Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016 Workgroup
February 21, 2017 Meeting
Committee #4 - Revising the Institutional Performance Criteria

Committee Members Present: Chadia Abras (MICUA), Lisa Booth, MAESP), Stacie Burch (MADTECC), Michelle Dunkle (MSDE), Deborah Kraft, (Stevenson University), Jack Smith (PSSAM), and Donna Wiseman (UMD).

Committee Members Absent: Lisa Booth (MAESP), Robin L. McNair (MSEA), Laurie Mullen (USM)

Workgroup Members Present: Nancy Shapiro (USM) and Rowena Shurn (MSEA)

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

Alternates Present: Jon Singer (UMBC)

Convene: 1:37 p.m.

Approval of Minutes:
January 31, 2017 minutes approved.

Discussion:
Four Handouts were distributed: January 31, 2017 Minutes, Draft #2 of the Institutional Performance Criteria (IPC) of the *Redesign of Teacher Education,* the Work Chart for State Program Approval Team Preparation and "Preparing Educators for High Poverty/Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Schools: A Manual for Teacher Educators, Teachers and Principals. Ms. Dunkle reminded the committee that the manual could be found on Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) website.

Ms. Dunkle asked members to introduce themselves. She noted that Component I title was changed from Strong Academic Background to Strong Instructional Preparation.
She clarified that the manual she distributed today was developed from the Race to the Top project originally intended to be included in the IPC structure. She stated that the manual is very good, but that its inclusion in the IPC has been forestalled in anticipation of IPC revisions.

Ms. Dunkle said that Component #2 was the most difficult. She asked the committee which one of the components did they want to approach first and that she would like to get something accomplished today that would result in a product.

Dr. Nancy Shapiro questioned the IPC working chart being placed on Google Drive.
Ms. Dunkle explained that legal counsel advised her that the chart could not be posted on Google Drive because it was a violation of the Open Meetings Act.

DRAFT

Dr. Shapiro referenced strong retention data when candidates are hired from PDS. Ms. Dunkle clarified the data by stating that interns in one study were trained in one institute of higher education (IHE) and hired into the Professional Development School (PDS) in which they were trained. This is different than PDS training - promoting retention in any school into which a candidate is hired. That is not to be negative, she said, because the retention is very strong, over 80% after five or more years. She said that Prince George's County Public Schools, College Park, and Bowie State University had strong retention data as well, when that data was being tracked. Dr. Shapiro said that if we know that students who go to PDS present better advantages both in training and retention, we do not want to get away from the parts of the model that work.

Dr. Donna Wiseman said sometimes you do not have space available in an existing PDS. Ms. Dunkle mentioned that there are exceptions where we cannot require PDS (e.g., at the Maryland Institute College of Art where there are exceptions to the rules). You have to look at the rules around the PDS.

Ms. Debbie Kraft said it is hard to do what is best for the majority of your students. One size fits all is not always best for a specific student. Ms. Dunkle asked do we change it or throw it out? Dr. Jon Singer suggested that PDS might be geared toward early field experiences at the beginning of the program as opposed to at the end.

Ms. Dunkle said perhaps each IHE should submit how they implement the standards or rules, whatever they may end up being. Dr. Kraft said we are talking about multiple experiences.

Dr. Wiseman suggested that there may not be enough certified teachers in an established PDS. There may be different levels (4) to look at and said that we seem to have abandoned the original plan which required all PDS to engage in the following areas:

- Collaboration
- Teacher Preparation
- Research
- Curriculum

Dr. Wiseman continued that perhaps we should consider the identification of a true PDS as only that school that is able to offer all services, that schools that can only offer one or two would not be considered less valuable a partner, but simply able to offer a particular service. The analogy was made that at certain hospitals, one can receive quality care for a heart attack, but only at a facility at a different level could one receive a heart transplant.

Ms. Dunkle and Dr. Shapiro both expressed that they like the idea of different levels.

Dr. Chadia Abras said we should think of the criteria. Dr. Kraft asked how did the 100 days come about and could it more flexible? Ms. Dunkle explained that the actual number was

adopted in a somewhat arbitrary way, although research certainly continues to support extended clinical experiences.

Ms. Dunkle suggested that the following could be possible:

- Let each IHE present to the state how they are meeting standards as defined by this group rather than MSDE developing prescriptive evidential markers to be used by all
- Measure candidate effectiveness across the board rather than through the proxies used in the recent past to determine intern performance

Dr. Jack Smith suggested that a set of threshold activities might be developed where, in a quasi-medical model such as was suggested above, interns could acquire certain experiences from different partnered schools without all schools having to offer all that a PDS would offer. He mentioned things such as observing and participating in opening and closing school activities, what resources are available in a school and how to find them, etc.

Comments and Suggestions:

- (Ms. Rowena Shurn) - How do we know we are getting the same quality if each IHE has a different structure?

- (Dr. Chadia Abras)
    - Experience gives quality not the structure
    - Outcome should not be a moving target
    - How do you control internship?
    - What qualities should an intern have?
    - Another layer to look at is to bring them in, teach them, keep them in the loop, and pay them enough (note: referencing mentor teachers)
    - What replaces the 100 days?

- (Dr. Jack Smith)
    - Preparation, structure and quality of environment

- (Dr. Debbie Kraft)
    - Not everybody is at the top, they are meeting the minimum
    - Make a checklist and look at the end results

- (Ms. Lisa Booth)
    - Best teachers may not be willing to be mentors, but have negative attitudes or no time for mentorship
    - What about their skills and what are we doing in the 100 days?
    - Align with Charlotte Danielson or other accepted philosophies
    - Students have demonstrated that they can and do have high level practices

- (Dr. Donna Wiseman)

DRAFT

- Not all good teachers are great mentors

- (Dr. Jon Singer)
  - In South Carolina PDS could bank IHE-partner courses to be offered to their mentor teachers for their use when needed as incentive

- (Ms. Michelle Dunkle)
  - It is necessary at the beginning of the development of PDS to set some proxy measurements of quality
  - Originally designed to be of assistance to the school
  - Cohort model was put in place to affect the school and for support for members of the cohort under one roof
  - Could there be a regional training model and how can interns and schools benefit from a regional approach?

Ms. Booth said teachers should be equally comfortable in both types of settings – poverty or not. Dr. Shapiro mentioned that there are direct resources for the issue. Ms. Dunkle noted that through all five regional Listening Tour meetings, participants said the same thing: that most new teachers cannot deal with the classrooms they have been assigned to.

Dr. Smith stated that for internships we could set up a series of experiences with tier parts (e.g., early experiences and extended experiences). Set up the experiences and learning you want them to have. You want them to have flexibility. Should anyone who wants to be a first year teacher, part of the internship should be how to set up a classroom. Course experience is helpful exposure.

Dr. Shapiro thought merging systems so they are all one partnership in layers is a good idea.

Ms. Dunkle asked who is going to pay for what and we need to think about the resources that we already have. What are the threshold markers and where do they go? We should engage in flexibility and need a framework for State program approval. Do we want series of practica?

Dr. Wiseman said identify the levels of partners and how much experience. Also, what are we going to do about classroom management? Dr. Kraft noted that we should think about the outcomes and that some students might be ready for a higher level and not require all experiences.

Ms. Stacie Burch stated that virtual experience and training is nice. Dr. Wiseman said instructors can setup situations that students have to react to, for instance if they can calm a classroom down and how they deal with different settings. We should think about how we can use technology in the internships.

Dr. Singer wanted to know if MSDE would approve multiple interns with one mentor.

Ms. Dunkle replied, yes.

Ms. Booth said students would get a double dose and come out better.

Dr. Abras stated that schools are better equipped to know what they need. Ms. Dunkle said that is the primary reason why we wanted to create PDS. Dr. Abras thought it would be beneficial to have a series of training events and to follow guidelines and that the teachers should be certified. Ms. Dunkle said training is required for mentors and we have to have a standard to meet. Dr. Abras noted that we are held responsible to meet the requirements and that the state has the requirements that should be met.

Ms. Dunkle pointed out that we need to be thoughtful about what we want to see (e.g., in establishing the standards for the first year teacher).

Ms. Booth said everyone needs to have the ability to walk into school and be prepared.
Ms. Dunkle said that partnership schools with three levels of performance at the school is a good concept to consider. Ms. Booth said criteria for partnership schools require schools with diverse populations to be defined. Ms. Dunkle said the State and CAEP need to figure out racial markers. Ms. Shurn stated that we are not limited to ability, race, and ethnicity - there is a big umbrella for diversity to look at.

Ms. Dunkle suggested we do have to deal with diversity, general framework, but need flexibility to design a program.

Ms. Burch asked if we can recommend that the term PDS be taken away. Ms. Dunkle stated that there is nothing wrong with the PDS Standards, just remove some proxies and get the framework together. Dr. Singer noted that the title PDS grants you certain resources.
Ms. Dunkle said we want to consider keeping what is good but modifying for current needs.

Materials of Interest Requests for next meeting:

Next Steps:

Workgroup Session scheduled on March 29, 2017.

Adjourn 3:45 p.m.

DRAFT