

**Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016  
Workgroup  
Minutes  
July 7, 2016 Meeting**



The 2<sup>nd</sup> 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:** Dr. Sylvia Lawson (MSDE), Sarah Spross (MSDE), Emily Dow (Maryland Higher Education Commission), Linda Gronberg-Quinn (Maryland Association of Directors of Teacher Education at Community Colleges), Deborah Kraft (Maryland Independent College and University Association), Nancy Shapiro (University of Maryland System), Rowena Shurn (Maryland State Education Association), Amanda Conn (MSDE)

**MSDE Staff:** Jean Marie Holly (MSDE), Cecilia Roe (MSDE), Dan Capozzi (MSDE), Alexandra Cambra (MSDE), Kelly Meadows (MSDE), Jessica Bancroft (MSDE), Ruth Downs (MSDE)

**Absentees:** Mariette English (Baltimore Teachers Union), Tess Blumenthal (Maryland Association of Elementary School Principals), Laura Weeldryer (Maryland State Board of Education), Jack Smith (Public School Superintendents Association of Maryland), Annette Wallace (Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals), Derrick Simonsen (Attorney General's Office/MSDE Legal Representative), Aidan DeLisle (MSDE)

**Welcome:**

Ms. Sarah Spross welcomed the panel members. Ms. Spross asked the panel members to reintroduce themselves as some changes in the panel have occurred since the last meeting. Ms. Spross introduced Dr. Sylvia Lawson as the new Chief Performance Officer for School Effectiveness and Ms. Amanda Conn, Executive Director of Government Relations. Dr. Lawson thanked the members of the workgroup for their time and perseverance.

**Senate Bill 493**

Senate Bill 493 has been multiple years of work. The meeting schedule for the workgroup is robust, due to the fact the first report is due November 1, 2016. Ms. Spross stated that in order for the workgroup to put together a comprehensive interim report, the workgroup will have to meet at a rapid pace to get everyone's input. The workgroup members will make their recommendations regarding the content of the final report. The first report needs to be done by September 15 at the latest.

Ms. Spross stated that the committees can have alternatives. There will be a primary and an alternate for the five committees. The alternate and the primary cannot be on the committee at the same time. They can be there to share information only. Ms. Spross stated that she does not know if there is a phone option. The feasibility will be explored.

Ms. Nancy Shapiro asked that given the fact that the most urgent issue on the table was not created by the workgroup, but external by CAEP not being grandfathered in under NCATE approval from USDE. In July and August, why not focus our energy on one thing, the CAEP issue.

Ms. Spross reiterated to the workgroup the CAEP issue. Statute 11-208 requires that our programs must have national accreditation from a nationally accrediting body recognized by the USDE. She continued that when NCATE and TEAC rolled together CAEP did not pursue USDE recognition. As of June 30, CAEP is not recognized. As of July 1, 2016, the state cannot meet the requirements of the Statute. As such, MSDE cannot continue to complete joint reviews with CAEP until CAEP meets the requirements under Education Article §11-208. As such, MSDE will need to amend the Statute, which is fortunately Ms. Conn's specialty.

The workgroup cannot solely focus the interim report on CAEP, because Chapter 740 does not require the workgroup to comment on CAEP. The workgroup must focus on the tenants of Chapter 740. The expectations for this report are to produce a content rich report that is high quality and responsive to the General Assemblies request. All of the workgroup members' names will be on the report.

Ms. Conn discussed and outlined the MSDE department bill process. She noted that we must sponsor the bill to fix the statute. It is a tight deadline. Proposals must be in by September 1, 2016. MSDE wants and needs input, and it must be a focus of the work groups. Ms. Shapiro stated that she understood and confirmed it could get done. She went on to comment that three committees have elements of CAEP in them. There needs to be input into statutory language. She noted it would be too easy to make a mistake with unintended consequences. The more eyes on it, the more likely there will be success. If we are looking at a September 1st deadline, then we need to get draft language by end of August to get to a review from constituents. Ms. Spross stated that she had added an August date to the meeting schedule just in case the workgroup might need additional time. She complimented the great discussion regarding the priority of Statute 11-208, but reiterated that that we can't focus solely on CAEP but need to address all requirements in Chapter 740.

Ms. Spross reminded the group that every meeting will be at the library and will be held in conference room A and she will try to get both rooms for the meetings.

Ms. Spross stated that there is a work group website and all meeting materials will be uploaded to the website from the last meeting and from this meeting. She reminded the group that this is an open meeting and therefore follows open meeting act principals. This allows the public to come and observe government at work. She also reminded the group that they cannot meet outside of the formal venue as this constitutes an official meeting.

### **Approval of Minutes**

Ms. Sarah Spross entertained a motion to approve the minutes.

**VOTE: UNANIMOUS** To approve the June 22, 2016 minutes.

### **PRESENTATIONS**

#### **Teacher Academies of Maryland (TAM)**

Ms. Jeanne-Marie Holly, Program Manager for Career and Technology Education for MSDE presented the Teacher Academies of Maryland (TAM) and how it relates to the workgroup. Dr. Karen Salmon had suggested that Ms. Holly be included, as she has done work with Teacher Academies and with Ms. Nancy Shapiro on E=MC Squared.

The Teacher Academy of Maryland (TAM) is a state-approved Career and Technology Education (CTE) Program of Study (POS). It was developed in 2004–2005 with representatives from: local school systems; community colleges; baccalaureate degree granting institutions; the Maryland Higher Education Commission; the University System of Maryland; and the Maryland State Department of Education through two areas: the Division of Career and College Readiness, and the Division of Educator Effectiveness. Please see attachments provided by Ms. Holly.

All workgroup members agreed that this was a great example of collaboration between the Higher Education Community and Maryland preK-12 community.

## Comprehensive Teacher Induction Program – COMAR 13A.07.01

Ms. Cecilia Roe, Director and Mr. Dan Capozzi, Specialist of Instructional Assessment & Professional Learning for MSDE presented the Comprehensive Teacher Induction Program – COMAR 13A07.01. They provided a brief overview of the regulations, which can be found at : <http://www.dsd.state.md.us/comar/SubtitleSearch.aspx?search=13A.07.01>

Ms. Rowena Shurn asked if anyone can be a mentor. Ms. Roe stated that mentors must have training.

Ms. Roe stated that her office visits districts on a rotating basis every year. This is a two hour, one on one meeting to talk about new teacher induction and professional activities that are associated with Title IIA funding. Ms. Roe stated that New Teacher Center Academies partnered with MSDE. There were 941 participants over 4 years.

Mr. Capozzi stated that since the Race to the Top funding has ended, some of the activities had to be limited; however, their office continued to offer a Mentor and a Professional Development Conference. This leads to the question-how do we continue development and collaboration with New Teachers Center? <https://newteachercenter.org/about-ntc/> Some mentors and LEA coordinators participate in New Teacher Symposium and some LEAs also include Induction Coordinators. The goal is consistency for LEAs, so mentors are consistent.

Every LEA has orientation pre-school year, and provides mentors some sort of professional development throughout the year either as an in-service or on an as-needed basis. The focus is on discipline, planning, and assessment. Despite the similarities in the types of training offered, Mr. Capozzi indicated that programs vary across the State and smaller systems have developed unique ways to meet their needs. This summer there will be a coaching collaborative. The grant includes teams of mentors and LEAs working together on important issues such as a professional learning community. Mr. Capozzi commented that they are building a state wide network of teacher inductees.

Ms. Shapiro asked if they had Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs) involved in induction work? Ms. Roe replied, no but MSDE would welcome it.

Ms. Spross commented that that was an excellent question. Statistics and number of people who were mentors would be helpful as we look at induction. Chapter 740 will be looking at mentoring pilot programs. The pilot program is not defined.

Ms. Spross reported that Georgia has changed teacher certification to have a 3<sup>rd</sup> tier recognizing mentor teachers. There is a robust amount of work done in Maryland for the purpose of bringing this information to build, expand, and leverage.

Ms. Shapiro asked, so why are IHEs not involved?

Mr. Capozzi noted there are teachers of promise meeting with universities; however, their office does need to connect.

Ms. Roe indicated that MSDE has collaborated with New Teachers Center for training their mentors. To address the cost, MSDE staff have attended The New Teacher Center Presenters Academy to be able to serve as trainers in Maryland. Much of what they are doing is exciting and the committee will help to make better.

Ms. Shapiro noted that they could save money being spent on the New teacher Center and partner with the Maryland public institutions since they have trained the New Teacher Center trainers.

Ms. Spross asked what our career levels are. This brings us back to the issue of retention. How do we elevate profession of teachers? How does Maryland want to position ourselves to become a second leader?

Ms. Shurn commented that they have three LEAs with peer assistance in review and that these three counties handle peer assistance differently. Ms. Shurn asked if some mentors are full time or part-time and is mentor a generic term or is there a title of mentor?

Mr. Capozzi responded that previously, it could be anyone assigned informally by a principal; however, they have been working to bring more status with training and work in LEAs.

Ms. Spross asked the workgroup, how does Maryland want to position ourselves to be a leader in the field regarding the qualifications for mentor teachers? Ms. Shapiro noted the groundwork that had been done and asked if Ms. Roe and Mr. Capozzi could be on the Induction Committee.

Ms. Spross also noted the extent of the groundwork on every aspect. Ms. Spross noted that Ms. Roe will be a resource as well as a member of the induction committee.

### **Materials of Interest**

Ms. Spross introduced the materials of information packet and highlighted three items that were a direct response to questions from the previous meeting:

- MSDE does collect causes for Separation (Response to Sec. Fielders question regarding attrition)
- Materials include information on Maryland pension system (Response to Dr. Salmons question regarding teacher pensions)
- CAEP information regarding other states that have a requirement for the accrediting body to be recognized by the USDOE. These include states included Ohio, Hawaii and Maine.

Ms. Shapiro was asked by Ms. Spross to address the topic of CAEP. Her presentation covered two parts: Ms. Shapiro provided an overview of the history of CAEP and reiterated IHEs' concerns with the CAEP Standards. She specifically addressed the issues related to the standard around the admissions process. Specifically that IHEs had previously justified a 2.75 GPA and CAEP wants 3.0 GPA. However, it is murky how CAEP defines cohort. Ms. Shapiro noted that there are still issues, but at the last board of directors meeting CAEP has a new take on admission requirements. CAEP says 3.0 must apply to 50% of cohort and they will allow institutions to redefine the criteria. Standard 3.2 is no longer a ramp up to academic performance standards. Educator Preparation Programs have the requirement of cohort average based on national norm.

Ms. Shapiro shared that a second concern of the IHEs is the data collection requirements. Specifically, the IHEs do not have access to the required data and LSSs are not required to provide or cannot collect the data. Ms. Shapiro commented that they are not the only ones concerned with admissions and data. How do we want to set criteria for quality in our programs? It is clear we do not want to bring people into the pipeline and become aspiration standards. Ms. Spross noted EPPs can design their own data collection if it is relevant and meaningful.

Ms. Shapiro returned to concerns around CAEP presented the following questions for discussion

1. First, can we do SPA reviews and CAEP separately? MSDE does not have enough staff to do everything. IHEs want SPAs to be newest and they need someone external to do it.
2. Whether the SPAs have USDE recognition or some kind of approval?
3. Are SPAs separate from CAEP?

Ms. Kraft asked, "How can we insure quality of those who do SPA reviews?"

Ms. Spross noted that the most immediate need is that SPAs and IPC are a shared concern. IPC standards are 20+ years old, which is why this issue has been included under the teacher preparation committee. These are exactly the types of questions that will be studied over the course of the year. MSDE's Program Approval has been given direction to look to spring for reviews at the earliest. Ms. Kraft commented that she can't look at work of committees separate from the SPA issue.

Ms. Spross agreed that it is all connected, so enmeshed. We need to divide and look at separate areas. Workgroup members will look at collective work, what we need from committees is to look specifically at how it impacts teacher preparation. Ms. Kraft commented that we don't want to say a year from now that this is not going to work now that CAEP is recognized.

Ms. Spross noted that it is so critical to figure out language to recommend that is not limiting. We do not want to lower standards but we also do not want to craft statute language that is so specific that we end up in a similar situation to what we find ourselves in now. Accreditation and recognition is important. How do we get language in statute that does not hurt us and maintains a high level of integrity and flexibility?

Ms. Shapiro provided 3 possible language changes based on the understanding that "national accreditation" means teacher education accreditation by an accrediting agency recognized by the U.S Department of Education and endorsed by the Department".

1) MSDE will certify that "Middle States Accreditation" which IS recognized by the U.S. Dept. of Ed, is an acceptable accrediting body, then we should not have a problem. MSDE just needs to certify that Middle States counts.

2) We change the language from: "an accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Department of Education and endorsed by the Department: "a nationally recognized accrediting agency" then CHEA (Council of Higher Education Accreditors) would count, and CAEP is recognized by CHEA.

3) We change the language to eliminate the requirement for national accreditation, and go with MSDE only, then institutions can choose, but there is not legal problem with CAEP not having Dept. of Ed approval.

There may be other options—but I think these should be discussed and evaluated by MSDE's lawyers and by higher ed. Ms. Shapiro noted Maryland has a narrowly defined waiver clause. Can we expand that? In certain circumstance MSDE can use waiver. UMES has issues. It is not their fault.

Ms. Shapiro shared that IHEs have just received an email from CAEP saying Maryland institutions have two choices in regards to CAEP;

1. IHEs can give up their accreditation and if in the future they wish to become accredited they will need to start the process over.
2. IHEs continue with CAEP and meet all established review timelines. Part of the challenge is to be clear that we have quality assurance, externally validated quality insurance but not necessarily the only model out there.

Can Amanda find the lowest common denominator to open the box to be compliant with law, but not trapped in box?

Ms. Spross noted she agrees that we need to find a way to open up and allow choice. Ms. Conn is good at language.

Ms. Shapiro asked if we can we work with Amanda for 2-3 versions, Middle States, one a waiver, one CHEA? Let community weigh in. Is there a red flag that we do not see? The sooner the language is out to consider the better.

Ms. Spross indicated that these were good examples for the CAEP committee to review.

### **Conclusion of Meeting**

Ms. Spross noted that the committees represent their communities.

The meeting today was framed as a two hour meeting for baseline information. The meeting on July 19<sup>th</sup> will be from 1 p.m. to 4 p.m. and the structure will be different. Workgroup members will meet and start with information and discussion. Two ideas from workgroup members have been suggested for future topics. Having Ann Nutter Coffman from NEA talk about the national scene and having someone provide information regarding the Massachusetts Teacher Preparation reform efforts. On July 19<sup>th</sup>, the work group has time in the beginning and then the majority of the meeting time will be for the committees to begin work. At the end of the meeting, each committee will provide a brief report of their discussions. This will be the format for the rest of the meetings. Workgroup members agreed that this was a good format. On August 16<sup>th</sup>, committee members will present their initial ideas and recommendations for the interim report. Workgroup members will have time to discuss these recommendations.

Ms. Kraft asked if there is a sense of how the final interim report will look.

Ms. Spross explained that the reports would look similar to the JCR reports provided in the first packet. This will include meeting structure, committee information, and any recommendations to be made. One recommendation that will be included is the Amendment to 11-208.

Ms. Spross adjourned the meeting promptly at 3 p.m.