



**Teacher Induction, Retention and Advancement Act of 2016**  
**Committee 3-Induction**  
August 2, 2016

**In attendance:** Stacy Williams (MICUA), Cecilia Roe (MSDE), Cathy Carpela (MSEA), Kelly Fiala (USM).

**MSDE Staff:** Jessica Bancroft (MSDE).

**Absent:** Phyllis Lloyd (MAESP), Lance Pace (MASSP), Deanna Stock (MADTECC),

**Committee 3: Determine how to *induct* quality teachers at all levels of education in Maryland**

**Sections of Chapter 740 to be covered:**

- Section 5(a)(1)(v) How to incorporate induction best practices into professional eligibility certificates
- Section 5(a)(1)(vi)1. How existing laws and regulations impact teacher recruitment, retention, and promotion for individual and team competency
- Section 5(a)(1)(vi)2. How existing laws and regulations impact teacher recruitment, retention, and promotion for performance measurement and management

**Committee 3- Materials and Information Requested by Committee Members**

- Information on the pilot program referenced in SB 493

**Introduction**

Ms. Bancroft opened the discussion with a brief reiteration of the charge of the group, distributed group charge materials, and confirmed attendees have received the previous materials for review. She also briefly answered questions regarding the professional eligibility certificate (PEC). The PEC may be renewed after two years, one time only. Furthermore, once the candidate completes their internship, this certificate immediately moves to the SPC I in the identified area. Ms. Fiala asked if this meant the candidate with a PEC does not have to retake required test for further certification. They do not have to retake the certification test for the area that is identified on their PEC; however, if they wish to add an endorsement they will need to complete the requirements. The group discussed reasons someone may hold onto a PEC, including graduate school, moving to another state, family, and other options.

**Approval of Minutes**

Ms. Roe noted that on page 2, it is COMAR that requires the reporting out from Bridge to Excellence states. Minutes unanimously approved with correction.

Kelly Fiala agreed to report out to the workgroup.

### **Discussion**

Ms. Roe asked to review the lists of best practices that Ms. Bancroft had provided in literature the previous week. Ms. Roe noted that the literature was sparse in its list of best practices for teacher induction. She also noted that if the lists provided were indeed the best practice, they reflect what Maryland is already doing to support new teachers.

Ms. Williams discussed the charge regarding the PEC and felt that it is not practical to implement with people who are not in jobs. She also noted the financial piece, asking who is responsible. She also noted there can be reasons to delay the professional certificate if candidates are doing something else.

Ms. Fiala discussed the reading and writing requirements and the challenge of trying to move when they are teachers and have classroom and students, that practice and theoretical are much different.

Ms. Williams noted that her personal experience at a small private college showed that many graduates go home to New York, New Jersey, or home to Pennsylvania. These students would have the PEC for Maryland but their certification in another state. How financially can higher education support them? Would Maryland as a state be supporting PEC holders in other state?

Ms. Roe brought the conversation back to the list of best practice. She recommend, for the first part of the Induction committee's charge, saying PEC students cannot be supported with induction best practices because they are not in a classroom and the current best practices require incorporation with their own students. All best practices are tied to students in in the classroom.

Ms. Williams asked if the charge was in fact to look at the PEC students or if it was a mistake.

Ms. Roe ask how can we answer this question or is it how we can't answer the question. She continued, maybe, to get candidates into teaching. That would be the goal, as induction practices are tied to the classroom. It might have been how to support teachers that go into teaching. Ms. Williams followed this with reflection on recruitment and if they, the candidates are eligible to pursue a job. Maybe the intent of the charge is to teach if they get a job. Ms. Roe noted that we could discuss how to support them when teaching, but that is not the charge.

Ms. Roe led the group forward to the next charge. She asked if Ms. Bancroft had found more then COMAR. She said looking at the two charges that they are tied together, one

asking how it impacts and other for performance management. The conversation continued, look at COMAR, only one we found, mentoring piece and having a mentor who is assigned specifically to teachers for years 1-3 will impact proficiency and will help retain them. It is possible that if a candidate knows they will get a mentor, it could help with recruitment.

Ms. Roe explained that COMAR specifies some pieces that are must haves and other pieces are recommendations. For instance, it recommends number of mentors per teachers.

Ms. Williams noted that not all things are required.

Ms. Roe explained that districts must report what they are doing to meet regulations. This includes the number of mentors and number of teachers. The reports are extensive and again, some are requirements some are recommendations. In general, if teachers have trained mentors, it would impact the new teachers. The trained mentor does mentors in pedagogy and content area. This helps with competency which helps with team competent and with management. If they feel successful and mentored, they may be more likely to stay and then be promoted. If they know they will have a good mentoring experience, they may be more likely to go to that district. Each district does induction and mentoring in their own way.

Ms. Williams and Ms. Roe had an extended conversation around access to data that shows if districts are doing their part with induction. Districts are required to do reports regarding induction, but the group was not sure if that data was public. Ms. Williams noted that if these things are all happening and there is better retention, we can say it, but where is the data to show what the impact is?

The conversation regarding data and how it can or would influence our report continued. Ms. Roe suggested we need to look at the laws, look at each piece of COMAR and show how it has an effect on induction.

Ms. Carpela said that the law greatly affects induction outcomes. COMAR lays it out clearly and in a specific way. Tells districts what mentors needs to have.

A discussion followed that set up a review of COMAR by each line to see how it relates to the second and third charge from the legislation. Ms. Fiala pointed out that we could use research to support our decisions.

The decision was made to answer the second and third charge by stating COMAR and the pieces contained in COMAR 13A.07.01, by including researched based best practices regarding induction and noting how these practices will impact competency.

The following conversation covers the discussion of how to interpret COMAR and the charge of the Senate Bill.

Ms. Fiala noted that COMAR 13A.07.01, 1-3 focus on individual and team competency and working together, while 4-6 address performance measurement and management and this leads to overlapping.

Ms. Williams also noted overlap. 1-5 address individual and team competencies, 4-6 performance measurement.

Ms. Fiala followed with a suggestion to talk about option items and how they can be considered with load reduction.

Ms. Roe pointed out that in regulation 05b it says you have to do one of these:

- 1) A reduction in the teaching schedule; and
- (2) A reduction in, or elimination of, responsibilities for involvement in non-instructional activities other than induction support.

Therefore, Sec 5b helps with management and individual competency.

Ms. Spross joined the group. She challenged the group to think outside of the specific charge. What is currently in place? How can IHE partner with school districts, what about credentialing? She reminded us that down the road there is a pilot program. What ideas would you like to see in the pilot? We can talk about things associated with induction. As long as we have the charges have to- what would ideal induction practices look like?

Ms. Gronberg-Quinn asked if LEAS don't have the resources, can the two and four year colleges and universities help out?

Ms. Roe commented that her office has whole day meetings. She would like to explore collaboration with the Higher Education Community and a district. The meeting will group participants by needs, and have someone from USM in the groups to brain storm with LEA induction coordinators. What can IHE do to help?

Ms. Roe returned to the conversation regarding COMAR and stated that COMAR is a list of best practices. Districts don't have the resources, human, money, capital. For that reason, the state recognizes the challenges and that is why they don't make all of COMAR mandatory.

Ms. Roe gave the committee some history on Race to the Top money. At the state level, mentoring academies were held. They did do some regional ones with New Teacher

Center (NTC) as well. Moving forward they want to do that without paying NTC. Instead they are getting people in office trained to do it. NTC materials are really good. Dr. Shapiro mentioned before that IHE worked with NTC to develop materials. We need to think outside box and tap into the resources and knowledge of IHEs. We are always answering the question, what can we do to support ideas that do not take a lot of money?

Ms. Williams returned to the charge to ask what performance measurement and management means? Is it the performance of new teachers? Or, is it the performance of the students that the new teacher instructs?

Ms. Williams noted that CAEP is still working on standards and no one is sure what is happening. This led to a brief discussion of CAEP and if the induction standards in CAEP will have an effect on the current work we are doing.

Ms. Roe said she would love to look at the pilot program language from SB 493 and discuss potential ideas as they relate to the pilot. We can also look at COMAR and recommend changes from the 2011 update.

Ms. Williams described a unique pilot program at Loyola which is delivered virtually. Loyola is currently partnered with Teacher Connect. It is intended to keep Loyola graduates connected while student teaching. This allows interns to connect with others who have been assigned to different cohorts. Teacher Connect posts articles and questions to the students and graduates for to discuss. In addition, faculty can participate and connect to student and graduates. The best part, Loyola has community managers from PDS schools who are experts in schools and who post and help student interns. It is a good collaboration between IHE and graduates.

Ms. Fiala noted that Salisbury informally follow student interns. She was interested in who is responsible for keeping in touch with graduates.

Ms. Roe described a conference she recently attended. At the conference, she was introduced to a model of instruction used at the University of Pittsburgh. The goal was to dispel myth of faculty are not teachers. The school asks professors go into schools and teach model lessons. This demonstrates how what they teach happens in the classroom. The professor can do a model lesson or co-teach. This helps make connection with students

Ms. Williams noted that Loyola has professors who volunteer to do it.

The committee adjourned at 3:15pm

Early draft of recommended language:

Regarding Section **5(a)(1)(v): How to incorporate induction best practices into professional eligibility certificates.** The committee recommends that no action be taken on this charge. Professional eligibility certificates do not offer a candidate access to students in a classroom, and based on known best practices of induction, a candidate must have access to students in a teaching environment and be engaged with a mentor teacher to best be served by any induction practice.

Continued discussion of this charge must include a discussion of access to a district and a classroom, and who and how would the experience of an educator who has not been hired by the district be financed.

**Section 5(a)(1)(vi)1: How existing laws and regulations impact teacher recruitment, retention, and promotion for individual and team competency and Section 5(a)(1)(vi)2: How existing laws and regulations impact teacher recruitment, retention, and promotion for performance measurement and management.**

These two charges can be addressed at the same time. COMAR 13A.07.01 clearly articulates what we feel to be best practices in new teacher induction, as supported by research, literature, and current practice. If all pieces of COMAR are adhered to, there will be an improvement in recruitment and retention. An individual who knows a school district will support them as a new teacher may chose this district for employment over another district. With induction best practices in place and extended to the new teacher, they may be more likely to stay in their teaching position and district, increasing both recruitment and retention. The longer an educator stays in the teaching field, the more they are able to integrate into the school community and gain competency, while at the same time, contribute to team competency.

Similarly, if COMAR 13A.07.01 is followed as it is articulated, the recruitment and retention issues are consistent with the above scenario. Furthermore, the longer an individual stays in one school or district consistently, there will be an improvement in the ability to identify and address performance measurement and management.