indicator and let the committee what rises to that level.

Ms. Spross suggested workgroup members integrate into the committee work. Do we need to identify different people to serve on the committees? Ms. Spross and the group agreed the four components are good. The elements should be moved into indicators.

Ms. Dunkle gave some feedback on the requirement for evidence where possible. She asked the group to encourage the workgroup to ask their constituents to think out of the box about

technology and innovation. How creative can they be and this should be brought to the table. This is an opportunity to see big change.

Ms. Spross noted the innovated program Drs. Smith and Shapiro talked about could fit into multiple places in the components.

Dr. Shapiro said we should not hold ourselves back based on finances and we should include the idea of career lattices in professional development.

Ms. Shurn offered the idea that mentors should be its own component. There should be collaboration between the locals and the IHEs with the help of the State.

Ms. Spross asked the group to consider new workgroups with certification, incentives, professional development, mentoring, and the IPC. We will need to know the new committee members. There also needs to be a new structure to committee work that lets the workgroup to debrief and update. There can be professional development for teachers and professional development for leadership.

The January 31, 2017 meeting is at the Arbutus Library.

Meeting adjourned 12:30