



Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016  
Workgroup  
October 4, 2016 Meeting  
Minutes

The 7th meeting of the Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016 Workgroup was called to order by Ms. Sarah Spross at 9:35 a.m.

In attendance: Sarah Spross ( MSDE), Amanda Conn (MSDE), Micheal Kiphart, (Maryland Higher Education Commission), Fran Kroll (Maryland Association of Directors of Teacher Education at Community Colleges), Deborah Kraft (Maryland Independent College and University Association), Kathy Angeletti (University of Maryland System), Gail Bennett (Public School Superintendents Association of Maryland), Tess Blumenthal (Maryland Association of Elementary School Principals), Rowena Shurn (Maryland State Education Association), Alexandra Cambra (MSDE), Jessica Bancroft (MSDE), Ruth Downs (MSDE), Derek Simmonsen (Attorney General's Office)

Absentees: Mariette English (Baltimore Teachers Union), Laura Wheeldryer (Maryland State Board of Education), Annette Wallace (Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals)

Miss Spross welcomed everyone to the 7th meeting of the Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016. She noted that everyone should have received the materials of interest and the draft interim report. The responsibility for the meeting is to review the interim report and offer feedback and comments. The workgroup also needs to identify if there were any egregious errors and then determine next steps.

Next, Ms. Spross asked everyone at the table, some of them substituting for workgroup members to introduce themselves. She then asked the group to look at calendar and project out for future meetings. The agenda includes looking at calendar dates, looking at the minutes, and an addition to the agenda, Mr. Simmonsen, Esq. will talk to the group about the requirements for the minutes and how we will move forward, then the group will look at the interim report.

The first item was the meeting schedule. Several dates provided were highlighted. Ms. Spross noted that in the beginning she asked the group to hold dates thought 2017. These highlighted dates are in conflict with the State Board of Education. The dates need to be changed and she needs to confirm the library's availability at Arbutus, which can only be done 3 months out. Currently, all dates proposed have library availability. In August, there was a concern about how frequently teachers needed to be out of classroom and available to represent for MSEA. Ms. Spross looked at a variety of calendars and worked from that. Every other meeting will have committee work, so that will be every other month. When the calendar was reviewed there were only three upcoming meetings until June 17, 2017, that teachers were asked to be out of the classroom. Ms. Spross requested the workgroup look at the calendar and see if the dates look feasible for teachers. Hopefully, after June 20<sup>th</sup>, schools will not be in session and the dates will work. Ms. Spross asked for comments and there were none. She then noted she is working hard to make the Arbutus Branch of Baltimore County Library as the future meeting place, it's a better location. As the dates are confirmed they will go onto the website at MSDE. Also, everyone will get notification. She then asked if that would work for everyone. Ms. Shurn was not sure about April, assessments may be on the calendar. Ms. Spross stated she tried to work around that as she considered spring break, holidays, and testing. Ms. Blumenthal noted July is a hard time with vacation, and as we get closer we should look if it is necessary to meet. Ms. Spross said she

could not agree more and we just wanted the dates on the calendar and at each meeting we will review for next meeting.

Ms. Spross noted with the arrival of Ms. Kroll, there was a quorum and the workgroup could vote on minutes.

Approval of minutes

Ms. Blumenthal is with elementary principals and not PSSAM. Deborah Kraft was in attendance and it was noted incorrectly.

Ms. Shurn made the motion and Ms. Conn seconded. Minutes accepted with corrections.

Mr. Simmonsen provided the workgroup with information regarding the posting of minutes from the meetings. As of Oct 1, 2017, agendas and meeting dates need to be posted on the MSDE website. Minutes need to be posted as soon practicable. The open meeting compliance board has said that, if minutes are posted faster, they can be done by email. We are encouraging this practice. Minutes can be amended and updated by email and then posted on the website. The minutes can then be approved and at the next meeting, the minutes can be amended. Ms. Spross confirmed we will send out the minutes with a time frame for them to be approved and amended. We can amend the minutes at the next meeting.

Ms. Spross said the draft report is available for review by the workgroup. Everyone was given a copy of interim report prior to the meeting. It is a draft and it is confidential. Some is pro forma, what needs to go into place. The outline includes the charge and process, which the committee members are, committee assignments, and attendance. The report includes interim recommendations and there will be an appendix with all information provided and minutes. Ms. Spross asked the group in what way did they want to proceed.

Ms. Spross explained the information in the report, from the committees, is all from the minutes and what was reported. The committees made their reports and the workgroup voted on those recommendations and that is what is in the report. Ms. Kraft asked how the workgroup could be sure the report is accurate regarding what the committees reported. Ms. Spross noted we took the information from the minutes, from every meeting, and we tried to capture as much discussion as possible. The minutes are included in the appendix. Page seven starts the summary of the meetings with reference back to minutes. It is all transparent and all of the materials and the minutes are posted on the website. If someone has a question, they can go back to the minutes.

Ms. Kroll asked if the interim report could include the recommendation to do more research and exploration. Ms. Conn confirmed that this is typical of interim reports.

The workgroup considered the format of the interim report, which will be the same for the final report, and agreed on it.

Ms. Shurn provided feedback on edits to the report, including committee members.

Ms. Spross noted the next meeting is scheduled for the workgroup and the focus will be digesting recommendations and determining if they encompass everything the workgroup wants to see, or are we missing major holes. Committee II is looking at the IPC and teacher academies. Now do

we want to define what we want that committee to do? We need recommendation from that committee to know how we can move forward.

Ms. Kroll asked if the report is confidential or can it be provided to their constituents. It will be hard to bring feedback for the report without their input.

Ms. Spross reminded the workgroup that all of the recommendations are in the minutes and the minutes are public. Those would be appropriate to share. The minutes will go up tomorrow and all will be public.

Ms. Blumenthal noted the charge is to share with constituents and groups and ask if there are other topics that need to be discussed.

Ms. Spross noted it is impressive how many recommendations came out within a short amount of time and were still interconnected. At the first meeting there was the question, how can it be separate, but it was not. Everything touched on each topic. It became innovative. Committee II said IPC is not right, but how can we use this chance to make changes for Maryland Students in 2017 and beyond. What do we need to recruit and retain teachers? Is it pensions? What are the things we know worked in other states or here in MD? We need to address what is in the best interest of students. We need to take this to the next level. Committee III said we should not pursue the PEC issue, they do not have access to students and there is no way to provide induction. We are not proponents and it's okay to say not all ideas are good ideas.

Ms. Blumenthal asked for clarification on the mentor requirements, specifically on the five years teacher experience with a minimum of three. Ms. Spross confirmed the preferred idea was for the mentor to have five years, but there should be a minimum of three.

Ms. Kroll noted there are sensitive issues and feelings around what should be legislated and what should be MSDE/MHEC and local. She liked the way it is general and does not lock ourselves into long term recommendations. It should not all be legislation. We need autonomy.

Ms. Spross stated the workgroup, in definition, gave autonomy to make decisions. We need to be out in front of it. If we do not make recommendations, people will make decisions for us. PSTEB has looked at lots of legislation. We need to be ahead of issues such as school systems having a hard time recruiting. We are not providing enough teachers to fill all the vacancies. It can be done in legislation or policy.

Ms. Shurn asked if we should ask LEAs to participate so they buy into this work. Ms. Spross noted Committee I has language around the stipend to expand it to be more inclusive. Committee I should be directed to expand on this and be more specific.

Dr. Angeletti followed up on Ms. Kroll's question regarding sharing the draft and having it vetted by member, she wanted to confirm some issues such as EdTPA. Ms. Spross explained everything in the draft is also in the minutes. The draft and has not gone through the entire review process. What you see here today could change.

Dr. Angeletti was concerned with the language from Dr. Robertson about EdTPA and wished to confirm what was in the report with her. Ms. Spross asked Dr. Angeletti to provide any edits once she had them.

Ms. Sgross advised the workgroup that we will be adding a representative from the Alternative Preparation Programs. It was not appropriate to include them in conversation if they are not at the table and in the conversation. Alternative prep and traditional prep are different ways to get into pipeline and both should be part of the conversation. They will also be able to put people on committees

Ms. Blumenthal asked if the representative would be from Higher Ed. Ms. Sgross said we will discuss how to best represent that community without dictating who is on committee. They too need autonomous.

Dr. Angeletti asked how do you envision Committee IV moving forward? Ms. Sgross said it will not be moving forward. She continued that 20 or 25 people on a committee is too big. Those on the committees can be changed. Committee II may need to be two separate groups. There will be one group to look at IPC and another group to look at the other requirement in the bill. We will be talking about the IPC at the next meeting. What is the future and what do we need?

Ms. Bennett asked if it is too late for PSSAM to add someone to Committee IV? Ms. Sgross said you can add a representative at any time, but just one per committee. The more voices we have solving the issues the better off we will be.

Ms. Kroll asked if the money for Anne Arundel had been appropriated. Ms. Conn explained there is a mandatory requirement for the Governor to include the money for 2018.

Dr. Angeletti asked for clarification on the adjunct certificate. Ms. Sgross noted the committee is exploring adding another teaching certificate that focused on someone who wants to teach in a high needs area, like nanotech, but does not want to teach full time. How can we do it? Current requirements have a specialized area certificate. It was added for Baltimore School for the Arts to teach violin. The certificate still includes pedagogical classes. How do we best meet the needs of someone with high level expertise? How do we make the requirements match the need without watering it down? Ms. Conn explained this came from a bill from last session allowing Anne Arundel County to create their own adjunct certificate.

Dr. Angeletti asked of there is anywhere in here to better integrate Higher Ed with the PK-12 induction process. Ms. Sgross noted Committee III was working on induction, and in the final paragraph it includes exploring better integration between PK-12 and IHEs to collaborate to better.

Ms. Sgross noted one thing needed to be clear. National Board is a not for profit. Ms. Kroll asked if the school systems pay for that. Ms. Blumenthal noted Frederick does. Ms. Sgross noted every district is different. It also depends on if you are working in comprehensive or non-comprehensive needs school. This bill increased \$2000 to \$4000. There is also a second subsidy program that is a bit different for counties (they can exceed) for National Board. It is 80/20 copay. State pays 80% of cost to get National Board certification. Not all counties participate. Frederick County put together a comprehensive partnership with an IHE out of county. The partnership pays for teachers to get National Board Certified. Dr. Angeletti asked how this applies to initial certification. How does that work? Ms. Sgross explained that someone from out of state with NBC could automatically qualify for an Advanced Prof. Cert or other. Is this a new way to come in? The committee needs to explore this more. Maryland has five routes to certification. You can come in from other states with specific requirements. You can come in with an out of state teacher education program. There is also Maryland approved programs,

alternative education programs, transcript analysis, out of state professional and out of state approved programs. NASDTEC has an interstate agreement.

The question was put forth in regards to Committee II, Teacher Preparation Academies. Whether or not the academies were for high school students?

Ms. Spross stated that this is out of the federal Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

Ms. Kroll asked a question in regards Committee II's recommendation to the legislation about whether a teacher academy or university-based academy, are all held under the same high standards? Also, who will be on the receiving end of this? This information needs to be clearer.

Ms. Conn stated that is up to the general assembly what will be done. The interim report is very clear that this is just a general idea.

Ms. Kroll asked Ms. Conn if she was expected to make a presentation to the Senate. Ms. Kraft asked if there may be a time when the committee might want other information added into the report?

Ms. Conn stated that really depends on the committee, if they want to hear an update.

Ms. Spross asked if there were any last minute comments?

Ms. Kroll, ask for a point of clarification. So when we discuss this with our constituents, do you want the information right away or at the next meeting?

Ms. Spross stated that here is where we are. Has the workgroup or committee missed something? The interim report with the exception of what Ms. Angelitti mentioned will be going in with this report.

The next meeting for the Teacher Induction, Retention and Advancement Act of 2016 will be held on Monday, November 14 at the Arbutus Library from 1 p.m. to 3 p.m.

**Meeting Adjourned**

Mr. Sarah Spross entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting.

**MOTION:** Ms. Amanda Conn/Ms. Tess Blumenthal      To approve the adjournment  
of the meeting.

**VOTE:** UNANIMOUS

**Meeting adjourned 11:30**