



**Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016 Workgroup  
January 31, 2017 Meeting  
Committee #4 - Revising the Institutional Performance Criteria**

**Committee Members Present:** Chadia Abras (MICUA), Stacie Burch (MADTECC), Robin L. McNair (MSEA), Laurie Mullen (USM), Eugene Schaffer (USM), Jack Smith (PSSAM), and Michelle Dunkle (MSDE).

**Committee Members Absent:** Lisa Booth (MAESP)

**Workgroup Members Present:** Nancy Shapiro (USM); Emily Dow (MHEC); and Rowena Shurn (MSEA)

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

**Alternates Present:** None

**Convene:** 1:30 p.m.

---

**Approval of Minutes:**

Not Applicable

**Discussion:**

Handouts that were distributed: Committee IV: Revising the Institutional Performance Criteria (Recruitment and Induction) a draft and discussion document Institutional Performance Criteria (IPC) of the Redesign of Teacher Education.

Ms. Michelle Dunkle asked members to introduce themselves. She stated that our charge is to look at the Institutional Performance Criteria and make revisions. Ms. Dunkle echoed Ms. Sarah Spross that Committee IV's name was changed to "Revising the Institutional Performance Criteria."

Ms. Dunkle said that there will be state program approval and asked everyone to look at the chart noting that the committee would note areas of change and innovation. Laurie Mullen suggested that Michelle needed to make sure that everyone understood the chart and what is being requested at this time.

Dr. Nancy Shapiro said it was good to keep everything as aligned as possible with Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). Ms. Dunkle suggested that the language of the bill did not intend for two sets of reports, as long as there is alignment with elements of teacher preparation that we want in our state program approval process.

Ms. Dunkle shared that:

- If the institution chooses to continue with CAEP there will be a process to ensure that state priorities are met
- It is not anyone's intent to make the process harder, but simple as possible

- The Work Group already committed to the four components of the existing IPC with 1, 3 and 5 probably not too much in controversy
- The Internship is where the distinction is with the elements forming the basis for program approval.

Ms. Robin McNair agreed with the importance of the internship and the need for background knowledge before they go into the field. She explained that the internship experience is different from what happens when teachers are then hired. Ms. McNair was an advocate for ensuring that coursework prior to internship prepares adequately for the field experience.

Ms. Dunkle noted that there was a manual developed from the Race to the Top project titled *Preparing Educators for High Poverty/Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Schools: A Manual for Teacher Educators, Teachers and Principals* that can be found on the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) website and hard copies were available. A consortium of eleven universities collaborated to provide this manual as a tool for preparation.

Ms. Dunkle shared that on the Institutional Performance Criteria discussion document items that were in the Elements column were moved over to the Indicator column. The feeling of the Work Group was that the committee should be free to decide which of the items rise to the level of a supporting element and which should remain as Indicators of having met the requirements of the Element. After a lively discussion, Dr. Smith suggested that Component I: Strong Academic Background might better be referred to as Strong Instructional Preparation so that pedagogy and instruction on cultural sensitivity, etc., would be considered a part of the instruction. Dr. Laurie Mullen stated that Component I defined as Strong Academic Background in comparison to Component III Performance Assessment may have more weight, but the only thing in regulations are reading courses.

Ms. Spross, in making her rounds, said that we will do what is good for Maryland.

Ms. Dunkle has three things that she wanted the Committee to focus on:

- What would you need going into an internship to support regional professional development centers? We cannot provide funding.
- What structure could we build that would not rely on additional external funding, or should this be one of those places where the committee requests funding?
- There a number of Professional Development Schools in very challenging schools, but are those experiences organized to the best advantage to the candidate and the schools?

Dr. Chadia Abras stated that she likes the idea of regional professional development centers.

Dr. Eugene Schaffer said some of the questions are:

- How does professional development work?
- How can I work with you as a county?
- The school system and university create and build standards.
- How do you address children coming from high poverty areas?
- All teachers can evidence that they can teach all children.

Ms. Dunkle said that the PDS model created in 1995 may not be what we need now.

Dr. Smith asked, at the minimum what do we want for the state?

- Provide multiple internship experiences
- Provide for lower critical poverty mass in schools possibly paired with...
- Higher critical poverty mass in school
- Candidates to understand the Social Emotional needs of our students
- Ensure strong instructional preparation
- Make teachers aware of the experiences some children have every day
- Teach prospective teachers to build relationships with others

Dr. Shapiro asked Dr. Smith if he would work with those schools, he said "Yes."

Comments and Questions:

- How can you measure that a teacher has the right disposition?
- There should be strong content knowledge across the board and there are still issues.
- A specific course addressing cultural competency could be in place that teachers must take.
- How do we address the challenge of diverse classrooms?
- Look at what is possible in a school system
- You can look at poverty, not necessarily based on English Learners, and look at what is actually doable
- What kind of accountability and responsibility is there for school superintendents?
- We hope CAEP moves us in the direction
- State Board involvement is needed
- How does it work with Maryland Approved Alternative Preparation Programs (MAAPPs)
  - Ms. Dunkle said it is totally on the local school system with MAAPPs, a different type of program. We need to know if we are doing a better job of recruiting teachers through the Maryland Approved Programs and MAAPPs.

We must have in a teacher education program:

1. Socio-Emotional coursework for teachers and children
2. Assure internships reflect diversity - should be coursework (this will add cost) modules – competency based-experience
3. More required fields – cannot do all in the same place

4. 100 days over two semesters (What should and could change?)
5. What is it I can give to people that is similar to their very first year?
6. How one begins and closes their school years (Dr. Smith said take out the word “teacher” and use “firefighter” instead when thinking of the requisite skills)
7. Experience has to be one where candidates are assessed and provided with feedback
8. Look at function of teacher, be able to produce student learning
9. Observe before teaching
10. Clinical component – high leverage and high impact practices (Towson University practices with a colleague)
11. Does everybody have to do the same thing?
12. Can there be a state model with umbrella requirements
13. Response to CAEP training
14. Critical Practice of Understanding
15. Theoretical instruction (continued in internship and employment)
16. Refinement and preparation for the continuation of learning throughout not only the induction years but throughout the career
17. Is data literacy non-negotiable?

**Materials of Interest Requests for next meeting:**

**Next Steps:**

Go over IPC Areas of Change/Innovation comments at next meeting.

Note: Not all conversation was ascribed to the speaker by name; however, everyone participated throughout the meeting and many of the bulleted points came from those not recognized by name.

Adjourn 3:45 p.m.