



Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016 Workgroup August 16, 2016 Meeting Minutes

The 6th meeting of the Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016 Workgroup was called to order by Ms. Sarah Spross at 1:00pm

In attendance: Dr. Sylvia Lawson (MSDE), Sarah Spross (MSDE), Emily Dow (MHEC), Amanda Conn (MSDE), Linda Gronberg-Quinn (MADTECC), Gail Bennett (PSSAM), Nancy Shapiro (UMS), Tess Blumenthal (MAESP), Rowena Shurn (MSEA), Alexandra Cambra (MSDE), Kelly Meadows (MSDE), Jessica Bancroft (MSDE), Ruth Downs (MSDE), Derek Simonsen (Attorney General's Office) Debra Kraft (MICUA)

Absentees: Marietta English (BTU), Laura Weeldreyer (MSBE), Annette Wallace (MASSP)

Introductions

Ms. Spross opened the meeting with an introduction of the workgroup. She noted that, during the meeting, the committees would be reporting their suggestions to the workgroup members for the interim report due September 1, 2016. She noted that the committees have done an incredible amount of work in the past three or four meetings.

Ms. Spross further noted that this work will extend the partnership work between P-12 and Institutions of Higher Education (IHE) begun more than two years ago. Currently, the workgroup members, combined with the committee members, have brought more than 72 people together to engage in this work.

Ms. Spross reminded the workgroup and committees that a comprehensive interim report with substantive recommendations and stated direction for continued work is due November 1, 2016 with the final report due November 1, 2017. The committees' reports will get feedback from the workgroup to inform Amanda Conn as she completes the required reports.

Public Comment:

We provided opportunity for public comment at this meeting, but the individual who signed up did not appear. There will be more opportunities for public comment in the future.

Approval of Minutes

Ms. Spross entertained a motion to approve the August 2, 2016 minutes.

MOTION: Ms. Gail Bennett/Ms. Amanda Conn moved and seconded a motion to approve the August 2, 2016 minutes.

VOTE: UNANIMOUS

Break for Committees to meet

Ms. Spross reiterated that, as agreed upon at the last meeting, committees would be given 30 minutes to finalize their recommendation for today's presentations. The committees reconvened at 1:50 p.m. for report out and discussion.

Ms. Spross offered two options for the committee report outs: Option 1: All five committees would report with the workgroup discussing the reports in total. Option 2: Each committee would report out separately and the discussion from the workgroup would immediately follow the individual report.

Dr. Shapiro felt the most urgent issue to be centered in the work of Committee V and asked if they could go first in order to assure adequate time to discuss the recommendations, vote, and make a decision thereby resolving the CAEP issue.. Ms. Spross agreed that Committee V could begin, but committing each equal time for each presentation since the information from the other four committees is what is required by the Statute. The workgroup must hear from all committees in order to make decisions for the interim report.

Committee Reports

Committee V: Education Article §11-208 (CAEP)

Ms. Kroll spoke for Committee V. She reiterated that the goal was to amend the statute in order to fix the CAEP issue. In addition, Ms. Kroll noted two other issues, the first of which was to recommend further discussion to see if the Department (MSDE) should include educational providers other than CAEP. Secondly, it was suggested that the work of Committee V should be merged into Committee II, Teacher Preparation, to make sure the work is aligned.

Mr. Simonsen provided background on CAEP and its lack of national recognition, the statutory issue currently being addressed. Amanda Conn reviewed the recommended language for Education Article 11-208

Workgroup questions and response to Committee V

Ms. Bennett asked specific questions regarding the role of the workgroup in the vote/approval of the bill. Ms. Conn explained the process of approval from the Department and from the State Board. Mr. Simonsen commented that an affirmative vote indicates the group's suggestion of language change and that the committee would be asking for the proposed changes to be adopted. He also confirmed for the committee that if, in the future, their constituents are not in favor of the language, they are able to voice their disagreement.

Conversation continued regarding the issue of approval from MSDE and approval from a nationally recognized organization. As noted in the proposed language, the organization must have standards that align with the state approval standards. If an organization has received recognition, then an IHE would not need approval from both but only from one. However if there are any standards not covered by the national organization, a state Addendum would need to be completed. Ms. Spross noted that this puts Maryland in prime position to assure that IHEs with approved programs are doing what is right for Maryland students. The committee further

discussed the difference between state approval and national accreditation, noting that there needs to be awareness of the perception of the potential value of national recognition.

Vote for approval

There were three abstentions (Dr. Shapiro, Ms. Bennett and Ms. Kraft) to the vote for the recommendations from Committee V's recommendations. As a result there were not enough members to complete a vote by quorum rules. The Department will take the recommendation from the committee and move forward with the proposed language.

Committee I: Determine how to recruit quality teachers at all levels of education in Maryland

Ms. Butler presented on behalf of Committee I. She noted the charge led to broad topics and philosophical discussions. While there is an understanding of the tenets of National Board Certification (NBC), there is a concern with tying it directly to certification, noting it is a for-profit organization. The committee will further explore how to tie NBC into recruitment efforts. There is a goal to break down barriers to certification in Maryland. In addition, there is a focus on how to link loan forgiveness to recruitment and a review of the required basic skills assessment. The committee also looked at specialized areas of certification and routes to certification, noting how difficult some areas are to fill. Specific recommendations include:

1. Section 5(a)(1)(ii) How to incorporate and interweave the principals of National Board Certification with the Advanced Professional Certificate, Master of Education programs, and other teacher preparation programs

- Teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate level should include the tenets /principles (core propositions) of National Board Certification (NBC) as they support quality teaching and learning experiences (interwoven throughout course of study to reinforce interdisciplinary connection); however NBC should not be a requirement of an educator preparation program nor should it be a requirement for MD certification.
- The committee recognizes that NBC is already an alternate pathway to achieve the Advanced Professional Certification (APC) in Code of Maryland (COMAR) and would like to explore NBC as a route to initial professional certification.

2. Section 5(a)(1)(iv) How to link loan forgiveness to teaching in high needs schools

- The committee believes loan forgiveness should be a focused marketing tool for teachers vs. all employees. This extends beyond "High Need" schools in hard to fill areas (STEM, SPED, etc.).
- Loan Forgiveness should be clearly communicated during recruitment to enhance recruitment/marketing efforts with a guarantee upon hiring vs. condition of hiring.

- Loan Forgiveness program should be tailored to teachers, easy for college students to understand and marketed at the collegiate level – transparent/clear language with ease of navigation
- Loan Forgiveness should be in the beginning and the end (financial support with entry and conclusion)
- The committee will explore stipend options for those in comprehensive needs schools who go above and beyond (mentoring, etc.)
- The committee feels that the Quality Teacher Stipend should still be given to APC holders in comprehensive needs schools, not solely for those with NBC.

3. Alternative Certification Programs: Conditional Certificate

- Group will explore different options for basic skills assessments, including whether assessments are the only way to measure basic skills and what multiple measures could be considered toward meeting this requirement. Could a performance-based assessment be considered?

4. Specialized Professional Areas: Routes to Certification

- Group will also explore what minimum pedagogy requirements are essential for all teachers.
- This group will explore the possibility of adding an adjunct certificate to the continuum of certifications in Maryland.

5. Additional Recommendations

- Expansion of Teacher Academies; increase number of Local School Systems (LSS)s participating to increase number of students participating.

Workgroup questions and response to Committee I

Dr. Shapiro opened the discussion with comments regarding those who are conditionally certified and their knowledge of content, but possible lack of knowledge of pedagogy. She noted a need for creativity in recruitment of these individuals. Ms. Spross noted that individuals could be conditionally certified for any number of reasons, such as the need to complete required tests, lack of internship, expired certificate, etc. Ms. Spross encouraged the workgroup and committees to consider what elements of certification are most necessary for someone to teach a specialty area such as nanotechnology or diesel automotive. Dr. Lawson noted the committee had generated some good ideas and reminded the committee to continue to think about how to recruit people who can teach students who are interested in careers such as culinary.

Ms. Shurn asked briefly about the issue of pensions in Maryland and suggested this is a topic for exploration in the future.

Vote for Approval

VOTE: UNANIMOUS

Committee II: Determine how to prepare quality teachers at all levels of education in Maryland

Sections of Chapter 740 to be covered:

- Section 5(a)(1)(vi)4. How existing laws and regulations impact teacher recruitment, retention, and promotion for discipline in the classroom
- Section 5(b)(2) Make recommendation regarding legislative changes that will ensure that teacher preparation academies, as authorized under the federal Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) will be of the highest quality and rigor if they are implemented in Maryland and the individuals that participate in these academies will be fully prepared and trained to be in a classroom in Maryland.

Dr. Mullen presented for Committee II. She noted that the committee would continue to explore how to work with the four charges and recognize how these charges are related to the workgroup and other committee charges. There needs to be consideration of discipline in the classroom. Here Ms. Mullen noted there was not consensus in the committee around the terms classroom discipline and classroom management. The committee also asked the intent of the charge and noted they will continue to explore an alignment between districts and the methodology of classroom discipline. The committee did not have specific recommendations for the workgroup to consider; however, they noted they would continue to explore, investigate the charges.

- Classroom management strategies need to be explored
 - Restorative practices
- Making recommendations for legislative changes regarding ESSA
 - They can't make recommendations on this today.
- Whether a teacher academy or university-based academy, all are held to the same high standards.
- Revision of institutional performance criteria
 - Institutions must show evidence
 - Still in great discussion and exploration
- Accreditation – look at national specialized professional associations
 - Still exploring and investigating

Workgroup questions and response to Committee II

Ms. Dow asked for clarification on the difference between discipline and classroom management. Ms. Spross noted there is some discussion around this topic and there is a belief that teachers are not prepared for all the potential classroom environments in which they could be placed. We need to address how to better prepare our teachers to teach in any setting ranging from an IB program to an alternative setting. How do we better prepare our students for all of the different cultures and behaviors they will be faced with? She continued that this is our opportunity to set Maryland standards. To do this, there must be collaboration between Institutes of Higher Education (IHE)s and PreK-12.

Dr. Shapiro suggested Committee V should work with Committee II, even though this would mean two representatives from the constituencies on the committee. Ms. Spross noted that this would create a group of potentially 24, and that number would be

unmanageable as a committee. Dr. Lawson also added that a large group as proposed could potentially lend its self to a reduced level of productivity.

Ms. Shurn noted the need to look at diversity in the LEAs and the need to fill positions with educators who are prepared for the work that is being done.

Vote for approval

VOTE: UNANIMOUS

Committee III: Determine how to induct quality teachers at all levels of education in Maryland.

Ms. Williams presented for Committee III. She clarified the definition of the Professional Eligibility Certificate (PEC) and noted induction commonly takes place in the classroom and with students. Someone with a PEC is not in the classroom and therefore not in a position to take advantage of best practices for induction. The committee will continue to work on the requirements of a mentor teacher. Also, the committee researched best practices of induction and found COMAR to include these best practices. The COMAR regulations were updated in 2011 and the committee intends to look at these and offer further suggestions for revisions. Specific recommendations include:

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 how would the experience of an educator who has not been hired by the district be financed.

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 him or her as a new teacher may choose this district for employment over another district. With induction best practices in place and extended to the new teacher, the teacher may be more likely to stay in the teaching position and district, increasing the effectiveness of both recruitment and

retention. Individuals who are nurtured through the best practices outlined in COMAR will improve individual and 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, following the best practices in COMAR should result in an improvement in the ability to identify and address performance measurement and management.

In response to the question, “*What should be the qualifications be for a mentor teacher?*”

The committee recommended that language be added to COMAR 13A.07.01.04 to reflect the following qualifications for mentor teachers.

Mentor teachers are recommended to be tenured and have at least five years teaching experience, with a minimum of three, and must be in good standing with a rating of highly effective, or the equivalent rating depending upon the rating scale used by the LEA. Further, mentor teachers should receive a recommendation from a principal or administrator and should express a willingness to participate in professional development specific to mentoring. Mentor teachers should receive training in best practices. Mentor teachers and administrators should mutually agree to the mentorship position.

Special Note:

During the committee meeting, prior to the report out, Dr. Karen Robertson asked the committee to consider including as a recommendation that the edTPA assessment should be used in candidates’ final semesters of their educator preparation programs. Dr. Robertson provided the committee with pertinent information regarding edTPA, including a handout explaining the edTPA Professional Growth Plan (included).

Committee members expressed concern about including the edTPA language because not all of the programs in Maryland use edTPA. Additionally, concern was expressed regarding the inclusion of only one program. Dr. Robertson suggested that language be included stating that for IHEs who have students complete a professional development plan at the end of their full-time internship experience, this plan should be shared require the plan to be shared with their induction mentors. A committee member opposed this idea as a professional development plan did not need to be considered by the committee in the scope of this charge.

Workgroup questions and response to Committee III

The workgroup’s conversation focused on the need for mentoring and mentor training. Dr. Shapiro asked if the final report could include requests for fiscal recommendations. She continued to note the importance of collaboration between the schools and IHEs to address induction. Ms. Blumenthal asked what MSDE and/or the regulations require regarding mentoring. Ms. Roe explained that COMAR is specific about what LEAs need to do and report on. COMAR includes both

requirements and recommendations allowing each district to determine what they are capable of doing. As a result there is great variation throughout the State.

The workgroup noted the committee's suggestions should be the minimum requirements. There was further discussion by the group recommending further consideration of the number of days an intern is in their placement, the ratio of mentors to teachers, and consideration of released time for both new teachers and mentors.

Vote for approval

VOTE: UNANIMOUS

Committee IV: Determine how to *retain* quality teachers at all levels of education in Maryland

Dr. Schaffer presented for committee IV. He discussed the use of the language "career lattice" and not ladder as a way to conceptualize an educator's career development in more broad terms. Teachers need to be valued for their time and experience. Committee IV questioned the merit of NBC and asked if it was the only model to follow. Mr. Schaffer also noted the need for recognition of teachers as a way to increase retention. In addition, any new policy needs to address the issue of diversity throughout the districts and schools.

Section 5 (a)(1)(iii) How to make the teacher recertification process more valuable, including an exploration of how to link recertification to career ladders and content or high need area specializations.

Career Lattice: Consider alternative career structures that fit the Maryland environment of both small rural and large urban and suburban districts. The lattice should reflect the development of teachers' expertise and experience and offer options, opportunities alternative pathways throughout their career.

Mentoring: Review mentoring models for beginning teachers that expand in duration and complexity. Teachers benefit from mentoring that reflects their needs in content, children's development and teacher experience and expertise. Just as first year teachers may require assistance with organizing classroom environments and instructional clarity, second and third year teachers often grow in expertise; therefore, while mentoring remains valuable, the emphasis can shift to exploring student in-depth learning and developing teacher expertise in advanced content. Mentors should be a major population for training as well.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards: The committee recognizes the incentives and recognition national board certification provides teachers, but also is aware of the costs both financial and time to teachers and schools. Reviews of independent assessments of the benefits and limitations of NBC should be undertaken by the committee within the context of career lattice.

Section 5(a)(1)(VI) 3. How existing laws and regulations impact teacher recruitment, retention, and promotion for reward and recognition for excellent work.

Beginning Teacher Pilot Program: Recent laws provide 20% additional planning time for beginning teachers. This appears to be a valuable contribution to support beginning teachers, but there are a number of questions that need to be answered before this proposal becomes a widely implemented. Among questions that need to be answered include the following: Does a reduced load in fact increase teacher expertise or reduce issues of retention of first year teachers? How do districts support beginning teachers to benefit from the increase of planning time? As giving five new teachers increased planning time would require the employment of an additional teacher, how would districts absorb the related costs?

Examination of Laws and Regulations: An example of a regulation that limits recruiting is the practice of individual teacher candidates submitting documentation to the state for certification rather than submission of all graduates of a program by the university or college. The submission of all graduates from a given semester by the institutions would reduce paper work and often the back and forth between the individual teacher candidate and the state. Paperwork would not be submitted until reviewed and approved by the institutions for this population. The state's role would be verification. While this does not address all certification issues it would reduce a significant bottleneck in the process. Other regulations could be reviewed in the same manner.

Section 5(b)4 Make recommendations regarding the best methods of incentivizing effective teachers to choose to teach in in low performing schools and schools with a critical mass of economically disadvantage students in light of federal regulations that require equitable distribution of effective teachers.

Teacher Voices: Any discussion of retention and assignment of teachers should recognize the teachers' voices and include a variety of teachers in those discussions about what increases commitment and retention in their schools. The committee suggests inviting a range of teachers from across the spectrum of schools and a varying experiences and expertise to inform the committee on desirable incentives to increase retention in and commitment to challenging settings.

Program Reviews: The committee will review practices by states and districts to assure all students receive quality instruction.

Additional Notes:

The committee determined that the national discussion on retention is not necessarily mirrored in Maryland based on a preliminary analysis of Maryland data. The national discussion is less nuanced than needed to create a strong policy to improve retention. First, the committee proposes a policy that takes into account variation among districts. Furthermore, additional analysis is needed to examine attrition. These analyses include, but are not limited to attrition by subject matter,

but extend to attrition at the school rather than district level, and attrition based on teacher pay, school location, and school climate and community poverty.

Finally, the committee was charged to assess the Anne Arundel County Grant for Teaching in an Economically Disadvantaged School. This grant has not been implemented at this time and therefore no assessment is possible.

Workgroup questions and response to Committee IV

Dr. Shapiro stated she was interested in the data differentiation, noting there are so many factors that impact a teacher's decision to stay in a school. We cannot make a broad generalization those certain things that will increase retention in all schools. Currently we only discuss the retention of teachers who are already in schools. She asked if there are there some things we could see in the early induction experiences that lead to teachers staying longer and would tie them to their community. What are the Teaching, Empowering, Leading and Learning (TELL) Survey results?

Ms. Spross noted the TELL survey is online and available for review at Tellmaryland.org

Vote for approval

Vote: UNANIMOUS

Conclusion/Adjournment

Ms. Spross asked the workgroup if there were other things they would like to see the committees work on. There was a short discussion regarding the work previously done by other groups and the benefit of reviewing this work. Ms. Spross continued by noting the need for a comprehensive interim report. The work is not done, but will continue in order to assure that the best ideas are put in place for Maryland students. Ms. Spross and Ms. Conn will begin to write the report and they hope to share preliminary pieces at the next workgroup meeting.

Dr. Shapiro asked for clarification on the process moving forwards. Ms. Conn noted that, once the interim report is completed; there would be a legislative briefing that may lead to additional feedback that will come from pre-session briefing. There may also be a presentation to the State Board as a courtesy. In the future, the report will be submitted to the Governor and General Assembly.

Ms. Spross noted a possible change in location for future meeting and there was a brief discussion regarding the schedule of meetings and who would attend the workgroup and the committees or only the workgroup. Ms. Spross will look at options and communicate with the workgroup and committee members.

Meeting adjourned 3:55pm