



**MARYLAND STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**  
**200 W. Baltimore Street**  
**Baltimore, MD 21201**

**PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND TEACHER EDUCATION BOARD**

**September 8, 2016**  
**Minutes**

The 409<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Professional Standards and Teacher Education Board (PSTEB) was held at the Maryland State Department of Education, 200 West Baltimore Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21201 on March 3, 2016. Mr. Darren Hornbeck called the meeting to order at 9:40 a.m.

**The following members were in attendance:** Ms. Jennifer Berkley, Mr. Charles Hagan, Dr. Kandace Hoppin, Mr. Darren Hornbeck, Mr. Philip Kauffman, Ms. Kathleen Kelbaugh, Dr. Barbara Martin-Palmer, Dr. John Mayo, Dr. Kristine McGee, Ms. Dawn Pipkin, Ms. Debra Poese, Ms. Karen Saar, Ms. Sarah Spross, and Dr. Jamey Tobery-Nystrom.

**The following members were absent:** Mr. Peter Baily, Ms. Louise DeJesu, Dr. Alyssia James, Ms. Maleeta Kitchen, Dr. Mary Ellen Lewis, Mr. Christopher Lloyd, Dr. Donna Newcomer, and Ms. Geralda Thompson.

**The following Maryland State Department of Education staff members were present:**

Ms. Kelly Meadows, Ms. Miya Simpson, Ms. Mary Voorhees, Ms. Jessica Bancroft, Ms. Tanisha Brown, Ms. Ruth Downs (Recorder), and Mr. Derek Simmonsen, Esq., Attorney General's Office.

**PRELIMINARY ITEMS**

**Recognition of Guests**

Ms. Geraldine Duval, MSEA

**Public Comment**

None

**State Board**

Ms. Miya Simpson, Executive Director gave a summary of the August 23, 2016 meeting of the Maryland State Board of Education.

The following actions were taken at the August 23, 2016 meeting of the Maryland State Board of Education (State Board).

- Approved the 2017 State Board meeting dates.
- Approved the FY 2018 Annual Capital Budget and the Five-Year Capital Improvement Program for submission to the Maryland Department of Budget and Management.
- Granted permission to repeal Regulations .01 and .02 under Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) 13A.02.08 Recognition of Employee Organizations. These regulations are no longer needed since the Public School Labor Relations Board now has jurisdiction over and have adopted regulations to carry out this activity.

- Granted permission to repeal Regulations .01—.11 under COMAR13A.04.03 Driver Education Programs. These regulations are no longer needed because driver education programs are now governed by the Maryland Vehicle Administration.
- Granted permission to publish new Regulations .01—.05 under COMAR 13A.03.07 Seal of Biliteracy. These regulations are required by Senate Bill 781/House Bill 708 and will make Maryland the 21<sup>st</sup> state to establish a voluntary recognition program for Maryland students to have achieved high levels of proficiency in English and another language.
- Opposed permission to publish amendments to Regulations .01—.10 under COMAR 13A.06.07 Student Transportation until additional clarification is provided on school vehicle attendant qualifications and disqualifications.
- Delayed adoption of amendments to Regulation .01 under 13A.04.11 Programs in World Languages. Board members requested to see supporting documentation before moving forward with adopting these amendments: specifically competency charts, which provide evidence and examples of how students demonstrate cultural competence/proficiency. It was agreed to bring this action back before the Board for consideration at the September 27<sup>th</sup> meeting.

The following Opinions and Orders were rendered on August 23, 2016:

- *Beverly Byrd v. Baltimore City Board of School Commissioners* – teacher evaluation – Opin. No. 16-34
- *Danielle Green v. Baltimore City Board of School Commissioners* – assistant principal termination – Opin. No. 16-35
- *Cash Williams v. Prince George's County Board of Education* – request for reconsideration – OR16-13.

Meeting materials, Opinions, and Orders can be found at: [www.marylandpublicschools.org/stateboard](http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/stateboard)

**The next meeting of the Maryland State Board of Education will be held on Tuesday, September 27, 2016**, at the Nancy S. Grasmick State Education Building, 200 West Baltimore Street, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor Board Room, Baltimore, Maryland 21201.

Appropriate accommodations for individuals with disabilities will be provided upon request. Eight business days' notice prior to the event is required. Please contact Charlene Necessary at (410) 767- 0467 or TTY at (410) 333-6442 so arrangements can be made.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **Deaf and Hard of Hearing Update**

Ms. Sross reminded the Board that they had asked MSDE to form a workgroup to address the Deaf and Hard of Hearing certification regulations. She stated that the need to review the regulations came from a letter from the Maryland School for the Deaf, which was centered around the issue that our regulations for the deaf and hard of hearing content requirements but to also have an addition of special education certification. About a 1 ½ ago, the Blind and Visually Impaired community had just finished revising their regulations and the Deaf and Hard of Hearing community was looking to have the regulations more mimic. Ms. Sross stated that typically they would come before the Board with a memorandum, some information and proposed regulations, but we don't have that today because we just wanted to give the board an update on where MSDE is. The workgroup has been meeting quite regularly and there is great representation. Ms. Sross stated that they thought that they would come to the meeting today with a memo and draft regulations but recognized that there was need for some more discussion.

Ms. Meadows stated that they had actually drafted the regs and that they were going to bring them to the last meeting. She stated that as she was reading the regulations one last time, she realized that there was some minor verbiage having to do with endorsements that was open to interpretation of how many credits were needed. Ms. Meadows felt this needed to be hammered out. She sent the regulation back to the workgroup and it opened up a big discussion and the workgroup will meet

one more time. So the plan is to come back to the board in November with the proposed language. The workgroup has met four times, so they will meet a total of five times. The discussions are really healthy and the group is very passionate about this regulation. Ms. Spross is right, what drove this is seeing that the Blind and Visually Impaired reg. was revised and they took out the special education requirement and that is exactly what the Deaf and Hard of Hearing community wanted as well. Ms. Meadows stated that they have drafted a regulation where special education is no longer a requirement and we took the opportunity to look at the transcript analysis requirements to really make sure that they were current. So what you will see is exactly what this community is wanting. Ms. Meadows stated that the other piece was to make sure that MSDE allowed people to come in from out of state with this either as an experienced professional or an out-of-state approved program, because the way that the regulation is currently written, it is a little bit difficult to do that. So we wanted to make sure that we open the doors for those people because we only have one I think program right now approved in Maryland for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing at McDaniel. So we really do need to open the doors for those individuals coming in from out-of-state and those that are experienced professionals and hopefully that is what we have done with this regulation.

Ms. Spross stated that we have Gallaudet University and those individuals are not qualified to teach in the state of Maryland. This was really presenting a problem, not only for the Maryland School for the Deaf, but also for our locals who have minuscule needs for this. Ms. Spross stated that one challenge for the group has been "What is the requirement for certification versus a hiring decision?" When you have such a robust group of individuals, you can't meet everybody's individual wants for that is what is in the best interest for the state of Maryland in doing that. Ms. Spross stated that she thinks that the HR representative from the community has been very good about "Yes, you can want that in your employee, but is it necessary to get a certificate in Maryland?" You can require more in the hiring process for your employees, but is it what's necessary and there have been a lot of discussions around that piece. Ms. Spross stated that there are several options to apply for certification, such as an Experienced Professional or Transcript analysis. The question right now is how many credits should it be 15, 18, 22 or 364 but there is not an agreement.

Ms. Meadows stated that the group agrees on the initial credits. She feels that the endorsement piece was almost an afterthought, last minute part of the conversation when the group wrapped up the proposal part of the language and because it was written in such a way that when I read it, I thought do I need 18 or 9 credits. Ms. Meadows explained that the group is very much on the same page as far as what we think the initial credits should be. It is just the matter on how do we want to word the endorsement piece without bogging you down in the endorsement section of the regulation, because deaf and hard of hearing just like visually impaired is not listed. So we cannot go by that regulation, these have to be built in as special exemptions into the reg. itself so that you can do the endorsement. Because if you just went by the endorsement regulation, there would not be options and that is why the group has to tackle that component. Ms. Meadows asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Hornbeck stated that he appreciated the time that Ms. Meadows was taking to deliberate and really look at the regulation with the group. He asked Ms. Meadows to convey the Boards appreciation on the work that they have dome and the work that MSDE done.

### **Open Meetings Act Update**

Mr. Derek Simmonsen from the Attorney General's Office gave an update to the Board in regards to the Open Meeting Act. Mr. Simmonsen stated that there have been a couple of changes in the Open Meetings Act and since we have new members, he just wanted to talk briefly about them. The two new major changes are mostly related to the MSDE staff. The first change is that all public bodies are going to have to post their agendas ahead of time before their meetings. That is at least 24 hours in advance. Mr. Simmonsen stated that it does not mean that the agenda cannot be changed on the day of the meeting if the presenter is not here or if you decide to change the order of the presentations it can still be done. This new change is to try and let the public know what is going to be discussed ahead of time. The other change is posting the minutes on line and both of these changes take effect on October 1. So for the next meeting this will be relevant. Also the meeting minutes have to be saved for at least five years. Mr. Simmonsen that the changes to the Open Meetings Act will not generally affect any members of the board, but if a member missed a meeting and they are trying to figure out what happened, this would be an easy way now to go back in time and easily find those minutes.

Mr. Simmonsen stated that in regards to the Open Meetings Act, he wanted to mention to the new members that the Board is a public body and that we don't necessarily have a large audience for the meetings, but that does not mean that we won't at some point in time. You never know when there might be an issue that is controversial or has a lot of public interest and really the purpose behind it is so that the public can see the kind of deliberations the Board has that leads to the type of

policies that are adopted. This is done so that there is not the idea that things are being done behind closed doors without the public seeing what is going on. If somebody really wants to see this process from the beginning, they could come to these meetings. They could see the discussions the Board has and understand why the Board proposed a certain regulation. So with that said, it applies anytime the Board has a quorum, which is 13. Which is a fairly large number and it is unlikely that we would even get a group of all of you together outside of these meetings. Mr. Simmonsen stated that that the Board has a hard time getting a full quorum for regular meetings but just be cautious that if you are ever outside of this group and want to discuss some of the issues that are discussed at the meetings, is sort of where he has the caution sign and technically that Act only applies when we have a quorum of people. There has been guidance from the courts especially in situations where bodies are trying to deliberately evade the Act, so just because we have ten people from the Board meeting together and you are intending to still do the same business that normally takes place at the monthly meetings that could be an Open Meetings Act violation. He stated that he has been cautioning boards of that fact. He told the board that if they ever have questions, please let Sarah know and he can funnel the questions that come along in regards to this.

Mr. Simmonsen stressed that it does not mean that the Board members cannot be in the same place at the same time for other reasons, conferences or whatever else. He stated that many members of the board represent other organizations and that does not mean that you cannot have conversations with those organization on what happens in the meetings. The caution is really on intentionally trying to get around the Act. Say a smaller group of the members want to kind of continue the discussion away from the full group and come to a consensus about something; that is the kind of thing that I would caution you against, just to make sure we are all on the right side of the law. Mr. Simmonsen stated that there are only specific reasons that the Board can close the meetings and in the 3 years that he has been working with PSTEB, there has only been one time that this happened. This incident occurred when the Board had a specific appeal that was coming out of a certification decision. Generally the meetings are not closed and it is unlikely that we will find a time when there will be a reason to close the meeting. The meetings are generally open to the public, but if there is ever a situation and the meeting needs to be closed for a specific reason, there is a process that we follow. He stated to the new members that if they have any questions, a follow-up will be provided during the orientation process. If any other members have questions in the meantime to, always feel free to let Sarah know.

Mr. Hornbeck stated correct if I am wrong, but one of the things we are encouraged to do is to go back to our constituents, discuss what is happening at the meetings, get their opinions and so forth because we represent them and bring back their information.

Mr. Simmonsen stated that okay. He has had that question before and that is why he wanted to clarify that. It does not mean that the board cannot have those types of discussions with their constituents; it is really as a board that it becomes an issue.

### **Update on School Counselor**

Ms. Spross provided a brief update on the regulation for School Counselor. She stated that this was a mandated regulation change to the requirements for the renewal for school counselors, which came out of the 2015 General Assembly. It was informally or formally called "Lauryn's Law." What this law does is requires school counselors to have to take a certain amount of seminar hours for renewal and this was to specifically address the situation as you may recall that occur in 2015. Unfortunately, a young woman name Lauryn committed suicide as a result of this, her mother lobbied very hard. During that same education year, there were several incidents that occurred both in schools and outside of schools. Ms. Spross stated that she has always been very careful of the extremely sensitive issue that has impacted many families at many different levels. What the concern was that spurred this law was that the school counselor had not done what he/she should have done in done in this case. That is a one side of the story and somewhere in the middle is what really occurred. As a result of that, a workgroup was formed, who came and presented to PSTEB. The Board gave permission to publish the regulation and then the regulation was sent to the State Board for permission to publish, which was given. The regulation was posted in the Maryland Register in July for public comments. On August 10, we received two public comments, which is why MSDE did not go to the State Board for adoption in August. We are going to the State Board in September for adoption. Ms. Spross stated that of the public comments that were received, which the members of PSTEB will get a formal copy of because the PSTEB ultimately introduced these regulation changes and it will come back to them for final adoption. Ms. Spross stated that this is a good example for all of the new PSTEB members to see how the two boards work together. In the public comments, there was one non-substitute change. We used the word "institute" instead of "institution" that we need to correct. There were questions that came up regarding definitions and I know that the Board had lengthy conversations about the definitions of CEUs and credits. We have put into our guidance chart that we do not concur with adding that into regulatory language. That has been defined in policy ant that is still something that is still currently under review as we look

at all the regulations, our definition section. Ms. Spross shared that at the State Board meeting, that the Board shared many of the same concerns as PSTEB, in that this is not the only solution to solving teen depression and suicide. It is just one avenue. Ms. Spross communicated that the State Board was very positive and encouraged as you were by the part of the regulation that it was not just go take a credit in these subject areas but that the last line was about providing the resources necessary to parents and guardians to support the child. Because we all know that the school is the front line crisis management and that a school counselor is not a long term therapist to solve the issues that are surrounding this and that the connection between the school in identifying and getting the families linked up with support in the community is virtually critical. Ms. Spross stated that not only did the bill go through, but at the state board there have been presentations about what counties are doing to help with the mental issues for children and how to address it. This is a very prominent issue that is occurring right now.

Mr. Hornbeck thanked Ms. Spross for the update and let her know that she did a great job presenting.

### **Teacher Induction, Retention and Advancement Act of 2016 Workgroup Update**

Ms. Spross gave the board a brief update on the progress of Senate Bill 493 workgroup. She asked that for those members of the board who are new and for those members that are seasoned and experienced, to please bear with her while she gives a little background.

Ms. Spross stated that the Teacher Induction, Retention and Advancement Act of 2016 workgroup is a workgroup that was formed by the Maryland State Department of Education as a legislative mandate out of the Teacher Induction, Retention and Advancement Act of 2016 legislation on Senate Bill 493. The bill is extremely robust and there are four major components of the bill.

1. The first component addresses the Quality Teacher Incentive Act of 1999 and changes the stipend that will be given to nationally board certified teachers that only work in comprehensive needs schools from \$2,000 to \$4,000. Because this is a fiscal mandate and even though the law went into effect on July 1, 2016, the financial and fiscal pieces go into effect a year later. So that is something that will go into effect on July 1, 2017.
2. The second component of the bill is a very specific section that is only application to Anne Arundel County Public Schools. The second section gives Anne Arundel County an additional \$1500 for teachers who hold a Standard Professional Certificate or an Advanced Professional Certificate and work in a middle or high school program where there is 30% or more of the students who receive free or reduced meals.
3. The third component of the bill is an entirely new pilot program. This pilot program is a tremendous opportunity. The new pilot program is written in the statute to provide first year teachers with 20% more time for planning, mentoring, etc. It is clear though in that section of the bill that it does not apply for all first year school teachers. Not all local school systems need to participate. It is the choice of a local board to participate. The program has \$5 million appropriation attachment to it for support that will be shared for those that are participating in the pilot program. It is a shared responsibility. The local boards will need to identify 20% for the cost of the program and the state would bear the other 80%. The Maryland State Department of Education is in the process of putting together what the stipulations and applications for the process of applying to become one of the mentor programs. In this section, it also talks about a preference should be given to low performing schools or comprehensive needs schools, however you want to put that definition in.
4. The fourth component of the bill is the workgroup piece. The bill required the Maryland State Department of Education to put a diverse stakeholder group together to address all parts of recruitment, teacher preparation, teacher retention, and teacher induction. This challenges the workgroup to look at current existing laws and regulations that need to be changed to improve teacher recruitment, retention, preparation and induction.

Ms. Spross stated that MSDE is not only looking at the statute and the laws that govern it, but also are using the best practices in teacher induction today. Classroom discipline is a specific line item in the bill and it is specific to our preparation programs. There was a lot of discussion about the word discipline. Is it classroom management? Different factions have issues with that terminology. The question that came to mind was, "Are we preparing the students in our institutes of higher education to be ready to teach in the diverse populations that make up our Maryland Public Schools." There have been comments that the student teaching placements maybe traditionally in schools that are the cream of the crop and that they

are not prepared for some of the more challenging placements. Is a 100 day practicum or internship correct? So there have been a lot of discussions around this. The bill also mandates that there will be two reports from this workgroup. The first report which is an interim report is due November 1, 2016 and the final report is due November 1, 2017. Ms. Spross stated that this gave MSDE from June to pretty much now to get an interim report together. There are 12 individuals on the workgroup and out of the workgroup 5 sub-committees were established. For the interim report, each committee was asked to give recommendations at the last meeting for the workgroup to consider.

The other thing that is important to note about this bill, interwoven throughout the bill are the tenets and pieces of national board certification. There are parts that say nationally board certified teachers to the extent practicable should be given opportunity for leadership roles. The bill also asks specifically for the proportions of national board to be considered in teacher preparation, in the recruitment, in the mentoring pieces and in the induction. So throughout this bill you will see the theme of national board being woven.

### **Teacher Induction, Retention and Advancement Act of 2016 Workgroup Update**

Ms. Spross gave the board a brief update on the progress of Senate Bill 493 workgroup. She asked that for those members of the board who are new and for those members that are seasoned and experienced, to please bear with her while she gave a little background.

Ms. Spross stated that the Teacher Induction, Retention and Advancement Act of 2016 workgroup was formed by the Maryland State Department of Education as a legislative mandate out of the Teacher Induction, Retention and Advancement Act of 2016 legislation on Senate Bill 493. The bill is extremely robust and there are four major components of the bill.

1. The first component addresses the Quality Teacher Incentive Act of 1999 and changes the stipend that will be given to Nationally Board Certified teachers who work in comprehensive needs schools from \$2,000 to \$4,000. Because this is a fiscal mandate and even though the law went into effect on July 1, 2016, the financial and fiscal pieces go into effect a year later. So that is something that will go into effect on July 1, 2017.
2. The second component of the bill is a very specific section that only applies to Anne Arundel County Public Schools. The second section gives Anne Arundel County an additional \$1500 for teachers who hold a Standard Professional Certificate or an Advanced Professional Certificate and work in a middle or high school program where there 30% or more of the students receive free or reduced meals.
3. The third component of the bill is an entirely new pilot program. This pilot program is a tremendous opportunity. The new pilot program is written in the statute to provide first year teachers with 20% more time for planning, mentoring, etc. It is clear though, in that section of the bill, that it does not apply for all first year school teachers. Not all local school systems need to participate. It is the choice of a local board to participate. The program has \$5 million in appropriations attached to it for support that will be shared with those that are participating in the pilot program. It is a shared responsibility. The local boards will need to identify 20% for the cost of the program and the state would bear the other 80%. The Maryland State Department of Education is in the process of putting together what the stipulations and applications for the process of applying to become one of the mentor programs. In this section, it also talks about a preference should be given to low performing schools or comprehensive needs schools, however that is defined.
4. The fourth component of the bill is the workgroup piece. The bill required the Maryland State Department of Education to put a diverse stakeholder group together to address recruitment, teacher preparation, teacher retention, and teacher induction. This challenges the workgroup to look at current existing laws and regulations that need to be changed to improve teacher recruitment, retention, preparation and induction.

Ms. Spross stated that MSDE is not only looking at the statute and the laws that govern it, but also we are using the best practices in teacher induction today. Classroom discipline is a specific line item in the bill and it is specific to our preparation programs. There was a lot of discussion about the word discipline. Is it classroom management? Different factions have issues with that terminology. The question that came to mind was, "Are we preparing the students in our institutes of higher education to be ready to teach in the diverse populations that make up our Maryland Public Schools." There have been comments that the student teaching placements may be traditionally in schools that are the cream of the crop and that they are not prepared for some of the more challenging placements. Is a 100 day practicum or internship correct?

There have been a lot of discussions around this. The bill also mandates that there will be two reports from this workgroup. The first report which is an interim report is due November 1, 2016 and the final report is due November 1, 2017. Ms. Spross stated that this gave MSDE from June to now to get an interim report together. There are 12 individuals on the workgroup and out of the workgroup 5 sub-committees were established. For the interim report, each committee was asked to give recommendations at the last meeting for the workgroup to consider.

The other thing that is important to note about this bill, interwoven throughout the bill are the tenants and pieces of National Board Certification. There are parts that say nationally board certified teachers to the extent practicable should be given opportunity for leadership roles. The bill also asks specifically for the proportions of national board to be considered in teacher preparation, in the recruitment, in the mentoring pieces and in the induction. So throughout this bill you will see the theme of national board being woven.

Ms. Spross stated that when you hear national board in many of these recommendations, it is to address the specific language of the bill. There have been robust discussions about National Board Certification not only at the committee level but also at the workgroup level. There are very strong feelings about National Board Certification both for and against and what are the best pieces to take into play for Maryland's teachers. In order to address the bill, we have to address National Board Certification in many areas.

We should explore including the principles referred to as the core proportion of National Board as they support quality teaching, to be included in the teacher preparation program. But they also say in that same paragraph, that it should not become a requirement for certification. While National Board Certification is a route to get your advanced professional certificate, they want to explore a little bit further as to whether or not National Board Certification should be an initial route for certification.

Loan forgiveness has come up significantly. There should be a focus marketing tool for the teachers and it should be supported. There should not just be a front end or a back end, there should be loan forgiveness at the beginning of a teacher's education process, whether it is going on for a masters or other schooling, to the point of completion. The committee really wants to look at how to explore Quality Teacher Stipends and they don't feel that it should be just for teachers in comprehensive needs schools or low performing schools. How can the quality teacher stipend be better implemented?

We should look at the different options for basic skills assessments in multiple measures or performance based assessments to meet the requirements. To really determine if adding an adjunct certificate to the continuing of education certificates will aid the recruitment of difficult to fill teacher specialty areas. The committee really wants to look at that and they really are exploring the conditional certificate and how do we better help our teachers who are on a conditional certificate meet the requirements, and/or are the requirements correct for that conditional certificate.

In the area preparation, the committee wants to study the possibility of enhancing the practicability of experiences and to expose teachers to the diverse school populations. A big topic of discussion is the institutional performance criteria, which is the guiding principles of how teacher preparation programs are approved. Do we need to revise it or is it current for 2016? The committee is also looking at specialized professional association's approval of higher education. There are going to be revisions to Education Article 11-208. That is the statute that guides how we get our teacher preparation programs nationally recognized. As we discussed at the last meeting, the Council for Accrediting Education Programs (CAEP) is not currently recognized by the U.S. Department of Education and that is what our statute requirements.

In the induction piece, some of the discussion points have looked at reviewing the induction regulations, which are not with this Board. Induction regulations are a separate set of regulations that are in the curriculum office. One of the things to look at in those regulations is if they are modeled after the best practices. We should also look to increase partnerships with colleges and universities in order to provide induction and/or professional development activities in the schools, and to have some of that continuation.

Other conversation was around increasing and standardizing the mentoring activities throughout the state. This is really important and is the biggest issue that has come back and forth at both the committee level and the workgroup level. The question is, "What are the requirements to become a mentor within a school?" There are currently 24 different requirements that are system specific. There has been a lot of discussion that maybe there should be some minimum standards that require a mentor. The discussion pointed out you could be a great teacher, but being a mentor requires a different skill set than being a teacher and how do we capitalize on that?

Retention – There was a big shift in thinking and they really did not like the terminology of career ladders, because that is specific in the legislative language. The committee liked the terminology of career lattice because not every teacher wants to be an assistant principal or an administrator but they would like to have opportunities for advancement whether that is a mentor or so forth. There are some people in the schoolhouse, teachers that are really strong at data driven results and understanding how to utilize that data. How can we capitalize on someone like that and the committee liked this idea of lattice.

A lot of time was spent in the recruitment workgroup talking about the need for mentoring, not just necessarily for someone who is having trouble getting tenure, or for that first year, but how do we expand the first three years so that we have less attrition in the time period of our teachers. The committee recognized the importance of the incentives and what the training could be provide, but we really need to look carefully at where does this play into the career lattice. There needs to be a full examination of the laws and regulations that maybe limiting recruitment and ultimately retention on the back end. The committee felt that the institutions of higher education that prepare the teachers should be working more closely with the certification offices, so that when you graduate in May not only do you get your diploma but you also graduate with your certificate in hand. There is an idea of having some sort of partnership, so when students graduate they are marketable. They have their certificate and they are not waiting nervously. Would that help?

Ms. Spross stated that these are some of the preliminary ideas that have come out and she was sure that there will be much more discussion around them. The group has been doing a lot of work. All of the meetings are open meetings and there are a lot of people in the audience.

Mr. Hornbeck asked the question, "With the absence of CAEP, does that put us in a position to perhaps be more innovative? Because in trying to consider changes to how we prepare teachers and those types of things, we all know that the number of hoops that CAEP required people to jump through was enormous. So in its absence, it would seem to me that these groups could, depending on how this goes with what they are replaced with, might allow people to become a little bit more innovative in how they think about these questions.

Ms. Spross stated that she thinks that this positions Maryland to be in a unique situation. It puts us in the driver seat to look at what is it that Maryland thinks is most important for Maryland students. She stated there has been a lot of work around what the bill language would look like. At the last meeting, it was stated that it would need to be recognized by an accrediting body, but that the department has to approve anybody that would be an accrediting agency. So it would be a department approval as opposed to a U.S. Department of Education being recognized. There are currently department standards, because any program that is under 2,000 students at full-time equivalency gets a department approval. That is already in place and that is the institutional performance criteria. So you can get a departmental approval or you can get nationally recognized by an organization that has been recognized by the Maryland State Department of Education. So there is a choice for our higher education community for how they want to proceed. What is really important is that the higher education piece of it and being recognized that it cannot be less than what is already identified for Maryland approval. If there is a nationally organization that is recognized and we feel that it is strong, but if it does not have for example a 100 day student internship then we would say that we will recognize them, but if a college or university chooses them, they would have to meet our 100 day internship and we would do a state addendum. The big discussion now is that the colleges and universities now have options. There will be state approval or a national accreditation process of it, but that national accreditation will have to meet all of the state requirements.

## **Action Items**

### **Approval of May Minutes**

Mr. Darren Hornbeck entertained a motion to approve the May minutes.

**MOTION:** Mr. Phil Kauffman/Ms. Jennifer Berkley      To approve the May 5, 2016 minutes.

**VOTE:** UNANIMOUS

### **Approval of June Minutes**

Mr. Darren Hornbeck entertained a motion to approve the June minutes.

**MOTION:** Mr. Phil Kauffman/Ms. Kathleen Kelbaugh      To approve the June 2, 2016 minutes.

**VOTE:** UNANIMOUS

### **Approval of August Minutes**

Mr. Darren Hornbeck entertained a motion to approve the August minutes with the suggested changes.

**MOTION:** Mr. Phil Kauffman/Ms. Dawn Pipkin      To approve the August 4, 2016 minutes.

**VOTE:** UNANIMOUS

### **Approval of Proposed Agenda Items for October**

- Approval of September Minutes & SBOE Update
- ProEthica Presentation
- COMAR 13A.12.03.02 School Counselor: Adoption
- Officer Election

Mr. Darren Hornbeck entertained a motion to approve the October Agenda.

**MOTION:** Ms. Dawn Pipkin/Dr. Kandace Hoppin      To approve the October Agenda.

**VOTE:** UNANIMOUS

### **Meeting Adjourned**

Mr. Darren Hornbeck entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting.

**MOTION:** Mr. Charles Hagan/Ms. Jennifer Berkley      To approve the adjournment of the meeting.

**VOTE:** UNANIMOUS

**Meeting adjourned 11:20 a.m.**