

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

The June meeting of the Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016 Workgroup was called to order by Ms. Sarah Spross at 2:00 p.m.

In attendance: Sarah Spross (MSDE), Nancy Shapiro (University of Maryland System), Rowena Shurn (Maryland State Education Association), Linda Gronberg-Quinn (Maryland Association of Directors of Teacher Education at Community Colleges), Emily Dow, (Maryland Higher Education Commission), Jin Schattenecker (Maryland Approved Alternative Preparation Programs), Dr. Lorraine Cornish-Harrison (Baltimore Teachers Union), Dr. Chadia Abras (Maryland Independent College and University Association), Alexandra Cambra (MSDE), Kelly Meadows (MSDE), Jessica Bancroft (MSDE), Ruth Downs (MSDE), Karen Dates-Dunmore (MSDE), Tanisha Brown (MSDE), Michelle Dunkle (MSDE), Linda Murel (MSDE).

Absentees: Laura Weeldryer (Maryland State Board of Education), Annette Wallace (Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals) Jack Smith (Public School Superintendents Association of Maryland) and Tess Blumenthal (Maryland Association of Elementary School Principals)

Ms. Sarah Spross called the meeting to order at 2pm. She noted we have been meeting for almost a full year as of today. The workgroup had strong dialogue last meeting. The next meeting is July 25, 2017.

Business

Ms. Spross asked for approval of the minutes. Correct the spelling of Kirwan Commission and Jennifer Franks name, and remove Kathy Angeletti's name from the absent list.

Minute approval: Ms. Shurn made motion. Ms. Gronberg-Quinn seconded- all in favor. None opposed. Minutes accepted as corrected.

Discussion

Ms. Spross shared that Dr. Dara Shaw, Director Research and Accountability, MSDE has meet with Maryland Higher Education Commission and Maryland Longitudinal Data System (MLDS) to pull together data.

Ms. Spross introduced Dr. Shaw to present data to inform the workgroup and committee's work that is being done. Some information is from MSDE's Teacher Staffing Report and Maryland Longitudinal Data Systems. These reports link employment and K-12 data. All of this information is public. This information is also available in an excel spread sheet upon request. There are multiple levers to pull to influence teacher shortage areas. The goal is to find what works the best. It is

also to see what the data shows about teachers in Maryland. Which of these policy levers should we push for high quality teacher supply from Maryland?

Dr. Shaw offered explanation for the spread sheets provided. Table 1 was number of students from four- year Maryland public institution with a teaching degree. There are 1200-1300 each year. Of these, 40% enroll with intent to earn teaching degree. Another 60% decide sometime after they enroll. Does this mean we should recruit from other majors? Is this a lever we can push? Ms. Spross noted the question-are we are talking recruitment is it into colleges, school districts, how can we strengthen pipelines? We are getting a larger percentage of teachers once they are in college. How do we recruit from more traditional math and science?

Dr. Shaw noted the 1200 is not enough. Ms. Spross noted this will not match Maryland Staffing report as it is only four- year public institutions. Information is provided on the average loans students take out. Tables 2-3 are 2014 numbers by percentage. What do the 1200 do after they graduate? Of the 1200 graduates, 536 are teaching in a Maryland public school.

Table 4 shows the Maryland Teacher Staffing Report Data. It shows that Maryland is not meeting the needs of the local districts. There is additional data that shows that the percentage of beginning new hires prepared out-of-state was comparatively high in CTE (93%), computer science (92%), and ESOL (93%). The percentage of beginning new hires prepared out of state was comparatively low in early childhood (Prek-3) (60%), elementary education (64%) physical education (93%).

Table 5 discusses salaries. Graduates who become teachers have higher salaries. If they did not become teachers they went to other places, including health care, early childhood and elder care. Ms. Spross noted the issue is not a salary issue. They are not choosing to not go into the field based on numbers in the data. Dr. Shaw said this is only descriptive data. What we do not know is if they are not getting jobs and going into health care because they are not hired. We can use GPA to see if this is an indicator. There are two ways all of this can be interpreted, "A" causes "B" or "B" causes "A".

Table 7 represents the geography question. Can there be geographical incentives such as housing?

Data shows graduates are working in the Local Education Agency (LEA), where they went to school, another LEA, or never went to public school in Maryland. We do not have complete data to know exactly who these teachers are. But we do see those who went to school in Maryland are divided between teaching in their former LEA or another LEA.

Dr. Shaw asked if anyone had questions for her.

Dr. Sarah Mallory asked how many years out is data collected? Dr. Shaw responded it is any point after they graduated. This can tweak the numbers a little. Dr. Mallory asked if students taking jobs in health care that influence the work they want to do. Dr. Shaw answered it is not just right after graduation

Ms. Gronberg-Quinn noted there could be a recruitment tool if you look at loans that students come out with. Dr. Shaw noted it does not show if they started as another major, but it cost more to become a teacher, or students who need greater financial aid are applying to be teachers. Ms. Fran Dresser asked if you can you tell who started in a community college. Dr. Shaw will look into it. Dr. Kathy Angeletti asked if they ask if they are pursuing graduate school. Dr. Shaw responded that question is not answered in this data. There is no information about intent. Dr. Nancy Shapiro asked if this data includes only undergraduates BA and Masters. Dr. Shaw responded this data is only BA. We do have the information on Masters Degrees. We chose BA because the MA that led to a teaching job is harder to define. Ms. Rowena Shurn asked if this disaggregated elementary education and secondary to see who is leaving or who is taking on higher loans. Dr. Shaw noted we have field of employment, not place of employment, but there is some MSDE Staffing data included in this. Ms. Emily Dow asked if you can provide information on time to degree. We would like to see this broken out by Community College, 2+2, and four-year. Dr. Shapiro seconded this request. Dr. Shaw said we can work on this data.

Ms. Spross noted those going into health care might be because they did not get certification. Dr. Shapiro noted Maryland Centre for Equity report has different data. It would be interesting to put some of these conclusions together. They inform what we want MLDS data to gather. Dr. Shaw responded this is why there is a caveat this is context free. We do not have access to the private institutions so their information is not available. Dr. Shapiro asked if is this a policy decision or is there limitation in MLDS? Ms. Spross noted this is a voluntary submission for private colleges. Dr. Shapiro asked if there is a sense of how many come through public vs private. Dr. Shaw answered there is information on table 4; the MSDE Staffing Report includes the new hires recruited in Maryland. If you take 700 from column AY you see who is not prepared at a Maryland public school. Dr. Karen Robinson asked where MLDS gets the data. The response is from MHEC. Ms. Dow noted MHEC gets the information from each institution's report. Dr. Angeletti noted there is a group working to see that the data collected is consistent and accurate. Ms. Spross noted we have what we have, and we need to move forward. The MLDS is in statute and it is from MSDE, MHEC, Department of Labor, and it's linked up.

Ms. Spross thanked Dr. Shaw for her time. She noted it is great information and we will work together to get information to answer the questions asked. We can do a public information request.

Ms. Spross reviewed the progress the committees have made by offering key bullet points. All of the workgroup members that met were pleased with the progress being done by the individual committees.

Committee 1

- Adjunct certificate. Workgroup members are in favor of the certificate. Possible outcomes are: one year nontransferable. The professional with an adjunct certification will not be a full time employee. The certificate will be awarded by the State. This should be geared towards a specialist to support the community. Individual can be employed elsewhere.
- Conditional Certification. The committee is considering industry wide standards. They are asking if there can there be multiple measure point for CTE.
- Micro credentialing. These are no longer on the Committee 1 radar.
- Can there be a graphic that shows pathways to certification that can be available on the website?

Committee 2

- Lever on tuition reimbursement and loans.
- Discount rates for continuing education. Institutes of Higher Education note this has an impact on staffing.
- Strengthen LEA partnership for continuing development. Which counties have incentives for difficult to fill areas?
- Look at non-monetary incentives.
- Quality Teacher Incentive Act- can it be expanded to be more than National Board? There were only 8 NBCT in comprehensive needs schools. Does not meet the intent. Total of 1847 NBCT in non-comprehensive.
- Recruitment into the field of teaching and retention of those teachers is the priority. Funding is an issue but do not let it be the issue that keeps you from making recommendations.

Discussion

- Dr. Shapiro asked if the act included a bump in pay for those in comprehensive needs. Ms. Spross responded there were once many options. Currently the compensation in comprehensive needs schools is \$2,000. \$1,000 for non-comprehensive needs schools. Comprehensive incentive may move to \$4,000. This is a disincentive if you help move a school out of high needs you no longer get the \$4,000. The State Board is concerned with the act. New Orleans is using their money in different ways. The definition of comprehensive and non-comprehensive needs schools aligned with the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).
- Ms. Shurn noted we discussed strengthening the partnership between higher education and local school systems that does not mean an exchange of money. Dr. Shapiro said this is the Professional Development School model.

Committees 3 and 5

- Recommendations for committees to work together on Professional Development and Mentoring for alignment.
- What are the requirements for a mentor teacher?
- Is there continuity?
- This is another avenue for professional growth.
- Micro credentialing for badging and PD. If we allow if for PD we will at some point need to address it for certification.

Committee 4

- Working on IPC.
- Working to not focus on the numbers but more focused on outcome based.
- Incorporating cultural competencies into the requirements.
- Working on the internship and looking at what needs to go into that including flexibility for design and amping up the requirements. Looking at a medical model, not every PDS has to have everything and students should have multiple experiences in the classrooms.

Discussion

- Dr. Shapiro asked if there is discussion within the group for regional centers that have mentors who are available to go with interns into comprehensive needs schools. Ms. Michelle Dunkle responded that this is written into the ESSA plan and in the new IPC it is in the level process. Comprehensive needs schools might not be able to offer a full internship, but could have students observe student services and other options.

Conclusion

Ms. Spross reviewed the timeline. The report will be due October 1, 2017 for review. The writing needs to be complete for internal review in September 2017. We have meetings in July and August for review. The report will be reviewed by the State Board of Education.

Dr. Shapiro motioned to adjourn the meeting at 4:30p.m. Ms. Gronberg-Quinn seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 4:30pm.