



Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016 Workgroup August 2, 2016 Meeting

The 4th meeting of the Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016 Workgroup was called to order by Ms. Sarah Spross at 1 p.m.

In attendance: Sarah Spross (MSDE), John Enriquez, (MHEC), Amanda Conn (MSDE), Linda Gronberg-Quinn (MADTECC), Gail Bennett (PSSAM), Debra Kraft (MICUA), Donna Wiseman (USM), Tess Blumenthal (MAESP), Annette Wallace (MASSP), Rowena Shurn (MSEA),

Absentees: Mariette English (BTU), Laura Wheeldryer (SBOE)

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) Aidan DeLisle (MSDE)

Welcome

Ms. Spross began the meeting by noting that today is 4th meeting of the Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016 workgroup.

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

Ms. Spross further highlighted the specific parts of Chapter 740.

- The first section focuses on the Quality Teacher Incentive Act of 1999. The changes in this section are twofold: first increasing the stipend for NBCTs in comprehensive needs schools to \$4,000.00 and the second is to place NBCTs in leadership roles to the maximum extent practicable.
- The second part is specific to Anne Arundle County. It creates a county grant in the amount of \$1,500.00 for teachers that hold a SPC or APC who work in a middle or high school in which at least 30% of the student receive free and reduced meals.
- The third section creates the Teacher, Induction, Retention, and Advancement Pilot. This pilot will provide support to those first year teachers in pilot programs. Specifically it will provide 20% more planning and mentoring in that year of teaching. \$5,000,000.00 has been allocated for this program; however, local boards that choose to participate in the pilot program will have to assume 20% of the cost while the State will assume 80%.
- The fourth section requires MSDE to form a diverse workgroup of those responsible for teacher preparation and prek-12 instruction. This section

provides the specific components that the workgroup must provide recommendations.

Ms. Spross reminded the group that each of the five committees has specific charges that are directly related to SB 493. Those charges are the have-to's and the interim and final reports must address these issues. However, the workgroup would be remiss if the report did not include all of the innovate ideas that are related to and support educator recruitment, preparation, induction and retention. Recruitment, preparation, induction and retention, must focus on what is best for Maryland children. The committees should not feel limited to the charges of the bill; there can be more discussion.

Ms. Spross reminded that while the workgroup members are charged with making the recommendations to be included in the reports that the task is immense and cannot be handled only by the 12 people at table. Therefore committees have been formed to assist with this work which expands the number of voices participating.

Committees will report their findings and recommendations for consideration by workgroup members. Workgroup members will review and prioritize the recommendations to be included in the interim and final report. Ms. Spross indicated that it is important to remember that these are recommendations that get submitted to Superintendent of Schools.

Ms. Spross emphasized what Dr. Salmon shared at our first meeting. Dr. Salmon put together an amazing team representing higher education, teachers, and the PreK-12 community. There is an amazing amount of work to be done and this is the group to work through complicated issue to come up with resolution and innovate ways to address the identified issues in education.

Ms. Spross addressed the confusion that was experienced by both committee and workgroup members at the last meeting. At the July 19th meeting, there was some confusion from committee members regarding their assignments (member vs. alternate) and that there was a misunderstanding about how many representatives could participate in the committee work. As has been shared and discussed at the workgroup meetings, each stakeholder group has an equal voice; and as such, will have equal representation on the both the workgroup and the committees. This means that each committee would only have one representative from an organization at the table as a participant at any given time. The alternate would fill in for that member if they are unable to attend a meeting or need to leave early.

Alternates are welcome to observe and listen so in the event they are asked to fill-in they are up-to-date with the relevant information. Workgroup members will continue to float to observe, participate, and ask questions for clarity. Furthermore Ms. Spross reiterated that it was never the intention to make anyone uncomfortable, we just believe it is critically important to have equal representation on the both the workgroup and committees.

Ms. Spross indicated that Dr. Shapiro; in her comments regarding the minutes, had asked for clarification regarding the number of people who can work together outside of group and not violate the open meetings act; specifically in regards to how she, as a workgroup member, can take information back to her constituency.

Due to the importance of this question, Ms. Spross asked Mr. Simonsen, to provide clarification for all workgroup members regarding the open meeting act. Mr. Simonsen noted that sharing information from the workgroup with their organization is fine; as is asking your organization for their input and thoughts. He continued, stating that this body was created by statute and is subject to open meeting act, which allows the public to attend. We advertise so the public can see the business of group that is being done. What that means as a workgroup or a committee, is that it's fine to go back to a group and discuss concerns and viewpoints to your organization. The issue is if multiple members are together, discuss the work to be done and come to the meeting with all decisions made. That scenario would violate the Act because the public would not have the opportunity to observe the process. Transparency is the ultimate goal of the Open Meetings Act.

Dr. Wiseman asked about the idea of going back to her peers, if they need to make decisions, how Nancy can bring information back? Can it be a phone conference? Mr. Simonsen replied yes, as long as they are not all in the same workgroup of committee. Dr. Wiseman noted this is important if they want to give Dr. Shapiro a voice if she is voting on something around the table. Mr. Simonsen noted that in context of this workgroup that convening representatives from USM to discuss USMs to discuss view point that would be fine. Dr. Wiseman noted that that is what Dr. Shapiro wanted.

Ms. Conn used her committee as an example. She did not send draft bill out via email for comment because that might have led to conversation about the draft language which needs to be done together in public. Email conversation is an easy place to violate the open meetings act. Mr. Simonsen replied that it is a conversation when it's email or text, this is still a meeting. We need public discussion.

Public Comment:

We provided opportunity for public comment at today's meeting but, no one signed up. Notice has also been provided for public comment at the August 16, 2016 meeting. There will be more opportunities for public comment.

Approval of Minutes

Corrections:

- Gail Bennett was attending for Dr. Smith.
- Tess Blumenthal is the representative for MAESP a
- Dr. Shapiro provided the identity of the co-chairs for committees.

- Dr. Shapiro asked for clarification of MSDE committee members. If there more than one member from MSDE, who can speak, one or both members?

Ms. Spross explained that there is a staff person from MSDE for each committee who is responsible for acting as the facilitator, time keeper and note taker. The MSDE staff person will not take active role in discussion but they can provide information from MSDE as requested by a committee member. There is also one representative from MSDE for each committee; this individual will be an active participant in the discussion. Not every organization has someone on every committee. Committee five is unique because there are three individuals from MSDE; Dr. Madden, Ms. Conn, and Mr. Simonsen. As previously explained, this is to assure that having the key players who will write the language be a part of it so the language is correct from the beginning. If you are uncomfortable with this we can move Dr. Madden to group four. The workgroup members did not express concern about these MSDE staff members participating in Committee V.

Ms. Conn made the motion and Ms. Shurn seconded. Minutes were accepted as amended.

Committee Reports

Ms. Spross noted that the committees and needed to discuss if a meeting August 8th was necessary to complete work before the August 16th meeting where they will be asked to report their recommendations to the workgroup. Dr. Wiseman asked if committees will have time to meet on August 16th. Ms. Spross responded that there would be 30 minutes for the committees to meet at the August 16th meeting.

Ms. Shurn asked if committees will be providing information before the August 16th meeting. Ms. Spross responded that the meeting is designed for the committees to present to the group, however if there are committee meeting on August 8th, they might be able to provide information. The meeting August 16th is to start the writing process. Drafts will be shared with the workgroup members.

Please see committee minutes for specifics

Committee 1 (Recruitment):

No Questions from Workgroup

Committee 2 (Preparation):

Ms. Bennett noted that recruitment and preparation do overlap and asked if there are enough enrollment openings in teacher preparation programs, to address the recruit needs of the LSSs. Secondly, are teacher p[reparation programs recruiting applicants into the right preparation programs?

Dr. Wiseman responded that nationally enrollment numbers are dropping in teacher preparation programs. She also indicated that in higher education it is hard to be

nimble when faculty is tenured into a specific program such as social studies or elementary. Furthermore, IHEs cannot require those applicants interested in elementary education to become a math teacher. She indicated that IHEs try to take advantage of what we know about needs.

Ms. Bennett asked how do you recruit to high needs areas?

Committee 1 members indicated that the problems are matching applicants to the needed areas. Mr. Enriquez noted you cannot take someone who is passionate about math and ask them to teach special education. Dr. Wiseman stated that the problem is elementary education and social studies.

Fran Kroll noted that statistics show 50% of teacher education students have started at a community college. All AA programs are available for the students. It is a harder sell to think secondary critical shortage areas. She noted elementary education and early childhood are dual with special education. She has seen an uptick with interest in Special education.

Ms. Shurn noted that classroom management area is a concern. We should look at classroom management across preparation programs not just one class. Having only one class is not necessarily best way to approach learning. Ms. Dunkel noted that the preparation committee talked about how long it has been since we looked at how we placed students. We need to put a diverse field experience into practice so interns have opportunity to practice in a variety of demographics. This is a change from 15 years ago when current requirements were established.

Committee 3 (Induction)

Dr. Wiseman asked how will people will reflect on best practices in the State?

Ms. Spross explained that individuals have been collecting information. They have been sharing article, strategies, and work that is being done is included in the next meeting's materials. Dr. Shapiro and Ms. Dow have been providing information. We collect materials any way we can get it.

Dr. Wiseman commented that she was thinking about what is already going on in higher education, pilots or different work that could be useful for some of these workgroups.

Ms. Spross noted that if pilots are going on in the University of Maryland System or any other system they should be shared with the workgroup for inclusion into the report. Ms. Spross also noted that pilots and innovative programs in LSSs should also be shared. For example, FCPS has recently collaborated with Frostburg in preparing teachers for NBC. We don't want to lose sight of what Maryland is already doing.

Mr. Thrift noted that Maryland will have to recruit 40-50% of its teacher work force from out of state. LSSs have to recruit outside of state. This is a huge void. What should we be doing differently?

Committee 4 (Retention)

No Questions from Workgroup

Committee 5 (CAEP)

Mr. Thrift sought clarification regarding CAEP not being approved as a accrediting body.

Ms. Kroll explained that CAEP is not approved by DOE. Group five was trying to have something open to use an accrediting body in future if it has similar standards to Maryland. Specifically, verbiage was taken out to make it simpler.

Closing Remarks

Ms. Spross noted that again there was strong and robust discussion and committees got to work today and got some good work done. There is a meeting tentatively on the schedule for committees to do work on August 8th from 12:30-3:30.

The groups were polled and all groups decided to meet on August 8th at 12:30pm. Workgroup members are welcome to attend to rotate between groups.

Ms. Spross concluded by reminding the workgroup and committees that the August 16th meeting will have time for public comment, 30 minutes for committee work, a short time for reporting out, and the addition time is for the workgroup to make decisions for the interim report

Meeting adjourned 3:59pm