

**Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016 Workgroup  
Committee #4 - Revising the Institutional Performance Criteria (IPC)  
June 20, 2017 Meeting**

**MINUTES**

**Committee Members Present:** Chadia Abras (MICUA), Lisa Booth, (MAESP), Michelle Dunkle (MSDE), Robin L. McNair (MSEA) and Japera Parker (Urban Teachers).

**Committee Members Absent:** Stacie Burch (MADTECC), Charelle D. James (Urban Teachers), Deborah Kraft (Stevenson Univ.), Laurie Mullen (Towson Univ.), Jon Singer (USM), Jack Smith (PSSAM), and Donna Wiseman (UMD).

**Workgroup Members:**

**Observers:** Sarah Baker (DLS), Carrie Cook (UMBC) and Rhonda Jeter (Bowie State Univ.).

**Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) Staff:** Linda Murel

**Alternates Present:** Laila Richmond (Towson University) and Eugene Schaffer (USM).

---

**Convene:** 3:10 p.m.

**Discussion:**

Ms. Michelle Dunkle welcomed everyone and asked individuals to introduce themselves.

Meeting handouts:

- May 30, 2017 Draft Minutes
- IPC of the *Redesign of Teacher Education* Discussion Revision Draft
- Worksheet for the IPC
- Professional Development Standards (PDS)

The committee members reviewed the May 30, 2017 draft minutes. The minutes were accepted unanimously. Dr. Chadia Abras motioned to accept the minutes and Ms. Robin McNair seconded the motion.

Ms. Dunkle said she took the liberty of trying to interpret notes from the May 30, 2017 meeting to put into writing Component I. Component I is all of the instructional elements that take place in an education program. Everything is linked to the INTASC standards. We need to look at indicators NASDTEC model #9 to incorporate the Model Code of Education Ethics.

The group reviewed Component #2 and Ms. Dunkle stated that different levels of service are provided at the different levels of PDS and another group needs to put in place immediately to revise the PDS standards.

Ms. Dunkle mentioned that Component #3 is where the data goes for developing our performance assessment system. She said that the Maryland Teacher Technology Standards are outdated and a workgroup may need to be established to revise the standards.

Ms. Dunkle stated that in the IPC chart on page seven an institution would not be limited to the evidence listed to show alignment with the standards. We do not want to make the SLO a requirement for everyone. Everything is not included nor required, so we are not going to depend on the list. It will go forward right now with a “possible but not limited to” statement.

Dr. Eugene Schaeffer said how are multiple outcomes measured as a unit as a university. Would we specify a particular instrument or outcome, which later becomes outdated? What do we have to do? There are two levels, the state and the national.

Ms. Dunkle said we have to move forward to develop what Maryland sees as essential to a program, and so will not intentionally link to national accreditation models. Much evidence, of course, can be used to both. In considering intern performance data, EPPs will have the choice of using a system like EdTPA. An institution would not necessarily have to share every piece of data that they have.

Ms. Dunkle mentioned that interns should have a handle on what student growth is and how to reflect on that growth to improve their practice and that this should be reflected in data collection.

Dr. Laila Richman said she did not see the impact on student learning as an important and critical piece of assessment as a part of this revision. Ms. Dunkle said it is included on page 8 of the IPC but could be another element. It will be more focused in the next iteration.

Ms. Dunkle asked the committee to look at page 9 and note that measurement of student growth is also about program improvement. Ms. Robin McNair asked is there any measurement that will measure qualitative data. Ms. Dunkle said instruction has to include a tool for measuring. Ms. Japera Parker asked do you feel like it may be unit by unit from beginning to end. Ms. Dunkle noted that you put it in your instructions – qualitative research, but she is not inclined to tell one how to do it.

Dr. Chadia Abras said it is understood, PreK-12 is implied but not evidence on page 10. Dr. Richman asked what the committee thought about getting rid of the bullets under element on page 7. Ms. Dunkle said the list was the same as on page 2 maybe just keep bullets 1, 2, 3 and 5. The committee decided to keep all bullets.

The committee reviewed Component IV. Ms. Dunkle said she wished that we could get away from transcript analysis altogether in the best interest of the candidate and students. The TPIP will continue to feed the Maryland Teacher Staffing report. Also, she made mentioned that we are considering moving away from Alternative Preparation Evaluation as separate from the IPC. Ms. Dunkle asked if there were any changes, additions or deletions. None stated.

Dr. Richman said accountability measures in Component I and III we need to add a new statement to be instructed and guided by the local school system. Also, should it be in Component III. Ms. Dunkle said it is more logical, she would make the changes and discuss with Ms. Sarah Spross for approval.

Ms. Dunkle asked that all committee members present only discuss the IPC Chart but not to disseminate it at this point and time, because the document is still in draft and needs to be completed soon as it has to be presented to the State Board at its October 2017 meeting first.

Ms. Dunkle stated we should decide what competencies are. We need to do a crosswalk and put any additions, changes and deletions on the IPC Worksheet. Ms. Dunkle will make changes using the INTASC standards as the control and decide where and how the PDS standards will fit in. She said we need to show what we mean by acquiring competencies. Dr. Chadia said we should align InTASC standards with PDS standards. Ms. Dunkle said we need to figure out the wording and how we would use the PDS standards, but the first step is to do the crosswalk. Ms. Dunkle said it is outlined in the IPC chart and asked if everyone was comfortable with that and all present agreed that they were.

**Next Steps:**

The next Workgroup and Committee members' meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, July 25, 2017 from 2:00 until 5:00 p.m. at the Arbutus Library Meeting Room.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.