



**Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016  
Workgroup  
Minutes  
November 14, 2016 Meeting**

The 8th meeting of the Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016 Workgroup was called to order by Ms. Sarah Spross at 1:03 p.m.

**In attendance:** Sarah Spross (MSDE), Emily Dow (Maryland Higher Education Commission), Linda Gronberg-Quinn (Maryland Association of Directors of Teacher Education at Community College), Justin Heid (Maryland State Education Association), Deborah Kraft (Maryland Independent College and University Association), Nancy Shapiro (University of Maryland System), Jack Smith (Public School Superintendents Association of Maryland),

MSDE Staff to include: Alexandra Cambra (MSDE), Ruth Downs (MSDE), and Derek Simonsen (Attorney General's Office).

**Absentees:** Tess Blumenthal (Maryland Association of Elementary School Principals), Mariette English (Baltimore Teachers Union), Kimberly Pratesi (Maryland Association of Elementary School Principals), Laura Weeldryer (Maryland State Board of Education), Annette Wallace (Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals)

Ms. Spross welcomed everyone to the 8th 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 priority for this meeting is for the workgroup to think about where they want to go from here and what they want to see the committees accomplish.

Ms. Spross asked the workgroup members at the table to introduce themselves because some of the members were substituting for other workgroup members. She asked the workgroup to review the October 4, 2016 minutes. The minutes could not be voted on because they did not have a quorum. The minutes will be posted in a draft format on the website and will be voted on at the next meeting in January.

Ms. Spross asked the workgroup to think about where they want to go from here and what they want to see the committees accomplish. She stated that the group needs to refocus and look at the broad goals. In terms of retention, it should be something measurable.

Ms. Nancy Shapiro stated that it would be good to get stakeholder buy-in. The sooner the workgroup can vet the language, the better.

Ms. Spross informed the group that both MHEC and MSDE collaborated on the shared responsibility of teacher preparation programs. She indicated that she will send out the language as soon as its release is permitted.

Mr. Jack Smith stated that the Administration will look at all the Bills across the state and will decide what Bills they are going to approve.

Ms. Shapiro asked about what is happening with CAEP? She suggested that the CAEP committee members should be distributed to the other four committees.

Ms. Spross stated that Committee 5 is gone. There were recommendations to make a Committee 5 on incentives for teachers. Ms. Spross asked the workgroup if they think that they should add a

Committee 5 on Incentives for Recruitment and Retention. Quality Teacher Incentive Act – National Board Certified Teacher Stipend discussion. Ms. Spross stated that other four committees touched on the subject of incentives for teachers.

Committee 2: What does Maryland think is right for accreditation to be conformed to?

- Looking at IPC and SPAs but didn't have any recommendations.
- Clear guidance?

Ms. Spross asked the workgroup if they should add a Committee 5 on Incentives for Recruitment and Retention. Quality Teacher Incentive Act - NBCT discussion

Ms. Shapiro stated that “we need to redesign and reframe what has happened in the past. We need to devote some time as a collaborative body together to decide what we think the new standards should be. What should all teachers know and be able to do?” (Regardless of whether or not the applicants come out of a teacher preparation program.)

Mr. Jack Smith asked Ms. Spross, “what is it that we are expected to deliver? What does the General Assembly expect us to deliver? Let's work back from that to figure out what we need to do in the next 10 months. The General Assembly works best with specific things to do. Picture what it will look like in June 2018 and work back from that - how do we make it happen?”

- Revisions and ideas for implementing the Act and what we should do with that
- Recruit, retain, and promote teachers at all levels
- Interweave principals with NBCT
- NBCT interwoven into leadership
- Look at how teacher certification and occur and how to make it more valuable by linking to high needs schools
- Incorporate induction best practices
- Recommendations to existing state laws
  - Measurement and management
  - Reward for high quality work
- Evaluate AACPS stipend for effectiveness (in 2019)

Mr. Smith asked, what needs to happen in regulation this year to make it happen?

Ms. Spross stated that we need to look at the routes to certification. We need to look at the conditional certification route and make it more user-friendly, especially in high-needs areas.

Mr. Smith suggested to the workgroup cleaning this up and creating a foundation for all the money projects. This could be a foundation for the changes we want in the content of the legislation.

Ms. Spross stated that the group needs to challenge the Induction Community to put some uniformity behind this work. Ms. Spross stated that all of the teacher certification test should be reviewed to see if they are aligned with other states and to determine if they are still what Maryland wants? Some of the test may or may not be the best. Are there other ways to measure the readiness of a teacher - other than certification?

Mr. Smith stated that the group needed to look at areas of work to determine where in each foundational area change needs to happen. Then create a process map:

- Certification
- Program Approval

Ms. Emily Dow stated that we need to state the why. What problem or barrier are we solving? This way people will understand why X is a problem and why X is a recommendation.

**FOUNDATION:**

- Certification
- Teacher Preparation
- Incentives
- Induction
  - 1st year teachers
  - Out of state teachers

Ms. Shapiro stated that if we look at the teachers who are retained, do we know where they came from? Is there research about what the pool of teachers that we want look like and where they came from?

Ms. Dow inquired about exit data - can we make this a one-year requirement to do a more thorough exit interview? Current survey does not ask WHY they leave.

Ms. Shapiro asked if the workgroup could propose a residency model. Especially for those individuals who are coming to Maryland from a 4-year program or from out of state. Residency experience is a true medical residence. You become part of the community/school you are working in. You get a mentor.

Ms. Spross stated that there are 3 areas of interest that need to be researched and discussed further.

1. General access to the profession
2. Innovation (current state of affairs: NBCT, AACPS, incentives, etc.)
3. A whole new way of thinking about it (residency model)

Ms. Spross asked the group, "How do you see accomplishing this?" Should there be 2-3 committees or just the main group?"

Ms. Shapiro stated that MSDE could get started on sorting through a collaborative website with MHEC for people to make recommendations and suggestions.

Mr. Smith stated that the committee should lay the foundation. It should be split it into two groups and structured in a way that makes it easier to do the desirable thing. Mr. Smith also stated that the workgroup should draft something and take it back to the other 72 members.

- Short term innovations (NBCT and access)
- Long term desirable state that we want to get to (residency model)

Ms. Spross stated that the individuals at the table are the driving force and should take the information back to their stakeholders.

Ms. Kraft asked what the workgroup members can or cannot say to their stakeholders.

Mr. Derek Simmons from the Attorney General's Office informed the workgroup that is not a problem with the quorum of the group discussing the information with their stakeholders. He recommended if there is an email sent out to the stakeholders, do not respond to all.

Ms. Spross told the group that she encourages them to go back and inform their stakeholders of the process, so that we can get feedback. She asked for recommendations of names of people to come and speak to the workgroup.

Ms. Spross told the workgroup that she wanted to make it clear and simple to those who are coming to Maryland to teach. You have X - then you do Y. We are not trying to lower standards - just make it clear and simple so that navigating the process is not a barrier to getting people to come teach in Maryland.

Ms. Shapiro told the group that this reminds her of the math pathway work they are doing. The pathway is equally rigorous, but not everybody has to do it the same way. The rigor is there but not everybody comes in at the same level. Our community college partners give us the opportunity to get the word out for recruitment and retention strategies.

### **Innovation and Access**

- Do we need to be looking at or changing online PD course work?
- Is the rigor something we need to be looking at as well?

Ms. Shapiro implied that having a residency requirement could actually help with the pipeline. With the “for-profit” businesses involved collaboratively with MSDE and the schools to help monitor the quality of the people who are coming in; this is a challenge worth looking at.

Mr. Smith stated that we need to use a recursive drafting and reviewing process.

Mr. Justin Heid (MSEA) stated that this way we can get as many voices in the process as possible to get buy-in.

STATUS UPDATE: The interim report has gone to Annapolis.

Mr. Smith stated that the group needs to think about getting budgetary needs to LEAs as quickly as possible.

Ms. Kraft stated that we should look at Friday, January 20, 2017 for extended meeting time...with a white board so that the group can edit collaboratively.

Ms. Spross thanked everyone for their participation and wanted to know if they were comfortable with the foundation.

### **Meeting Adjourned**

**Meeting adjourned 2:45 p.m.**