



Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016
Workgroup
July 19, 2016 Meeting

The 3rd meeting of the Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016 Workgroup was called to order by Ms. Sarah Spross at 1:04 p.m.

In attendance: Sarah Spross (MSDE), Emily Dow, (Maryland Higher Education Commission), Amanda Conn (MSDE), Linda Gronberg-Quinn (Maryland Association of Directors of Teacher Education at Community Colleges), Jennifer Frank (Maryland Independent College and University Association), Nancy Shapiro (University of Maryland System), Tess Blumenthal (Maryland Association of Elementary School Principals), Annette Wallace (Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals), Rowena Shurn (Maryland State Education Association), Gail Bennett (Public School Superintendents Association of Maryland)

MSDE Staff: Dr. Sylvia Lawson (MSDE), Alexandra Cambra (MSDE), Kelly Meadows (MSDE), Jessica Bancroft (MSDE), Ruth Downs (MSDE), Derrick Simonsen (Attorney General's Office/MSDE Legal Representative)

Absentees: Mariette English (Baltimore Teachers Union), Laura Weeldryer (Maryland State Board of Education) Aidan DeLisle (MSDE)

Welcome

Ms. Spross introduced herself and welcomed everyone to the 3rd meeting of the Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016 work group. She noted that the group would be breaking into committees and she anticipated important and robust committee work to occur.

Ms. Spross briefly reiterated that the workgroup was formed as a result of the legislative session. Its charge is to look at induction, preparation, retention and recruitment. These are the four basic tenants of teacher preparation education and pk-12. She reminded members that the interim report was due November 1, 2016. The second report is due November 1, 2017.

Ms. Spross continued to note the robust group of individuals interested in prek-12 across the state working together to see what is happening with regards to teacher retention, preparation, induction and recruitment. She then asked what is it we can do in MD that makes us leader's induction, preparation, recruitment and retention.

Approval of Minutes

Ms. Conn made motion- all in favor. None opposed. Minutes accepted as drafted.

Administrative Details:

Ms. Spross asked if there were any specific topics of interest the group would like to hear about. She reminded the workgroup they had heard what is currently happening with regard to induction and teacher academies from MSDE staff at the last meeting. Topic recommendations from the July 9th meeting include: information on Massachusetts teacher reform and a presentation by Ann Nutter Coffman.

Mr. Dwayne Morgan noted that Ann Coffman has national perspective and information regarding trends and policy that would be interesting. Ms. Spross asked members of the committee for additional names of potential speakers that could provide an overview on the national perspective.

Ms. Spross recommended providing the opportunity for public comment at both the August 2 and August 16 meetings. Workgroup members agreed that this would be beneficial. Ms. Linda Gronberg-Quinn asked if there would be a limit to the number of speakers. It was determined that the first 10 to sign up would have 3 minutes to speak. Ms. Spross reminded that the purpose of public comment is to provide outside individuals the opportunity to provide their comments for the workgroup's consideration. During this period workgroup members listen only.

Ms. Frank asked how public comment would be focused. Ms. Spross explained that one would anticipate comments being about bill; however, the public may always give comment on something else. Ms. Spross shared that the MSDE Work Group website has been established and under each meeting there will be an agenda, materials of interest with links to the various document, and the minutes approved by the workgroup. They can be found here: [Teacher Induction, Retention and Advancement Act of 2016 Workgroup](#), on the left hand side there are meeting dates and times. Please click on this link to access all materials.

Ms. Spross asked permission to publish the email addresses of workgroup members with the work group. All members present agreed to share their contact information.

Review of Materials

Ms. Spross noted while the materials of interest document is in the same format, paper copies were not provided for those items for which links were available. The materials are arranged by committee and workgroup members will be provided a copy of the items provided to each of the committees.

Ms. Spross explained that each of the 5 committees will have approximately 1.5 hours to discuss their topics. Each stakeholder group was asked to provide one the name of one participant for each committee. This will allow each committee to have equal representation.

There are five subcommittees: committee 1 will focus on recruitment, 2 will focus on teacher preparation, 3 will focus on teacher induction and 4 will focus on teacher retention. The fifth committee will address CAEP, and Education article §11-208.

Ms. Spross explained each committee would be making recommendations for the workgroup members to consider. Workgroup members will discuss those recommendations and formalize the recommendations to be shared with the State Superintendent of Schools, at which time there will be an internal review and vetting by MSDE's attorneys.

Ms. Spross reiterated how enmeshed all of the committee work is and the interrelatedness is recognized surrounding the charges of SB 493. Ms. Spross noted that while the sections of SB 493 that must be addressed are included on the agenda, the committees are free to discuss additional topics and ideas related to the charges of the bill.

Committee members were challenged to identify ideas and strategies that will move MD forward as a leader in teacher education and pk-12 education. This work should expand on the work that has already been done through the collaborative work of IHEs, Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) and the pk-12 community. Questions to consider include what we need to do as a State to reduce the need to "import" teachers as well as what can we do during the induction period to prevent teachers from leaving the profession?

Ms. Spross explained the committees would work until 3:00 pm. Each group should pick a spokesperson to report out when we reconvene as a work group.

Dr. Shapiro asked a question about organization of committees, specifically if each committee should identify co-chairs; one from the higher education segment and one from the k-12 segment. She saw a tendency to dump work on whoever is taking notes. She suggested that the groups identify people to help organize. If there is an agenda, the chair could move the agenda forward.

Ms. Spross replied that every agenda is the same. Ms. Spross identified that each committee was made up with one representative from each stakeholder group. Not all stakeholder groups identified an individual for every committee and that is okay. Some stakeholder groups identified alternates and that is okay too, but only one member at a time can participate in the discussion. Ms. Spross indicated that there would be two people from MSDE in each committee- one is staff from her office to serve as the task master and time keeper; the second is a working member. The staff member is there to assist with securing specific information the committee needs. Ultimately if committee members want to contribute materials, the work group will have to establish a due date before meeting so that we can assure that all workgroup members have access to the materials the committees are using.

Dr. Shapiro asked if there are people present to represent k-12 schools? She also asked for a listing of the committee members. Finally Dr. Shapiro asked for the minutes to be provided earlier than the day of the meeting

Ms. Spross indicated that she had the list of committee members compiled but needed to obtain permission to share contact information. Ms. Spross further clarified that each stakeholder group was asked to share the names of committee members. Ms. Spross noted the importance of assuring that the work of the this workgroup and committees are representative of all of the stakeholders. Every voice is of equal importance. Everyone had a chance to put a representative on each of the five committees. Negotiation and collaboration must happen to accomplish the work required by SB 493. MSDE will not have double representation in committees 1-4 as the second MSDE employee will be participating asstaff. Ms. Spross noted that the CAEP group will have one extra person representing MSDE, Derek Simmons, to provide legal guidance along with work group member Amanda Conn, who will provide legislative guidance.

Ms. Frank inquired about the time line for legislative changes. Ms. Conn's recommendation is to have a draft for submission no later than August 16th.

1:30-3:00pm-Workgroup divided into committees.

Committee Reports

Please see the attached notes from each committee.

Discussion and Questions

Ms. Spross noted that the open meetings act for workgroups and committees states that no more than two people can work outside of a formal work group meeting. The decision was made to keep it open to public.

The group can convene for an additional meeting on August 8th if necessary.

On August 15th there will be a more time to do questions and answers with the individual committees. At the end of meeting, the works group will make recommendations.

Committee Report Out

Committee 1- Recruitment-Audra Butler: No questions from workgroup

Committee 2- Preparation-Laurie Mullen: No questions from workgroup

Committee 3- Induction- Cecilia Roe: No questions from workgroup

Committee 4- Retention- Judy Jenkins: No questions from workgroup

Committee 5- CAEP- Amanda Conn: No questions from workgroup

Ms. Spross noted the next meeting will be held on August 2nd at the Odenton Regional Library. The workgroup will decide at the end of the meeting on the 2nd if the tentatively scheduled meeting on August 8th will be necessary. The meeting on August 16th will be more focused on the workgroup. Each committee will provide presentation on what their recommendations are and the workgroup will discuss those recommendations.

Ms. Spross emphasized that the report due on November 1, 2016 will be content rich and high quality. The work does not end with interim report; the focus for the final report will include what we want to move forward with and what has the most potential impact.

Dr. Shapiro noted that the minutes of workgroup meeting are important. All committee members should be able to see all of the other minutes from each committee. Dr. Shapiro asked to have the minutes posted before the meeting. Ms. Spross noted the minutes need to be approved by the workgroup before they are posted to the website.

Ms. Shapiro asked if it is possible to see draft minutes.

Ms. Spross indicated that she would provide workgroup members with a draft of the minutes 48 hours prior to the scheduled meeting.

Linda Gronberg-Quinn asked if there would be a limit to public comment.

Ms. Conn noted at the State Board there are spots for 10 speakers

Ms. Spross said we will follow the State Board model and allow up to 10 people. Public comment will be at the beginning of the agenda and we will reduce the time for each committee report.

A motion by made by Amanda Conn to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Emily Dow and the meeting adjourned 3:35.