

# Appendices XXVI-XXX

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

### Final Report



November 1, 2017



# Appendix XXVI



**Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016  
Workgroup  
May 30, 2017 Meeting**

The May meeting of the Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016 Workgroup was called to order by Ms. Sarah Spross at 1:00 p.m.

**In attendance:** Sarah Spross ( MSDE), Nancy Shapiro (University System of Maryland), Tess Blumenthal (Maryland Association of Elementary School Principals), Rowena Shurn (Maryland State Education Association), Linda Gronberg-Quinn (Maryland Association of Directors of Teacher Education at Community Colleges), Emily Dow, (Maryland Higher Education Commission), Jennifer Frank (MICUA), Jin Schrattenecker (Teach for America) Alexandra Cambra (MSDE), Kelly Meadows (MSDE), Karen Dates-Dunmore (MSDE), Tanisha Brown (MSDE), Michelle Dunkle (MSDE), Linda Murel (MSDE).

**Absentees:** Mariette English (Baltimore Teachers Union), Laura Weeldreyer (Maryland State Board of Education), Annette Wallace (Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals), Jack Smith (Public School Superintendents Association of Maryland),

Ms. Spross welcomed those attending to the Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement (TIRA) workgroup. Ms. Spross informed the workgroup that there would be a change in the meeting structure. Committee 1 and Committee 4 would be meeting today.

Mr. Jin Schrattenecker from Prince George's County Public Schools introduced himself as a new member of the workgroup. Ms. Spross stated that the workgroup would be looking at the recommendations from the committees. Each recommendation should be a 1 to 2 page summary.

**Approval of Minutes:**

Ms. Spross asked for the approval of minutes provided for Committee 2. All in favor. None opposed.

**Meeting Schedules**

Shift meeting time for the June and July meetings

- June 20, 2017 – 2:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.
- July 25, 2017 – 2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Committees: Breakout to work.

## Wrap-up Discussion

Ms. Sarah Spross:

- Look at committee recommendations after April's last meeting
- Four (4) committees made significant progress.
- Determine what they are incentivizing
- Dara Shaw joined – background on incentive research.
- Meet with MLDS to narrow data pull.
  - Individual teacher prep, no link to certification
  - Look at entering with major of Education complete or not (change major or not)
  - Look at entering with major other than Education complete
- Look at exit with employment in Maryland
- Have attended grade school or secondary school in a LEA
- Will have data for June 20 meeting
- Hope to answer why we import 61%

Nancy Shapiro:

- Secondary certificate – must major in Education?

Sarah Spross:

- We are capturing all major education “codes”.
- Discussed MAT data also.

Jennifer Frank:

- Problems with data – try to align data that's collected and sent to State. Jon Enrique has best understanding of data.

Sarah Spross:

- Anna and Lea – data specs.
- We know data limitations

Jennifer Frank:

- Issues with teacher Ed data. Will need to be aware of these issues.

Alex Cambra:

- We will determine if the data tells us anything and then dig further if need be.

Sarah Spross:

- Which “policy lever” do we want to pull/push? Which issues are deterring teachers?

Nancy Shapiro:

- Hopes MSDE will connect with the Kirwan Commission. Is it okay to tell the commission that MSDE is looking into data? Maybe take this back to Dr.

Salomon as the commission has not heard much from Maryland, more from private industry.

Sarah Spross:

- Will share with Executive Team at MSDE. Dara Shaw will be at the next meeting to provide data.

Nancy Shapiro:

- June 28 is the next Kerwin Commission meeting. Can Dara's information be shared at both meetings?

Workgroup:

- Discussion of who reports graduation data?
  - Public vs. private
  - 2 years vs. 4 years institutions
- Report to MHEC and then it's turned over to MLDS.
- Why do we lose teachers?
- We will have loan data at next meeting. Data provided/attrition may not always be honest.
- Loan repayment may be an important lever to pull.

Rowena Shurn:

- Can you pull information from para-pros?

Sarah Spross:

- Not necessarily – more generic.

Workgroup:

- Can we pull attrition data? Not able to do this.
- ESSA Listening Tours – invalid. Professional Development a necessity.
- Workgroup supports joining of two (2) committees.

Feedback:

- Questions about TIRA Pilot Program (1<sup>st</sup> year teachers), posted April 7 on website.
- Has mentor group considered state requirements? Endorsement language? A requirement in regulations?
- No longer a “recommendation”. Endorsement is a stronger, more meaningful path. Must nail down this recommendation.
- Rowena Shurn to participate with committees 3 and 5. Also, committee 1 to share feedback.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00pm.

## Committee #1

- Meeting currently.
- Summary of their current work (attached)
- Discussed with group, concerns with composite scores, ETS, and industry – standard test.
- Adjunct? All in favor.
  - One (1) year, non-transferrable renewal requirements (once) are a concern
  - Transferability across locals not necessarily an option
  - Not a full-time employee
  - Certificate issued by state.
  - This is geared towards the specialist (at Lockheed Martin) who wants to teach P/T.
  - Can be fully employed elsewhere.
- Conditional? Working to explore options.
  - Industry wide standards?
  - Connected with CTE to explore industry requirements and coursework.
  - PTE and \_\_\_? Coordinate to Board for approval of req. change.
- Initial requirements – interwoven into other recommendations.
- Micro-credentialing not on radar now.
- All agree that the committee is going in right direction

### **Feedback:**

- None.

\*A graphic of routes to certification for general public.

---

## Committee #2 (Summary attached)

- Group wants incentives that are available to all – not always possible.

### **Feedback:**

- Considered discount rates for continuing Ed?
- Strengthen LEA Partnership for cost-sharing.
- All negotiated agreements being reviewed.
- Look for commonalities; regional trends.
- Look for non-money incentives too.
- Consider Quality Teacher Incentive Act (QTIA) – how to further?



**Committee #3 and Committee #5**

- Will meet together next time
  - Using extensive research to back recommendations (summaries attached).
  - Micro-credentialing an area for specialty – not generalists as all other teachers are expected to be.
- 

**Committee #4**

- Still working on IPC revision.



**Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016**  
**Workgroup**  
May 30, 2017 Meeting  
**Committee #1- Certification Restructuring**

**Committee Members Present:** Jessica Cuches, PSSAM; Kelly Meadows, MSDE; Karen Robertson, Associate Dean, Towson University

**Committee Members Absent:** Margret Trader, MICUA, Carrie Conley, MAESP; Darren Hornbeck, MSEA; Mary Tillar, PSSAM; Nomsa Geleta, USM; Audra Butler, MADTEC

**MSDE Staff:** Tanisha L. Brown

**Attorney General's Office:** Derek Simonsen, Esq., Assistant Attorney General

**Alternates Present:** Fran Kroll, MADTEC; Geraldine Duval, MSEA

---

**Discussion**

Ms. Meadows began with a recap of the previous meeting on April 26, 2017. The following was noted as discussed at the prior meeting:

- Micro-credentialing and how it relates to certification. The group agreed that it could be included with the concept of equivalent credits, or continuing professional development (CPD), if local education agencies are willing to offer the CPD courses
  - Ms. Kroll expressed that she liked the idea of micro-credentialing and asked how it affects steps and salaries within the local school system.
    - Ms. Cuches shared that it did not affect salary in Anne Arundel county
- Difficulties passing the basic skills exam for professional and technical educators (PTE)
- The option of creating an adjunct certificate for Maryland. Ms. Meadows noted that the committee felt that the adjunct certificate should be:
  - Applicable only to specialty areas,
  - Used only for part time teaching,,
  - Nontransferable to another district; and
  - Valid for only one year.

Concern was raised as to whether the adjunct certificate would lower the standard for individuals entering the teaching profession.

Ms. Cuches asked if the adjunct certificate would be renewable. Ms. Meadows responded that it likely would be, but that the committee had not yet agreed upon the renewal requirements.

The committee made the following comments about the adjunct certificate:

- **Ms. Cuches:** Anne Arundel County has individuals from Northrup Grumman, for example, who would be willing to come in and teach a class or two, but are not willing to leave their full time job. The adjunct certificate could be used to certify them.
- **Ms. Kroll:** There are two populations that could be interested in the adjunct certificate: 1) Hard to staff areas, such as Chinese 2) The retired person who may want to teach.
  - **Ms. Kroll** compares the adjunct certificate to the adjunct certificate used in higher education. She says that although a master's degree is typically the required minimum for adjuncts, they have accepted candidates with a bachelor's degree to teach specialty areas such as dental hygiene. She also questions how long we would allow individuals to teach on an adjunct certificate.
- **Ms. Duval:** Allowing individuals to renew too many times may create another path to entry that allows individuals to bypass the traditional routes to certification.
  - **Ms. Duval** recommended a required co-teaching model for adjuncts. Ms. Cuches indicated that would be a financial strain for school districts.
  - **Ms. Duval asks Ms. Cuches** how many renewal cycles she envisions for the adjunct certificate. **Ms. Cuches** suggests unlimited renewals, with yearly evaluations, and that adjuncts not be allowed to teach more than two classes
    - The committee asked what an evaluation for adjuncts would look like and whether it would be something included in policy.
  - **Ms. Kroll** noted that she does not think individuals will abuse the certificate and renewal options. She mentioned that she has often heard individuals say "I thought you needed people!" Then turn away from the idea of teaching because they do not want to have to get another degree to enter the classroom.
- **Ms. Robertson:** How would we determine critical shortage areas and what would qualify for teaching under an adjunct certificate?
  - **Ms. Meadows** notes basing the adjunct certificate on shortage areas would likely be difficulty because shortage areas are different from local to local.
  - **Ms. Cuches** recommends areas such as German, Italian, Artists, biomedical.
- **Ms. Meadows:** We should continue to consider the adjunct certificate as a stepping stone towards a professional certificate.
  - **Ms. Cuches** asks what about those individuals who have no desire to obtain a professional certificate.
- **Ms. Meadows** notes that we must define what areas are eligible for the adjunct certificate. She mentions possibly creating a list of eligible and ineligible areas that includes some flexible verbiage.
  - **Ms. Kroll** notes eligible adjunct certification areas should be based on region and needs of the local.

Ms. Meadow's shared the regulation for Specialized Professional Areas (Grades 7-12) to demonstrate how the adjunct certificate could fit within. She notes that the regulation for specialized areas requires professional education courses in:

- Lesson planning and delivery of instruction;

- Assessing instruction;
- Diversifying instruction to accommodate special needs;
- Managing the instructional environment; and
- Providing literacy instruction relevant to the specialized professional area

Ms. Meadows suggested requiring these courses for adjuncts as well, and offering them as continuing professional development (CPDs) courses through the local school system.

- **Ms. Cuches** mentions three years is not enough time for adjuncts to obtain these credits. She suggest giving them 5 or 6 years to complete the requirements.
- **Ms. Kroll** notes that if there are too many requirements for the adjunct certificate, individuals will not want to obtain it. She recommends using pedagogy requirements from the Specialized Professional Areas.

Ms. Robertson asks if adjuncts will need the basic skills exam.

- Ms. Meadows responds that if the recommendation is made to eliminate the need for a basic skills exam for those who hold a Bachelor's degree or higher, then the answer is no. She adds that the committee must determine what the requirements for the adjunct certificate should be.
  - **Ms. Cuches:** Adjuncts should receive onboarding before and during employment from the local that occurs before and during employment. It should include classroom management, lesson planning and differentiating instruction.
  - **Ms. Meadows** asks if it should possibly include observations of the adjuncts, and/or opportunities for the adjuncts to observe experienced teachers.
- **Ms. Meadows** asks if individuals should be able to obtain an adjunct certificate with less than a bachelor's degree if they have extensive experience. The committee agreed that a Bachelor's degree should be the minimum.
  - **Ms. Cuches** notes that an industry credential should not trump experience. The adjunct certificate is supposed to be based on the idea that the individual has extensive experience in their specialty area.
- **Ms. Meadows** notes that the Board may have concern that "anyone can teach" if the required degree is less than a bachelor's.
  - **Ms. Kroll** noted that parents are more interested in individuals specializing in an area, than whether or not they are certified as a teacher. But she does believe locals should provide mentoring, and conduct evaluations of adjuncts.

Ms. Cuches states that Anne Arundel County public schools would love to pilot an adjunct program with a study of implications. Ms. Kroll suggested Washington County may be interested in piloting a similar program as well.

Ms. Kroll asked if there is currently a certification that would accommodate "adjuncts". Ms. Meadows stated no, and that local education agencies will often use long term substitutes as an alternative.

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

**NONE**



Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016 Workgroup  
May 30, 2017  
Committee #4 – Revising the Institutional Performance Criteria (IPC)

**Committee Members Present:** Chadia Abras (MICUA), Lisa Booth (MAESP), Michelle Dunkle (MSDE) and Charelle D. James (Urban Teachers).

**Committee Members Absent:** Stacie Burch (MADTECC), Deborah Kraft (Stevenson University), Robin L. McNair (MSEA), Laurie Mullen (USM), Jon Singer (UMBC) and Donna Wiseman (UMD).

**Workgroup Members Present:** None

**Observers:** Kathy Angeletti (UM) and Nancy Hall (?)

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

**Alternates Present:** Laila Richman (Towson University)

---

**Convene:** 1:05 p.m.

**Handouts:** Redesign, Draft IPC of the Redesign, PPT Progress Report: Senate Bill 493, Committee #4

**Discussion:**

Ms. Michelle Dunkle distributed handouts to all persons present to look over. Ms. Dunkle stated that if they went forward with the proposed changes, the Professional Development Schools (PDS) Standards would need to change, as well. She reminded the committee that all of our work goes to the work group for recommendation and then would probably go to the Professional Standards and Teacher Education Board for approval. She also stated that IPC Components I and II were completed. Ms. Dunkle said that Goucher College may currently be the only institution using the Essential Dimension of Teaching (EDoT), but will check to be sure and report back at the June meeting. The charge to the committee today is to make any revisions, additions and deletions starting with Component III indicators.

Ms. Lisa Booth asked what is the difference between using the term program and unit? Ms. Dunkle explained that a program would be Elementary Education, Secondary Education, etc. with all of the programs offered making up the unit in a college or university.

The rest of the meeting was spent as a working session going over the IPC of the Redesign of Teacher Education. An updated draft will be distributed at the June 20, 2017 from 2:00 until 4:00 p.m. A revised draft of the IPC reflecting the May 30 work will be forwarded within a few days to accompany the minutes.

**Adjourned:** 3:15 p.m.





# Appendix XXVII



**Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016**  
**Workgroup**  
**Materials of Interest**  
**May 30, 2017 Meeting**

**Chapter 740 (SB 493) Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016**

[http://mgaleg.maryland.gov/2016rs/chapters\\_noln/ch\\_740\\_sb0493e.pdf](http://mgaleg.maryland.gov/2016rs/chapters_noln/ch_740_sb0493e.pdf)

Statute that requires the State Department of Education to establish a workgroup, the participants, sets forth the elements to be reported on and the dates (November 1, 2016, November 1, 2017, and December 1, 2021) by which the interim and final reports must be submitted to the governor.

**Materials of Interest**

**“Layoffs Complicate Teacher Shortage in Baltimore City”, WBAL-TV, May 19, 2017**

<http://www.wbalTV.com/article/layoffs-compound-teacher-shortage-in-baltimore-city-schools/9884222>

Highlights the difficulty Baltimore City faces filling vacancies in the face of layoffs. Baltimore has one of the most competitive teacher salaries in the state with a package of incentives.

**“Hogan Announces \$83 Million in Student Need Based Scholarships for 2017-2018”, Montgomery Community Media, May, 16, 2017**

<http://www.mymcmedia.org/hogan-announces-83-million-in-student-need-based-scholarships-for-2017-18/>

Howard P. Rawlings Education Excellence Award Program includes two need based grant programs providing financial assistance to low income students: the Educational Assistance Grant (EA) and the Guaranteed Access Grant (GA). The article states, “In order to be eligible, the student must be a Maryland resident who plans to enroll at a two-year or four-year Maryland college or university as a full time degree seeking undergraduate student.

EA grant awards take into account the expected family contribution towards the cost of tuition, books, and fees, and range anywhere from \$400-\$3,000. GA grants are designed to help the neediest students by providing 100% of the student’s cost of attendance, as determined by the school’s financial aid office, or \$19,000, whichever is less.”

**“Minnesota on the verge of teacher licensing overhaul” Pioneer Press, May 7, 2017**

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?tab=cm#inbox/15bfd0e92a0fb450?projector=1>

**Provided by: Nancy Shapiro, workgroup member**

The proposed changes would streamline teacher licensing by consolidating standards and creating a four-tiered system in an effort to reduce the States teacher shortage areas.

**“Educators Share Their #BestPD, #WorstPD”, Education Week, May 1, 2017**

<http://www.edweek.org/ew/section/multimedia/educators-share-their-bestpd-worstpd.html>

This article shares twitter posts from teachers regarding their best and worst professional development.

**“Landscapes in teacher prepare: undergraduate secondary” NTCQ, May 2017**

[http://nctq.org/dmsView/US\\_2017\\_Landscape](http://nctq.org/dmsView/US_2017_Landscape)

NTCQ’s latest review of over 700 undergraduate programs that prepare secondary teachers.

**“Op-Ed: Maryland Colleges Should Revive Teacher Pledge Tuition Waiver” Baltimore Sun, April 25, 2017**

<http://www.baltimoresun.com/news/opinion/oped/bs-ed-teacher-pledge-20170425-story.html>

The “Pledge to Teacher” originated in 1866 when the teachers college was founded at Towson. This program provided a free four year tuition as long as the recipients agreed to teacher in a public school for two years after graduation. The author suggests that this would be a great program to reinstitute as it would

## **Committee 1:**

### **ETS Explanation of Composite Score for Praxis Core**

Following is a description of why ETS does not support composite scoring and was developed by our researcher and psychometrician:

In general, we do not recommend the use of a composite passing score because such compensatory scoring rules allow students to make up for a low score in one area with a high score in another and so avoid meeting the minimum standard set in one or more areas. If a state wishes to use a composite, they should not do so arbitrarily but should consider the level of knowledge and skills necessary to succeed in a teacher preparation program. If the intention of the state is to allow candidates to compensate for relative weaknesses in one area (e.g., mathematics) with relative strengths in another (e.g., reading), a compensatory decision rule can be established but it must be appropriate for the structure of the assessment and psychometrically defensible.

The Praxis Core assessment was designed to include three separate tests measuring reading, writing and mathematics skills. As such, scores on each test (e.g., reading) are comparable across administrations and across forms (consistent with APA/AERA/NCME Standards). However, composite scores — the simple sum of the scale scores from the three Praxis Core tests — are not necessarily comparable across test takers or across administrations.

**Committee 2:**

**Associate of Arts in Teaching Charge to ATT Recruitment Committee (attachment 1)  
Provided by, Fran Kroll, Committee Member**

This document summarizes the recommendations for recruiting teacher candidates in the AAT programs of study.



# Appendix XXVIII





**Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016  
Workgroup  
June 20, 2017 Meeting**

The June meeting of the Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016 Workgroup was called to order by Ms. Sarah Spross at 2:00 p.m.

**In attendance:** Sarah Spross ( MSDE), Nancy Shapiro (University of Maryland System), Rowena Shurn (Maryland State Education Association), Linda Gronberg-Quinn (Maryland Association of Directors of Teacher Education at Community Colleges), Emily Dow, (Maryland Higher Education Commission), Jin Schattenecker (Maryland Approved Alternative Preparation Programs ), Dr. Lorraine Cornish-Harrison (Baltimore Teachers Union), Dr. Chadia Abras (Maryland Independent College and University Association), Alexandra Cambra (MSDE), Kelly Meadows (MSDE), Jessica Bancroft (MSDE), Ruth Downs (MSDE), Karen Dates-Dunmore (MSDE), Tanisha Brown (MSDE), Michelle Dunkle (MSDE), Linda Murel (MSDE).

**Absentees:** Laura Weeldryer (Maryland State Board of Education), Annette Wallace (Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals) Jack Smith (Public School Superintendents Association of Maryland) and Tess Blumenthal (Maryland Association of Elementary School Principals)

Ms. Sarah Spross called the meeting to order at 2pm. She noted we have been meeting for almost a full year as of today. The workgroup had strong dialogue last meeting. The next meeting is July 25, 2017.

**Business**

Ms. Spross asked for approval of the minutes. Correct the spelling of Kirwan Commission and Jennifer Frank name, and remove Kathy Angeletti's name from the absent list.

Minute approval: Ms. Shurn made motion. Ms. Gronberg-Quinn seconded- all in favor. None opposed. Minutes accepted as corrected.

**Discussion**

Ms. Spross shared that Dr. Dara Shaw, Director Research and Accountability, MSDE has meet with Maryland Higher Education Commission and Maryland Longitudinal Data System (MLDS ) to pull together data.

Ms. Spross introduced Dr. Shaw to present data to inform the workgroup and committee's work that is being done. Some information is from MSDE's Teacher Staffing Report and Maryland Longitudinal Data Systems. These reports link employment and K-12 data. All of this information is public. This information is also available in an excel spread sheet upon request. There are multiple levers to pull to influence teacher shortage areas. The goal is to find what works the best. It is

also to see what the data shows about teachers in Maryland. Which of these policy levers should we push for high quality teacher supply from Maryland?

Dr. Shaw offered explanation for the spread sheets provided. Table 1 was number of students from four- year Maryland public institution with a teaching degree. There are 1200-1300 each year. Of these, 40% enroll with intent to earn teaching degree. Another 60% decide sometime after they enroll. Does this mean we should recruit from other majors? Is this a lever we can push? Ms. Spross noted the question-are we are talking recruitment is it into colleges, school districts, how can we strengthen pipelines? We are getting a larger percentage of teachers once they are in college. How do we recruit from more traditional math and science?

Dr. Shaw noted the 1200 is not enough. Ms. Spross noted this will not match Maryland Staffing report as it is only four- year public institutions. Information is provided on the average loans students take out. Tables 2-3 are 2014 numbers by percentage. What do the 1200 do after they graduate? Of the 1200 graduates, 536 are teaching in a Maryland public school.

Table 4 shows the Maryland Teacher Staffing Report Data. It shows that Maryland is not meeting the needs of the local districts. There is additional data that shows that the percentage of beginning new hires prepared out-of-state was comparatively high in CTE (93%), computer science (92%), and ESOL (93%). The percentage of beginning new hires prepared out of state was comparatively low in early childhood (Prek-3) (60%), elementary education (64%) physical education (93%).

Table 5 discusses salaries. Graduates who become teachers have higher salaries. If they did not become teachers they went to other places, including health care, early childhood and elder care. Ms. Spross noted the issue is not a salary issue. They are not choosing to not go into the field based on numbers in the data. Dr. Shaw said this is only descriptive data. What we do not know is if they are not getting jobs and going into health care because they are not hired. We can use GPA to see if this is an indicator. There are two ways all of this can be interpreted, "A" causes "B" or "B" causes "A".

Table 7 represents the geography question. Can there be geographical incentives such as housing?

Data shows graduates are working in the Local Education Agency (LEA), where they went to school, another LEA, or never went to public school in Maryland. We do not have complete data to know exactly who these teachers are. But we do see those who went to school in Maryland are divided between teaching in their former LEA or another LEA.

Dr. Shaw asked if anyone had questions for her.

Dr. Sarah Mallory asked how many years out is data collected? Dr. Shaw responded it is any point after they graduated. This can tweak the numbers a little. Dr. Mallory asked if students taking jobs in health care that influence the work they want to do. Dr. Shaw answered it is not just right after graduation

Ms. Gronberg-Quinn noted there could be a recruitment tool if you look at loans that students come out with. Dr. Shaw noted it does not show if they started as another major, but it cost more to become a teacher, or students who need greater financial aid are applying to be teachers. Ms. Fran Dresser asked if you can you tell who started in a community college. Dr. Shaw will look into it. Dr. Kathy Angeletti asked if they ask if they are pursuing graduate school. Dr. Shaw responded that question is not answered in this data. There is no information about intent. Dr. Nancy Shapiro asked if this data includes only undergraduates BA and Masters. Dr. Shaw responded this data is only BA. We do have the information on Masters Degrees. We chose BA because the MA that led to a teaching job is harder to define. Ms. Rowena Shurn asked if this disaggregated elementary education and secondary to see who is leaving or who is taking on higher loans. Dr. Shaw noted we have field of employment, not place of employment, but there is some MSDE Staffing data included in this. Ms. Emily Dow asked if you can provide information on time to degree. We would like to see this broken out by Community College, 2+2, and four-year. Dr. Shapiro seconded this request. Dr. Shaw said we can work on this data.

Ms. Spross noted those going into health care might be because they did not get certification. Dr. Shapiro noted Maryland Centre for Equity report has different data. It would be interesting to put some of these conclusions together. They inform what we want MLDS data to gather. Dr. Shaw responded this is why there is a caveat this is context free. We do not have access to the private institutions so their information is not available. Dr. Shapiro asked if is this a policy decision or is there limitation in MLDS? Ms. Spross noted this is a voluntary submission for private colleges. Dr. Shapiro asked if there is a sense of how many come through public vs private. Dr. Shaw answered there is information on table 4; the MSDE Staffing Report includes the new hires recruited in Maryland. If you take 700 from column AY you see who is not prepared at a Maryland public school. Dr. Karen Robinson asked where MLDS gets the data. The response is from MHEC. Ms. Dow noted MHEC gets the information from each institution's report. Dr. Angeletti noted there is a group working to see that the data collected is consistent and accurate. Ms. Spross noted we have what we have, and we need to move forward. The MLDS is in statute and it is from MSDE, MHEC, Department of Labor, and it's linked up.

Ms. Spross thanked Dr. Shaw for her time. She noted it is great information and we will work together to get information to answer the questions asked. We can do a public information request.

Ms. Spross reviewed the progress the committees have made by offering key bullet points. All of the workgroup members that met were pleased with the progress being done by the individual committees.

### **Committee 1**

- Adjunct certificate. Workgroup members are in favor of the certificate. Possible outcomes are: one year nontransferable. The professional with an adjunct certification will not be a full time employee. The certificate will be awarded by the State. This should be geared towards a specialist to support the community. Individual can be employed elsewhere.
- Conditional Certification. The committee is considering industry wide standards. They are asking if there can there be multiple measure point for CTE.
- Micro credentialing. These are no longer on the Committee 1 radar.
- Can there be a graphic that shows pathways to certification that can be available on the website?

### **Committee 2**

- Lever on tuition reimbursement and loans.
- Discount rates for continuing education. Institutes of Higher Education note this has an impact on staffing.
- Strengthen LEA partnership for continuing development. Which counties have incentives for difficult to fill areas?
- Look at non-monetary incentives.
- Quality Teacher Incentive Act- can it be expanded to be more than National Board? There were only 8 NBCT in comprehensive needs schools. Does not meet the intent. Total of 1847 NBCT in non-comprehensive.
- Recruitment into the field of teaching and retention of those teachers is the priority. Funding is an issue but do not let it be the issue that keeps you from making recommendations.

### **Discussion**

- Dr. Shapiro asked if the act included a bump in pay for those in comprehensive needs. Ms. Spross responded there were once many options. Currently the compensation in comprehensive needs schools is \$2,000. \$1,000 for non-comprehensive needs schools. Comprehensive incentive may move to \$4,000. This is a disincentive if you help move a school out of high needs you no longer get the \$4,000. The State Board is concerned with the act. New Orleans is using their money in different ways. The definition of comprehensive and non-comprehensive needs schools aligned with the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).
- Ms. Shurn noted we discussed strengthening the partnership between higher education and local school systems that does not mean an exchange of money. Dr. Shapiro said this is the Professional Development School model.

### **Committees 3 and 5**

- Recommendations for committees to work together on Professional Development and Mentoring for alignment.
- What are the requirements for a mentor teacher?
- Is there continuity?
- This is another avenue for professional growth.
- Micro credentialing for badging and PD. If we allow if for PD we will at some point need to address it for certification.

### **Committee 4**

- Working on IPC.
- Working to not focus on the numbers but more focused on outcome based.
- Incorporating cultural competencies into the requirements.
- Working on the internship and looking at what needs to go into that including flexibility for design and amping up the requirements. Looking at a medical model, not every PDS has to have everything and students should have multiple experiences in the classrooms.

### **Discussion**

- Dr. Shapiro asked if there is discussion within the group for regional centers that have mentors who are available to go with interns into comprehensive needs schools. Ms. Michelle Dunkle responded that this is written into the ESSA plan and in the new IPC it is in the level process. Comprehensive needs schools might not be able to offer a full internship, but could have students observe student services and other options.

### **Conclusion**

Ms. Spross reviewed the timeline. The report will be due October 1, 2017 for review. The writing needs to be complete for internal review in September 2017. We have meetings in July and August for review. The report will be reviewed by the State Board of Education.

Dr. Shapiro motioned to adjourn the meeting at 4:30p.m. Ms. Gronberg-Quinn seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 4:30pm.



**Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016**  
**Workgroup**  
June 20, 2017 Meeting  
**Committee #1- Certification Restructuring**

**Committee Members Present:** Karen Robertson, USM; Darren Hornbeck, MSEA; Mary Tillar, PSSAM; Jessica Cuches, PSSAM; Kelly Meadows,

**Committee Members Absent:** Audra Butler, MADTEC; Margret Trader, MICUA, Carrie Conley, MAESP; Nomsa Geleta, USM

**MSDE Staff:** Tanisha L. Brown

---

**Discussion**

Ms. Spross shared general feedback regarding the progress of Committee I. She noted that the workgroup was in favor of the following preliminary recommendations:

- Not being able to transfer the adjunct certificate across locals
- Not allowing adjuncts to be full time employees
- Allowing adjuncts to be full time employees of other entities
- Requiring the adjunct certificate to be issued by the state
- Making the adjunct certificate valid for one year
- Directing the use of adjunct certificates to specialty areas

**Ms. Spross** stated that the workgroup is still exploring whether industry wide standards can be used to evaluate PTE candidates. She notes that further research needs to be done around industry requirements for various technical areas.

The workgroup recommended Committee I create a graphic depicting the various routes to certification to be shared with candidates.

The group began by discussing the perceived overlap between some CTE areas and possible specialty areas for the adjunct certificate.

**Ms. Meadows** questioned whether there should be additional requirements for the adjunct certificate, like the LEA having difficulty finding a certified teacher to teach the content. She noted there is similar language around need in the regulations regarding the conditional certificate. The committee agreed this should be included.

**Ms. Meadows** asked what areas should be included as adjunct areas. The committee made the following comments:

- **Mr. Hornbeck:** Locals should have to demonstrate need for “specialty areas” for the adjunct certificate.
  - **Ms. Meadows** questioned under what circumstances would a local’s request be denied as a specialty area.
- **Ms. Tillar** recommends defining “specialty” by industries defined as specialty areas
- **Dr. Robertson** recommends listing all certification areas that are currently being considered for the adjunct certificate in order to determine commonalities that can be used to define other areas that may be eligible for the adjunct certificate
- **Mr. Hornbeck** asks if we have ever reached out to LEAs regarding the specialty areas they would like to have included
  - **Ms. Meadows** noted that the community of Certification Authorized Partners (CAPs) have concerns regarding the creation of an adjunct certificate. Many of their concerns were concerns also discussed by the committee.
- **Mr. Hornbeck** suggested a certified teacher should be in the classroom with adjuncts who are content experts
  - **Ms. Cuches** and **Ms. Tillar** disagreed with the idea due to financial constraints.
    - **Mr. Hornbeck** suggests that the mentor teacher can be removed in time once the adjunct has demonstrated proficiency with pedagogy.
    - **Ms. Tillar** recommended building in pedagogical training throughout the school year
    - **Ms. Meadows** asks if it is feasible to identify a mentor for each adjunct as the committee agrees a mentor should be a requirement
      - **Mr. Hornbeck** notes you would have to be very specific with those requirements to ensure adjuncts are actually getting the appropriate support.
        - **Ms. Cuches** recommends each local education agency submits a plan for how they would support the adjunct, since each district handles mentor teachers differently
- **Ms. Tillar** reminds the group that we are looking to have a small number of adjuncts, since it is meant for very specialized areas.
- **Ms. Meadows** asks about the possibility of entering into an agreement/partnership with the industry when the adjunct is coming from a community organization
  - **Ms. Tillar** notes that Anne Arundel County has established roles with various partners in the community, but limiting it to a partnership may exclude individuals who are specialized, but retired, for example.
- **Ms. Tillar** recommended the following for adjuncts during onboarding:
  - LEA 101
  - Mini Sessions around systems, curriculum, PBIS, classroom management, and grading system



- Lesson planning and delivery
- Diverse learners
- Methodology
- Literacy
- **Ms. Tillar** recommends an additional 15 hours of modules before renewal, possibly offered online
  - Mr. Hornbeck expresses concern with online content
- **Ms. Meadows** asks if pedagogy module could be available for conditionally certified teachers as well. Anne Arundel County mentioned they had not considered it, but could offer courses to conditionally certified teachers as well.
- **Mr. Hornbeck** expressed concern about adjuncts being responsible for special education students in their classrooms without support. **Ms. Meadows** notes that many general educators only have a basic intro to special education course as well.
- The committee discussed the following criteria for adjunct certification:
  - Minimum of a Bachelor's Degree
  - Hold an Industry licensure when applicable for that profession
  - 5 years of experience in field
  - Mentor required
  - Educator must be evaluated
  - Onboarding requirements
  - PD required throughout year
  - Certificate should be requested by the local to MSDE with a plan. If plan approved, certificate issued. Application criteria must be developed.
- Committee must establish what areas would qualify for adjunct certificate.

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

Presentation on EdTPA from Kellie Crawford, Pearson.



# Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016

## Workgroup

June 20, 2017 Meeting

### Committee #2- Quality Teacher Incentives

**Committee Members Present:** Justin Heid, MSEA; Fran Kroll, MADTECC; Althea Pennerman, Salisbury University

**Committee Members Absent:** Monique Sloan, MAESP; Tess Blumenthal, MAESP; Tanya Williams, MICUA

**MSDE Staff:** Alex Cambra, Ruth Downs, Jeanne-Marie Holly

**Alternates Present:** None

**Guests:** None

---

#### Approval of Minutes:

Not applicable

#### Discussion:

Ms. Alex Cambra reiterated the topics of discussion.

- Student loan differences are higher because of the length of time.
- Tuition reimbursement - \$15,000 more feasible. Committee should recommend amount to the workgroup.
- Review the Quality Teacher Incentive Act
- Look at bargaining agreements of each LEA
- Recruitment
- Financial issues
- Exposing teachers to a classroom
- Who is coming into Maryland
- What are the recommendations

Ms. Jeanne-Marie Holly stated that Teacher Academy of Maryland (TAM) is part of strengthening local school system partnerships. She stated that they met with Del. Queen in regards to the legislation offering scholarships to TAM students.

Mr. Justin Heid asked if there are some school systems that provide college tuition reimbursement. Mr. Heid stated that the Quality Teacher Incentive Act only focuses on 24 schools.

Ms. Holly stated that TAM students at Towson University receive reimbursement if they agree to work for that county.

Ms. Cambra stated that slightly more than half of students enter Maryland schools to become teachers. Salaries become lower when they do not become teachers.

Ms. Fran Kroll stated that salaries are negotiated within their contract.

Ms. Cambra talked about changing the regulation for the Quality Teacher Incentive Act.

Ms. Spross informed the committee that Comprehensive-needs schools are not going to be represented across the state. She suggested that the committee take a look at the Quality Teacher Incentive Act and make suggestions to modify it. Consider a modification to it - only teachers who go to certain schools receive the stipend or those teachers who apply for the hard to fill positions.

Ms. Cambra stated that the committee needs to decide on 3 or 4 recommendations. At the next two meetings, the committee must be more specific with details.

- Tuition reimbursement
- Doing away with Quality Teacher Incentive Act or make a change to it
- Recommendations for teacher recruitment

Ms. Spross recommended policy levers be considered

- Quality Teacher Incentive Act recommendations
- Loan forgiveness
- Teacher Academies of Maryland (strengthen)

Ms. Cambra stated that it does not all have to be about money. Consider getting TAM programs up and running in every school district. Start tapping into fields outside where the shortage is. See what is different about private school versus public school. We should provide an incentive for interns coming into the schools.

Ms. Kroll stated that we should look at other UTeach models that are not teacher models.

Ms. Spross stated that we need to look at the incentive that interns get for going to comprehensive-needs schools. Also look at recommendations that have a positive outcome for children.

Ms. Cambra asked the question, "Is it an incentive for a teacher to have an intern with them?" Consider working with Committee 5 to incentivize mentors to work in high need schools.

Mr. Heid stated that you should look at the teacher. Some teachers should be mentors and other should not.

Ms. Holly stated that the committee should look at tax credits as an incentive for teachers who are placed in critical shortage areas. Ms. Holly recommended expanding TAM to all school systems and increasing the numbers. She also stated that there should be one or two school systems where the teacher teaches all of the coursework for TAM. This would help with increasing the number of teachers and the diversity of the teachers.

Ms. Cambra stated that the committee should submit a brief summary of what Teacher Academies of Maryland (TAM) are. For the Quality Teacher Incentive Act (QTIA), recommend that the stipend should be used in a different way.

Ms. Kroll stated that it is more difficult to recruit teachers in subject areas/geographic areas. We should use the stipend to incentivize people to go into geographic and certified areas.

Mr. Heid stated that it would be good to expand the QTIA, geographically and to the shortage areas of need. They need to look at this yearly. He asked the question, "How do we increase opportunities for people to get into those placements?"

Ms. Cambra recommended a stipend for living arrangements. She talked about the next steps in upcoming meetings.

**Materials of Interest:**

None

**Next Steps:**

1. Provide information on Teacher Academy of Maryland (TAM)
2. Review language in the Quality Teacher Incentive Act (QTIA) – look at retention incentives using ACT
3. Recommend Tuition reimbursement/Loan forgiveness
4. Increase Partnerships between LEA's and 2 year/4 year colleges
5. Review incentives for recruitment of teachers

**Next meeting will held on July 25, 2017.**



## TEACHER INDUCTION, RETENTION, AND ADVANCEMENT ACT OF 2016

### WORKGROUP

June 20, 2017 Meeting

#### COMMITTEE #3 & COMMITTEE #5 – Professional Development for Teachers and Administrators and Mentoring

**Committee Members Present:** Kathy Angeletti (USM), Yi Huang (USM), Heather Lageman (PSSAM), Sarah Mallory (UMD), Debbie Poese (MADTECC), Stacy Williams (MICUA), Dan Capozzi (MSDE)

**Committee Members Absent:** Deanna Stock (MADTECC), Phyllis Lloyd (MAESP), Judy Jenkins (MICUA) : Jasmine Stewart(MSEA), Diane Workman (PSSAM)

**MSDE Staff:** Jessica Bancroft, Karen Dates Dunmore

**Workgroup Members:** Lorraine Cornish-Harrison (BTU), Rowena Shurn (MSEA)

**Guests:** Duane Morgan (USM), Damon Jones (USM)

---

#### Committees 3 & 5 Discussion:

**Goal for committee work:** Review the stand-alone recommendations from both committees and if there are links, have a statement that indicates they are aligned and develop one goal or over-arching recommendation.

Recommendations for revised regulations—looking at ways to strengthen. (*Rowena Shurn*)

Let's look at recommendation 3 from committee 5 regarding mentors and incorporate a separate bullet. (*Sarah Mallory & Stacy Williams*)

Committee 3 – Recommendation 2b (referencing previous recommendations) – we can strengthen so we could have multiple bullets to emphasize professional development, mentoring and induction. (*Yi Huang*)

Recommendation 1b— including an on-line repository for professional development, mentor training and induction programs.

We need to be sure we mention all areas – statewide, partnerships with LEA's (*Stacy Williams*)

Let's look at Recommendation 2a (*Yi Huang*)--after development – mentor training and induction program

Look at Recommendation 3 –add to group 3 (*Sarah Mallory*)

- Generic language then add Recommendations 1 and 4 from group 5—As the cornerstone of the induction period

Let's look at page 1 from Rowena – need to incorporate into our recommendations (*Kathy Angeletti*)

I would prefer if we reviewed COMAR regulations (*Deb Poese*)

We need to make sure suggestions do not hurt smaller counties (*Sarah Mallory*)

Smaller counties do mentoring in buildings, not district. Do mentors have the necessary resources to help the new teacher? *(Stacy Williams)*

Do we need to add sub-bullets to recommendation? *(Sarah Mallory)*

Can we incorporate the one recommendation from page 3 from Rowena's report? *(Kathy Angeletti)*

We need to add from page 3 – adult learning theories, cultural competencies, peer coaching. *(Sarah Mallory)*

We is our big ask – help with teacher prep and help with teacher mentors? Then we need to add a recommendation: *(Yi Huang)*

- Recommendation 3 -- Create statewide mentoring training pathways among IHE's to support teacher preparation and teacher leadership development.
- Recommendation 3a – develop and implement and high impact mentor training programs which imbed
- Recommendation 3b – provide appropriate time and resources to address professional needs to support
- Recommendation 3c –establish mentoring networks

At NASTDEC, one of the issues that came up was ethical issues. Recommendation 2 (group 3), we need to specifically address Model Code of Ethics for Educators (MCE) and include in recommendation—add to recommendation 3. *(Kathy Angeletti)*

Add to recommendation 2c – model code of ethics. “..and the Model Code of Ethics for Educators” *(Dan Capozzi)*

***Below is a compilation of all of the ideas regarding the recommendations from both committees—compiled and synthesized by Yi Huang:***

#### **TIRA Recommendations from Committee III and Committee V (As of 6/20/2017)**

##### **1. Create statewide professional development pathways with career-wide learning opportunities for educators across the state.**

- a. Leverage state, LEA, Union, and two- and four-year higher educational expertise and resources to increase quality, transparency, and portability of professional learning.
- b. Leverage new knowledge, promising practices, and advanced technologies to increase access and success, including an online repository for professional development, mentor training, and induction programs.
- c. Leverage statewide and regional partnerships, resources, and delivery structures to ensure equitable access across the state.

##### **2. Establish LEA-IHE partnerships in developing, delivering, and ensuring high quality professional development programs that link but are not limited to certification regulations for renewal.**

- a. Establish shared vision, responsibilities, and resources for professional development, mentor training, and induction programs that meet LEA and school priorities and address individualized needs for teachers.



- b. Establish professional development, mentor training, and induction programs that incorporate evidence-based practices with context, content and pedagogical currency, such as cultural proficiency and technology integration, to increase teacher effectiveness and student achievement.
- c. Establish a quality assurance framework that meets state and national guidelines such as National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, Standards for Professional Learning, and Model Code of Ethical Standards for Educators.

**3. Recommendation 3: Create statewide mentoring training pathways among IHEs, LEAs, and regulatory agencies to support teacher preparation and teacher leadership development.**

- a. Co-develop and implement high-impact mentorship training programs which embed innovative evidence-based strategies and ethical practices, such as adult learning theories, cultural competencies, and peer coaching, to support teacher development.
- b. Provide appropriate time and resources to address professional needs and support individualized learning for mentors and mentees.
- c. Establish mentoring networks and provide theme-based (such as EL and special education), role-based (such as department chair and resource teacher), and or/context-based (such as urban and rural schools) opportunities to improve effectiveness of mentorship in diverse school settings.
- d. Match mentees with mentors who have similar experiences serving specific student populations, such as student with disabilities, EL, and socio-economic background. (Item d is from the original Committee 3 recommendation)



**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.



# Appendix XXIX





**Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016**  
**Workgroup**  
**Materials of Interest**  
**June 20, 2017 Meeting**

**Chapter 740 (SB 493) Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016**

[http://mgaleg.maryland.gov/2016rs/chapters\\_noln/ch\\_740\\_sb0493e.pdf](http://mgaleg.maryland.gov/2016rs/chapters_noln/ch_740_sb0493e.pdf)

Statute that requires the State Department of Education to establish a workgroup, the participants, sets forth the elements to be reported on and the dates (November 1, 2016, November 1, 2017, and December 1, 2021) by which the interim and final reports must be submitted to the governor.

**Materials of Interest**

**“He’s One of the Finest Educators I’ve Ever Seen in the Classroom and He’s Leaving”,  
Better Conversation, June 6, 2017**

<http://educationpost.org/hes-one-of-the-finest-educators-ive-ever-seen-in-the-classroom-and-hes-leaving/>

This blog focuses on one teachers perspective of why teachers are leaving the profession. It references recent studies and research focused on teacher retention.

**“How States Fail their Teachers on Retirement: New Report Gives 42 States Failing Grades for Pensions”, The 74, June 14, 2017**

<https://www.the74million.org/article/how-states-fail-their-teachers-on-retirement-new-report-gives-42-states-failing-grades-for-pensions>

A report from the Bellwether Education Partners grades teacher pension plans on an A-F scale failing 42 out of 50 states. Furthermore, no state received higher than a C. The report used two questions to focus the report; “Are all of the state’s teachers earning sufficient retirement benefits?” and “Can teachers take their retirement benefits with them no matter where life takes them?” A state would earn a perfect score if it offered all its educators “a portable and financially secure retirement plan.”

While strategies to improve pensions will vary from state to state, the authors offer three recommendations that all states should use:

- get finances under control;
- make portable teacher retirement plans the default to provide all teachers with financially secure benefits
- expand Social Security coverage to include teachers.

**“THE NCTQ Teacher Trendline: A snapshot of district-level teacher policies from NCTQ’s Teacher Contract Database” Teacher Trendline, May 2017**

<http://www.nctq.org/commentary/article.do?id=357>

This article looks at how common differentiated pay is for teachers. NCTQ focused on two types of differentiated pay: more compensation for either teacher a hard-to- staff subject or teaching in high needs schools. The sample included 124 districts, 2/3 of which were large districts. NCTQ found that districts are twice as like to offer additional compensation for hard-to-staff position. 71 of the 124 had policies to offer additional pay to those position which were declared a shortage. 37 of the districts offered incentives to teach at high needs schools.

**“Improving our education system to increase student achievement requires a multifaceted effort that involves action and initiative at all levels of the system” ”, Learning Policy Institute, June 5, 2017**

[https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/effective-teacher-professional-development-report?utm\\_source=LPI+Master+List&utm\\_campaign=29fbd9e12e-LPI+MC+ProfLearning+CommSchools+2017+06+05&utm\\_medium=email&utm\\_term=0\\_7e60dfa1d8-29fbd9e12e-42322391](https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/effective-teacher-professional-development-report?utm_source=LPI+Master+List&utm_campaign=29fbd9e12e-LPI+MC+ProfLearning+CommSchools+2017+06+05&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_7e60dfa1d8-29fbd9e12e-42322391)

[https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/community-schools-equitable-improvement-brief?utm\\_source=LPI+Master+List&utm\\_campaign=29fbd9e12e-LPI+MC+ProfLearning+CommSchools+2017+06+05&utm\\_medium=email&utm\\_term=0\\_7e60dfa1d8-29fbd9e12e-42322391](https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/community-schools-equitable-improvement-brief?utm_source=LPI+Master+List&utm_campaign=29fbd9e12e-LPI+MC+ProfLearning+CommSchools+2017+06+05&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_7e60dfa1d8-29fbd9e12e-42322391)

LPI released two new studies focused on professional development and community schools

**“California programs to entice would-be teachers to the classroom” EdSource, May 30, 2017**

<https://edsource.org/2017/california-programs-to-entice-would-be-teachers-to-the-classroom/581708>

**Provided by: Nancy Shapiro, Workgroup Member**

Article focuses on new programs developed by the California Department of Education, California State University, University of California and nonprofits to entice individuals into the math and science fields. NASA has gotten involved and the U.S. Department of Labor has funded loan forgiveness and scholarship programs for those pursuing math and science. Report indicates that lowering standards is not a long term solution however simplifying the process and lowering the cost of training would help. Furthermore, the report recommends “higher salaries, especially for teachers at high-needs schools; housing incentives, loan forgiveness and scholarships both for initial teacher training and ongoing professional development; fewer barriers for teachers who move to new districts or across state lines; earlier hiring processes, so schools have fall staff rosters in place by the previous spring; and surveys of teachers to find out what they need, why they’d consider quitting and how the administration can better support them”

**“IS there a Teacher Shortage in Maryland? A new Policy Brief from the Maryland Equity Project” Baltimore Sun, April 25, 2017**

[http://www.education.umd.edu/TLPL/centers/MEP/Research/k12Education/Janulis\\_5.30.17/](http://www.education.umd.edu/TLPL/centers/MEP/Research/k12Education/Janulis_5.30.17/)

This article reviews Maryland’s data as it pertains to teacher shortages for the state. It offers the following three recommendations:

**“Monitor the regional teacher market.** Understanding the intricacies of the teacher supply and demand dynamics in the state of Maryland requires looking beyond our state borders. School districts consistently rely on out of state hiring, and it is likely that MAP graduates also consider positions out of state. Understanding the push and pull factors that may entice candidates to and away from our state may be key in better understanding the teacher labor market in Maryland. In particular, further attention must be paid to the causes of the sharp decline in the hiring of MAP graduates for the 2015-2016 school year.

**Improve tracking of critical content area shortages:** The current tracking system tends to inflate critical area shortages because it does not take into account the supply of teachers from out of state. While the measure includes data on both in state and out of state hires, the teacher supply data includes only those graduates from Maryland institutions of higher education. Revising this system to take into account teachers prepared out of state will provide a more reliable measure of critical shortage areas. Since districts continue to report shortages in critical content areas via survey reports, it is important to better understand the scope and depth of possible shortages.

**Track geographic shortage areas:** Maryland needs to develop a more reliable indicator of geographic shortages that is independent of content area shortages. This will help us gain a greater understanding of the within state market for teachers.”

#### **Committee 4 Document:**

Draft IPC Concept Paper (attachment 1)

#### **Speaker Materials**

Handouts from Dr. Dara Shaw (attachment 2)



**TO: Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016 Workgroup**  
**FROM: Dara Zeehandelaar Shaw**  
**DATE: June 20, 2017**  
**SUBJECT: Data on preparation of Maryland teachers**

**DATA SOURCES:**

Maryland Longitudinal Data Center, data requested May 25, 2017

Maryland Teacher Staffing Report, Division of Educator Effectiveness, Maryland State Department of Education.  
[Dashboard data retrieved June 19, 2015](#)

All data are public (including additional data not shown in this brief), and available in Excel format on request ([dara.shaw@maryland.gov](mailto:dara.shaw@maryland.gov)). The column headers in the tables correspond to the columns in the “master file.”

Approximately 40 percent of students who graduate from a Maryland 4-year public institution with a teaching degree initially enrolled with the intent to pursue a teaching degree (Table 1, column C). Approximately 60 percent of students enrolled with a different intended major (column D).

Students who graduated from MD public institutions with a degree in teaching have average aggregate loans of approximately \$24,000 (column E/F). Students who initially enrolled with an intent to pursue a teaching degree have aggregate loan amounts of approximately \$3,000 more than students who enrolled without that intent (data not shown in Table 1).

**Table 1. Graduates of Maryland 4-year public institutions with teaching degrees, by degree sought.**

	B	C	D	E/F
<b>Academic Year Cohort</b>	Number of students that graduated from a Maryland 4-year public institution with a teaching degree	Number of students who <i>enrolled</i> with the intent to pursue a teaching degree	Number of students who enrolled with the intent to pursue a degree <i>other</i> than teaching	Average aggregate loan amount for graduates with a teaching degree
<b>2007-08</b>	994	*	*	\$20,430.65
<b>2008-09</b>	1,088	*	*	\$24,735.15
<b>2009-10</b>	1,036	*	*	\$23,709.76
<b>2010-11</b>	1,223	545	678	\$25,128.28
<b>2011-12</b>	1,179	484	695	\$27,188.95
<b>2012-13</b>	1,200	452	748	\$20,430.65
<b>2013-14</b>	1,327	533	794	\$24,735.15
<b>2014-15</b>	1,182	479	703	\$23,709.76

\*Data not available for given year.

Additional data (not shown in Table 1) show:

- Students who graduated from MD public institutions with a degree in teaching have average college GPAs of 3.4 to 3.5. There is no difference in college GPA between students who enrolled with the intent to pursue teaching and those who switched to a teaching degree.

**Table 2. Graduates of Maryland 4-year public institutions with teaching degrees, by employment type.**

	B	J	R	O	U
<b>Academic Year Cohort</b>	Number of students who graduated from a Maryland 4-year public institution with a teaching degree	Number who, at any point after graduation, were employed TEACHING at any K-12 <i>public</i> school in Maryland	Number who, at any point after graduation, were employed TEACHING at any K-12 <i>private</i> school in Maryland	Number who, at any point after graduation, were employed in Maryland <i>not</i> in a K-12 public or private school	Number who, at any point after graduation, do not have any employment record in Maryland
<b>2007-08</b>	994	666	69	99	160
<b>2008-09</b>	1,088	696	141	117	134
<b>2009-10</b>	1,036	575	190	143	128
<b>2010-11</b>	1,223	661	190	210	162
<b>2011-12</b>	1,179	698	167	198	116
<b>2012-13</b>	1,200	724	180	175	121
<b>2013-14</b>	1,327	775	194	221	137
<b>2014-15</b>	1,182	536	242	235	169

**Table 3. Graduates of Maryland 4-year public institutions with teaching degrees, by employment type.**

	B	V	X	W	Y
<b>Academic Year Cohort</b>	Number of students that graduated from a Maryland 4-year public institution with a teaching degree	Percent who, at any point after graduation, were employed TEACHING at any K-12 <i>public</i> school in Maryland	Percent who, at any point after graduation, were employed TEACHING at any K-12 <i>private</i> school in Maryland	Percent who, at any point after graduation, were employed in Maryland <i>not</i> in a K-12 public or private school	Percent who, at any point after graduation, do not have any employment record in Maryland
<b>2007-08</b>	994	67%	7%	10%	16%
<b>2008-09</b>	1,088	64%	13%	11%	12%
<b>2009-10</b>	1,036	56%	18%	14%	12%
<b>2010-11</b>	1,223	54%	16%	17%	13%
<b>2011-12</b>	1,179	59%	14%	17%	10%
<b>2012-13</b>	1,200	60%	15%	15%	10%
<b>2013-14</b>	1,327	58%	15%	17%	10%
<b>2014-15</b>	1,182	45%	20%	20%	14%

Table 3 shows that only about 60 percent of students graduating from a Maryland 4-year public institution with a teaching degree go on to become teachers in Maryland public schools (column V). (The 2014-15 numbers could be low because fewer students went on to become teachers, or because they waited until 2016-17 to become teachers; data for 2016-17 is not yet available.) About 15 percent became private school teachers in Maryland, 15 percent entered the Maryland workforce in another field, and 10 percent do not have an employment record in Maryland.

**Table 4. Maryland teachers, by location of preparation.**

	AW	AX	AY	AZ	BA	BB	BC
School Year	Total new hires	Beginning new hires	Beginning new hires, prepared in Maryland	Beginning new hires, prepared out-of-state	Experienced new hires	Experienced new hires, prepared in Maryland	Experienced new hires, prepared out-of-state
2010-11	3,590	2,271	826	1,445	1,319	713	606
2011-12	3,695	2,342	815	1,527	1,353	711	642
2012-13	5,069	3,079	1,151	1,928	1,990	1,319	671
2013-14	5,512	3,238	989	2,249	2,274	1,229	1,045
2014-15	6,048	3,597	1,049	2,548	2,451	1,302	1,149
2015-16	5,714	2,952	317	2,635	2,762	1,467	1,295

\*Data from MSDE staffing files

Table 4 shows the number of new hires, and where they were prepared. Recall from Table 2, column B that Maryland 4-year public institutions prepare approximately 1,200 graduates each year. Even if all these graduates became teachers in Maryland public schools, Maryland would still need approximately 4,300 to 4,800 teachers from elsewhere (Table 4, column AW minus 1,200). However, recall from Table 2, column J that only about 700 graduates each year actually *become* Maryland public school teachers. This means that an additional 500 teachers each year (1,200 minus 700) are needed from either out-of-state or other Maryland institutions (private and alternative certification programs).

Table 4 also shows that, in 2014-15, 71% of beginning new hires were prepared in Maryland (column AY divided by column AX).

Additional data (not shown in Table 4) show:

- The percentage of beginning new hires prepared out-of-state was comparatively high in CTE (93%), computer science (92%), and ESOL (93%).
- The percentage of beginning new hires prepared out of state was comparatively low in early childhood (Prek-3) (60%), elementary education (64%), physical education (63%).

**Table 5. Graduates of Maryland 4-year public institutions with teaching degrees, by average salary.**

	M	S	P
<b>Academic Year Cohort</b>	Average salary of those who, at any point after graduation, were employed TEACHING at any K-12 <i>public</i> school in Maryland	Average salary of those who, at any point after graduation, were employed TEACHING at any K-12 <i>private</i> school in Maryland	Average salary of those who, at any point after graduation, were employed in Maryland <i>not</i> in a K-12 public or private school
<b>2007-08</b>	\$38,135.71	\$27,258.74	\$37,475.89
<b>2008-09</b>	\$40,890.13	\$21,158.23	\$27,732.70
<b>2009-10</b>	\$41,024.78	\$19,760.76	\$24,194.56
<b>2010-11</b>	\$41,866.48	\$22,592.10	\$26,271.21
<b>2011-12</b>	\$41,979.36	\$18,443.40	\$26,322.02
<b>2012-13</b>	\$41,955.64	\$17,777.30	\$26,193.89
<b>2013-14</b>	\$41,436.15	\$16,010.18	\$19,036.51
<b>2014-15</b>	\$40,699.04	\$16,677.23	\$19,644.85

\* Average salary for teachers (M) is drawn from DLLR files, not MSDE staffing files, for comparability. Private school salaries (S) are approximate.

Data do not support graduates of Maryland 4-year public institutions choosing employment other than in Maryland public schools for salary reasons (Table 5).

**Table 6. Non-teacher graduates of Maryland 4-year public institutions with teaching degrees.**

	O	AA	AD	AB	AE	AF
<b>Academic Year Cohort</b>	Number who, at any point after graduation, were employed in Maryland <i>not</i> in a K-12 public or private school	Industry code #1	Number in that industry	Average salary for that industry (all employees, not just students graduating with teaching degree)	Industry code #2	Number from (F) in that industry
<b>2007-08</b>	99	Health Care	36	\$40,225.94	Prof Services	12
<b>2008-09</b>	117	Health Care	47	\$29,235.04	Retail	14
<b>2009-10</b>	143	Health Care	59	\$26,800.29	Restaurants	18
<b>2010-11</b>	210	Health Care	70	\$31,143.93	Prof Services	29
<b>2011-12</b>	198	Health Care	76	\$25,320.57	Prof Services	27
<b>2012-13</b>	175	Health Care	67	\$26,330.72	Retail	21
<b>2013-14</b>	221	Health Care	73	\$22,384.97	Restaurants	36
<b>2014-15</b>	235	Health Care	79	\$21,403.53	Retail	26

Of the graduates of Maryland 4-year public institutions with teaching degrees who go on to employment other than teaching, about one-third go in to health care fields (Table 6, columns AA and AD). Evidence does not support students choosing this employment for salary reasons (column AB).



**Table 7. Teacher graduates of Maryland 4-year public institutions with teaching degrees, by geography.**

	J	AO	AP	AQ	AR
<b>Academic Year Cohort</b>	Number who, at any point after graduation, were employed TEACHING at any K-12 <i>public</i> school in Maryland			Number who were Maryland residents when applying to college	Number who were not Maryland residents on college application
<b>2007-08</b>	666	*	*	610	55
<b>2008-09</b>	696	*	*	627	68
<b>2009-10</b>	575	*	*	503	69
<b>2010-11</b>	661	*	*	587	72
	Number who, at any point after graduation, were employed TEACHING at any K-12 <i>public</i> school in Maryland	Number who were Maryland residents on college application and, after college graduation, were ever employed teaching in the LEA they attended as a K-12 student	Number who were Maryland residents and, after graduation, were only ever employed teaching in an LEA that they did <i>not</i> attend as a K-12 student	Number who were Maryland residents when applying to college but who did not attend public school in Maryland	Number who were not Maryland residents on college application
<b>2011-12</b>	698	113	83	423	79
<b>2012-13</b>	724	187	175	283	79
<b>2013-14</b>	775	254	219	221	81
<b>2014-15</b>	536	183	167	140	46

\* Data not available on where students attended K-12 for years prior to 2011-12 cohort

Most graduates of Maryland 4-year public institutions who go on to teach in Maryland public schools are Maryland residents (Table 7, columns AO-AQ). Of the Maryland residents 30 to 38 percent teach in the LEA where they attended school, and 27 to 35 percent teach in a different LEA.



## Institutional Performance Criteria of the Redesign of Teacher Education

### Component I: Strong Instructional Programs Linked to Maryland PreK-12 Priorities

This standard is designed to identify all of the standards and outcomes-based instructional and testing requirements in an educator preparation program and affirm fidelity to their implementation across programs.

Element	Indicator	Evidence
<p><b>Programs Meet Testing Requirements</b></p>	<p>Praxis 80% Summary Pass Rate required by Title II                      Each cohort meets state qualifying scores on basic skills (Praxis I, Praxis Core, SAT, GRE or ACT scores) and content and pedagogy tests (e.g., Educational Testing Service (ETS) or American Council on Teaching of Foreign Language (ACTFL) tests.</p>	<p>Identification of test requirements for entry to professional unit and internship; exit requirements for graduation or completion. Charts showing pass rates by test by program.</p>
<p><b>Programs Assure Strong Instructional Programs in all Areas of Content and Pedagogy</b></p>	<p>Programs assure strong academic instruction in mathematics and science for teacher candidates as appropriate to the content area.</p>	<p>Documentation of 12 credits each math and science for early childhood, elementary, and Special Education grades 1-8 certifications with a minimum of six credits bearing the HEGIS code of mathematics, and six credits bearing the HEGIS code of Education accepted, but not required. Documentation of math and science credits appropriate to all other certification areas offered. Identification of key required outcomes.</p>
	<p>Programs provide evidence that teacher candidates demonstrate proficiency in math and science related to outcomes-based instruction with data captured in</p>	<p>Data that determine proficiency appropriate to certification area, meeting, at minimum, the outcomes-based requirements of the general education program and relevant to areas of certification.</p>

	<p>the assessment system</p> <p>Programs assure strong outcomes-based content <b>instruction</b> for teacher candidates that aligns with national and state content standards and required assessments in all content areas.</p>	<p>Standards to be Addressed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National Content Standards</li> <li>• Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL)</li> <li>• InTASC Standards</li> <li>• Maryland Teacher Technology Standards out of date <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Document candidate performance for each of the seven technology standards.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards (MCCRS)</li> <li>• Ready for Kindergarten (R4K) (Early Childhood)</li> <li>• Student Learning Objectives (SLO)</li> <li>• PARCC Assessments (PARCC)</li> </ul> <p>Transcripts document major.</p>
	<p>Secondary candidates major in certificate areas.</p> <p>Programs include reading/literacy courses that meet current state requirements and a process for ensuring that all outcomes continue to be addressed in the program.</p> <p>Affirm that current college/university catalogs list the required literacy courses for each program.</p>	<p>Three hours for secondary and PreK-12 initial certification. (Three additional hours due at certificate renewal.)</p> <p>Twelve hours for Early Childhood and Elementary Education</p>
	<p>Programs <b>instruct</b> for required candidate competencies based on InTASC Standards.</p>	<p>Where performance-based behavioral competencies are to be met on continuum of instruction and field experiences.</p> <p><b>The Learner and Learning</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Learner Development</li> <li>2. Learning Differences</li> </ol>

		<p>3. Learning Environments  <b>Content Knowledge</b>  4. Content Knowledge  5. Application of Content  <b>Instructional Practice</b>  6. Assessment  7. Planning for Instruction  8. Instructional Strategies  <b>Professional Responsibility</b>  9. Professional Learning and Ethical Practice  Model Code of Educator Ethics  10. Leadership and Collaboration</p>
	<p>Programs achieve PreK-16 standards and pedagogy alignment by collaboration between the education and arts and sciences departments.</p>	<p>Evidence of effective collaboration between and among departments and colleges related to standards alignment and balanced content and pedagogy requirements.</p>
<p><b>Programs provide strong instruction relevant to cultural competencies.</b></p>	<p>Programs provide outcomes-based instruction designed to promote cultural competency and support the teacher candidate's ability to build and maintain a positive classroom environment.</p>	<p>A minimum of three assessments across the program with evidence of instruction in cultural competency with practical applications such as but not limited to Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS), Restorative Justice, etc. Strong evidence includes use of <b>A Manual for Teacher Educators, Teachers and Principals</b>  <i>Preparing Educators for High Poverty/Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Schools: A Manual for Teacher Educators, Teachers and Principals</i></p>
<p><b>Support Systems</b></p>	<p>Programs provide interventions and support for struggling candidates for all programs.</p>	<p>Identify interventions and supports provided.</p>

**Component II: Extensive Pre-Professional Field and Clinical Experiences Aligned with Program Instruction and PreK-12 Priorities**

This Standard is designed to establish with local school system partners a system of identification of Professional Development Schools based on the ability of that school to offer opportunities for teacher candidates to meet one or more required identified Competencies based on the InTASC Standards. Field experiences should build their competencies through a program of scaffolded experiences culminating in a full-semester internship. All instructional elements identified in Standard I must now be implemented in through the scaffolded field experiences.

Element	Indicator	Evidence
<p>Teacher candidates have extensive and direct field-based preparation in PreK-12 schools with diverse populations. These include a plan of scaffolded clinical experiences that culminate in evidence-based demonstration of competencies found in the InTASC standards, core content standards, and cultural competency instructional elements. This evidence is drawn from the continuum of field experiences that includes a minimum of one semester of full-time teaching.</p>	<p>In partnership with school partners, programs identify through established criteria PDS Level 1, PDS Level 2, PDS Level 3, and PDS Level 4 placement sites aligned to Professional Development School Standards (immediate revision necessary) and designed to scaffold candidates' ability to acquire and demonstrate proficiencies on required competencies.</p>	<p>PDS partners' list, with identifications</p>
	<p>Programs ensure each candidate has direct experience in a diverse setting.</p>	<p>Demographic breakdown of field experience and PDS sites.</p>
	<p>Teacher candidates demonstrate ability to plan instruction, adapt materials, and implement differentiated instruction in a</p>	<p>Assessment data related to competencies in indicator related to InTASC Standards and where they are</p>

Element	Indicator	Evidence
	diverse and inclusive classroom, and <b>programs document</b> how the performance is captured and utilized in the performance assessment system	met along the field experience, internship continuum.
	Teacher candidates <b>demonstrate</b> ability to use functional behavior assessments, and to provide positive behavior support for all students and <b>programs document</b> how the performance is captured and utilized in the performance assessment system	Assessment data related to competencies in indicator related to InTASC Standards and where they are met along the field experience, internship continuum.
	Teacher candidates <b>demonstrate</b> ability to collaborate with school-based and LSS resource personnel.	Assessment data related to competencies in indicators related to InTASC Standards and where they are met along the field experience, internship continuum.
	Programs <b>assess candidates' performance on the continuum of clinical experience</b> to assure acquisition of all required competencies, analyze data, and use for program improvement	
	Programs <b>document the developmental stages of PDS(s)</b> determined through annual self-assessment and Teacher Preparation Improvement Plan reporting guided by the revised <i>PDS Assessment Framework for Maryland</i> .	

Element	Indicator	Evidence
	Consistent with the goal of preparing all teacher candidates in specially designed professional development schools and providing continuing professional development for PreK-16 faculty, <b>the unit maintains state recognition of its PDSS.</b>	

**Component III: Performance Assessment**

This Standards requires that all data collected from instructional standards-based requirements and related performance in Standard I, and implementation of those instructional and standards-based requirements from Standard II be housed, aggregated or disaggregated by program and unit as required, analyzed in an integrated assessment system and reflect use of the system to inform ongoing program and unit improvement.

Element	Indicator	Evidence
<p><b>Programs Meet Testing Requirements</b></p>	<p>Praxis 80% Summary Pass Rate- required by Title II if Praxis Core set by state as requirement.</p> <p><b>Each cohort meets state qualifying scores on basic skills (Praxis I, Praxis Core, SAT, GRE or ACT scores) and content and pedagogy tests (e.g., Educational</b></p>	<p>Charts aggregated by program and unit of test data for entry to professional unit and internship; exit data for graduation or completion.</p>



Element	Indicator	Evidence
<p>The educator preparation provider unit uses a performance assessment system of assuring continuous improvement based on the Interstate Teachers Assessment and Support Consortium Standards (InTASC), national content standards, state PreK-12 standards and scoring tools, and which utilizes standards-based and rubrics-assessed scoring.</p>	<p><b>Testing Service (ETS) or American Council on Teaching of Foreign Language (ACTFL) tests.</b></p> <p>Programs provide evidence of use of <b>standards-based, rubric-assessed performance assessments</b> for teacher candidates.</p>	<p>Data from key assessments, rubrics, scores, data, analyses, feedback loop, aggregated by unit, disaggregated by program. As appropriate to certification area, data required for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National Content Standards</li> <li>• Professional Standards for Education Leaders (PSEL)</li> <li>• InTASC Standards</li> <li>• Maryland Teacher Technology Standards               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Document candidate performance for each of the seven technology standards.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards (MCCRS)</li> <li>• Ready for Kindergarten (R4K) (Early Childhood)</li> <li>• Student Learning Objectives (SLO)</li> <li>• PARCC Assessments (PARCC)</li> </ul>
	<p>Programs document use of a system that assesses</p>	<p>Data Charts aggregated by unit, disaggregated by program (grades, project scores, etc.)</p>

<b>Element</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Evidence</b>
	<p>candidate competence determined by mathematics and science instruction, provides the method used to address areas of candidates' strengths and weaknesses, and how both identified strengths and weaknesses are used for program improvement.</p>	<p>Data that determine proficiency appropriate to the certification area, meeting the requirements of the general education program and those particular to certain areas of certification: grades, etc.</p> <p>Systematic data collection of both disaggregated candidate and aggregated program data including results of the data-driven system of addressing weaknesses at both the candidate and program level.</p>
	<p>Programs document the teacher candidate's ability to demonstrate proficiency in all content areas appropriate to the area of certification through assessments in field experiences and internship, and provide the method used to address areas of candidates' strengths and weaknesses and how each is used for program improvement.</p>	<p>Data that determine content proficiency appropriate the instruction by certification area, meeting the requirements of the general education program and those particular to certain areas of certification: grades, etc.</p> <p>Systematic data collection of both disaggregate candidate and aggregated program data including results of the data-driven system of addressing strengths and weaknesses at both the candidate and program level and using each for program improvement.</p>
	<p>Programs document the teacher candidate's ability to plan instruction, adapt materials, and deliver differentiated instruction in a diverse and inclusive</p>	<p>Systematic data collection of both disaggregate candidate and aggregated program data including the data-driven system of addressing weaknesses at both the candidate and program level.</p>

Element	Indicator	Evidence
	classroom in field experiences and internship.	
	Programs use performance data from field experiences and internship in identified PDS (Levels 1-4) to assure candidate acquisition of required competencies.	<p><b>Competencies Assessed for Proficiency</b></p> <p><b>The Learner and Learning</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Learner Development</li> <li>2. Learning Differences</li> <li>3. Learning Environments</li> </ol> <p><b>Content Knowledge</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Content Knowledge</li> <li>5. Application of Content</li> </ol> <p><b>Instructional Practice</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Assessment</li> <li>7. Planning for Instruction</li> <li>8. Instructional Strategies</li> </ol> <p><b>Professional Responsibility</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9. Professional Learning and Ethical Practice</li> <li>Model Code of Educator Ethics</li> <li>10. Leadership and Collaboration</li> </ol>
	Programs provide formative and summative performance feedback to candidates both in coursework and field placements, collect data from that feedback and employ a system of program feedback for ongoing improvement.	Aggregated and disaggregated data by program: feedback, action generated by feedback, and data fed to program for improvement

Element	Indicator	Evidence
	Programs monitor candidate progress, and provide supports to those at risk for not meeting criteria.	Data collected from support interventions
	Programs provide evidence of candidates' having met criteria at critical milestones (such as entry, internship, and exit).	Data collected at critical milestones, candidate criteria for achieving milestones, data collection chart by program, system of feedback to program for ongoing improvement.
	Programs provide aggregated and disaggregated teacher candidate performance data related to PreK-12 student learning in the assessment system.	Purchased intern assessment data: edTPA, PPAT or IHE-developed intern assessment data related to PreK-12 student learning.
	Programs provide performance measures and aggregated and disaggregated performance data reflecting the teacher candidate's ability to teach to elementary literacy standards and/or to standards for literacy in the content areas.	Performance assessment data from Elementary Literacy courses or Literacy in the Content Area Parts I and II
	The education unit shares data with internal and external stakeholders, analyzes the data, and uses data for continuous program improvement.	Charts, data, stakeholder advisory meeting agendas, department agendas, action plans, etc.

**Component IV: State Approval**

This Standard assures that all programs in the unit hold State Program Approval and that required annual reporting informs the state of continuous and ongoing improvement efforts.

Element	Indicator	Evidence
<p>The education unit and all professional educator certification programs have state program approval</p>	<p>The unit identifies any series of courses offered for certification or endorsement through transcript analysis, and documents the institution's timeline for seeking state approval.</p>	
	<p>The unit provides evidence that any alternative preparation programs in a local school system partnership (Maryland Approved Alternative Preparation Program) with the college or university have received approved program status from the Program Approval and Assessment Branch, Division of Educator Effectiveness, MSDE.</p>	<p>See Program Review Documents for MAAPP attached. Evidence: Program Approval letter of approval</p>
	<p>The unit uses feedback from state program review to</p>	

Element	Indicator	Evidence
	facilitate ongoing improvement, addressing Areas for Improvement or Recommendations for Improvement and to reports on that improvement through the annual Teacher Preparation Improvement Plan (TPIP) report process.	
	Programs maintain copies of TPIP annual reports to illustrate the annual improvement process	

Note: If the outcome of the state program approval visit is conditional approval or probation, the institution is then identified as “at risk for low performing or low performing” according to the reporting guidelines of Title II. The on-site review schedule is modified to meet state requirements.

# Appendix XXX





**Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016  
Workgroup  
July 25, 2017 Meeting  
Minutes**

The July meeting of the Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016 Workgroup was called to order by Ms. Sarah Spross at 2:05 p.m.

**In attendance:** Sarah Spross (Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Nancy Shapiro (University of Maryland System), Rowena Shurn (Maryland State Education Association), Linda Gronberg-Quinn (Maryland Association of Directors of Teacher Education at Community Colleges), Emily Dow, (Maryland Higher Education Commission), Alexandra Cambra (MSDE), Kelly Meadows (MSDE), Jessica Bancroft (MSDE), Karen Dates-Dunmore (MSDE), Tanisha Brown (MSDE), Michelle Dunkle (MSDE), Ruth Downs (MSDE), Jennifer Frank (Maryland Independent College and University Association), Jin Schrattenecker (Maryland Approved Alternative Preparation Programs), Carla McCoy (Baltimore Teachers Union),

**Absentees:** Laura Weeldreyer (Maryland State Board of Education), Annette Wallace (Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals), Jack Smith (Public School Superintendents Association of Maryland, Tess Blumenthal (Maryland Association of Elementary School Principals)

Ms. Spross welcomed those attending to the Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement (TIRA) workgroup. The meeting is a full meeting of workgroup and committees. Ms. Spross thanked everyone for their attendance and participation.

Today we have two guest speakers to provide information to the entire group and then we will meet in committees.

**Approval of Minutes:**

Ms. Spross asked for the approval of minutes.

Nancy Shapiro motioned.

Jennifer Frank seconded.

All in favor. None opposed.

Ms. Spross reminded the group there will be two more meetings for the workgroup. The next meeting is August 29, 2017. It will be held at same location 1pm-4pm. Both the workgroup and committees will meet. This is the last time for the committees to meet to provide recommendations to be included in the final report.

On September 25, 2017, the workgroup will look at final recommendations and review the report for last thoughts. This meeting will be 1pm-3pm.

Ms. Spross noted it is important for the August meeting to start with committees meeting first in order to have as much time as possible to finalize recommendations. At 3pm, each committee will report out on

recommendations. This will allow the workgroup to see where groups stand and review committee recommendations.

Dr. Shapiro asked when the State Board will have an update in October. Ms. Spross responded that we would like to submit information to Dr. Salmon for her review by October 1, 2017. The Professional Standards Teacher Education Board (PSTEB) will also have an update in October. Currently there is no finalization on these dates to present to the State Board. The reports will be sent to the General Assembly by November 1, 2017. The report is for the General Assembly and will include the recommendations by the committees. The State Board and PSTEB may also include recommendations. Both Boards are interested in the work being done. There has been a report out on the progress of this workgroup at all PSTEB meetings. All Boards are supportive of current initiatives. They are interested in incentives and the Institutional Performance Criteria (IPC) standards. They are also interested in professional development and mentoring.

Ms. Spross continued that the report is answering the questions of how to bring in the best and brightest to teach in Maryland and how to keep them? We look at certification and make sure current standards are still appropriately applicable. How do we overcome barriers for specialized areas? We have heard from the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) that teachers do not feel prepared for the classroom, they are lacking cultural competencies. Multiple committees are addressing cultural competencies. Teachers want meaningful experiences in the communities in which they want to work.

This work is the perfect storm, with ESSA, 493, and the Kirwan Commission, to retain, grow, and train teachers. All recommendations we hope are aligned. ESSA and 493 are aligned to supporting excellent educators. The second draft of ESSA is online with a comprehensive PowerPoint. The survey is currently open for comment. ESSA survey results are mostly from teachers and parents. Some of the questions pertain to the work we are doing. These include, to what degree is there a need for an online teacher education program? The response was high to medium need. Should local school systems support online by providing regional internship positions? The feedback noted teachers need more time for collaborating and mentoring. All information from the survey is online.

Ms. Spross provided a Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) update. She noted there are some questions that need to be addressed. House Bill 715, with the new language, has been approved and has gone into effect. Those schools that have approval will be held harmless while decisions are made. The bill requires MSDE and Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) to work collaboratively to recognize any national accrediting body interested in being accredited in Maryland. It says the outside organization will need to meet the State standards for approval and as we know committee 4 is currently working on the Institutional Performance Criteria (IPC). Looking at the IPC has been a part of the conversation from the beginning. The January 20, 2017 workgroup met at MSDE and pivoted the committees once the CAEP work was done. Committee 4 became the IPC revision committee.

Dr. Shapiro asked for clarification of charge to committee 4. She stated that she heard the IPC will be finished by committee 4. She stated that thought there would be recommendations from the IPC committee but it would not be complete. She stated she felt more stakeholders need to be involved and that the right individuals were not present.

Ms. Spross noted all work from the beginning has been working towards the IPC. She stated that there continues to be representation from all stakeholder communities. Multiple groups across the board are

represented including 4-year public schools, 4-year private schools, 2-year schools, principals, teachers, the State Board, alternative preparation programs, etc. Each of whom have had a representative in this workgroup and in the subsequent committee work. Committee members were identified by workgroup members to complete the work of the committees. Committee 4 has been given the task to make changes to the standards, as recommended and agreed upon by the workgroup. As a workgroup, we agreed with the four standards proposed. The standards moved to indicators. It is now the expectation there will be strong recommendations for the changes to the IPC.

Dr. Shapiro asked if we did in fact agree about categories. To what level of detail does this small group provide? Is this the right group to look at indicators? She stated she is not sure the members participating in this committee are the right people to do this.

Ms. Spross responded that we need to table this conversation. She reiterated that we have talked about the expectation of the group and they have been working on the standards. We are on a tight time frame and we will continue to vet what is coming out of workgroup and committees. The State Board and PSTEB might want something different. She asked what stakeholder group Dr. Shapiro believes is not represented?

Dr. Shapiro responded that when the material comes out of the committee it says do not distribute. We cannot share information. If all standards are coming out of a committee of 10 people it is not fair we cannot distribute.

Ms. Spross responded that everyone is permitted, even encouraged, to go back to their constituency groups and share information from the workgroup and committees. In fact, this has been the directive from the beginning and been addressed by her and Derek Simonsen, legal counsel to the workgroup. All committees have been given guidance that they can share information. Ms. Spross offered an apology for the confusion but restated the intent has been that all should talk to their respective stakeholder groups.

Dr. Shapiro noted that she understood we could not share the documents.

**Presentations:** From Pearson and ETS to present on EdTPA and PPAT.

How can these programs be used in certification?

**Kelly Crawford-Pearson, EdTPA** did a brief presentation for the workgroup and committee members.

EdTPA is a portfolio assessment out of Stanford (SCALE) to support teacher preparation programs. Currently 14 MD schools are using EdTPA in some capacity.

Ms. Kroll asked how many people evaluate the portfolios. Ms. Crawford answered that one person typically scores. There are some that are double scored based on need.

Mr. Christopher Lloyd, MSEA, asked how does this deal with cultural proficiency and how is it measured. Ms. Crawford answered that candidates pull together artifacts and also they have to provide rationalization for everything they are doing. Mr. Lloyd asked if it addresses implicit bias. Yes, the assessment does two or three rubrics that address it.

**Kathy Owens Oliver- ETS, PPAT** did a brief presentation for the workgroup and committee members.

PPAT is an assessment out of ETS. There is a distributed scoring model

Mr. Lloyd asked if it is aligned with National Board. Ms. Owens Oliver answered that National Board is for accomplished teachers. This lends itself to what does mastery look like?

Ms. Spross thanked to the presenters.

Ms. Spross further shared that all committee members are part of a group that is making recommendations that will be reviewed by the workgroup for inclusion in the report. The State Board, PSTEB, and General Assembly can all make recommendations above and beyond those made by the committees and the workgroup. There are several processes in place for review and comment. Everything, including all minutes from all meetings and materials that have been distributed, is available online on the MSDE's website. We recognize that there may be additional work afterwards, including on the IPC.

Mr. Lloyd asked if PSTEB and the State Board will have the opportunity to review recommendations from both workgroup and committees.

Ms. Spross reiterated that all documents are part of the report in appendices. The minutes are all online.

Linda Gronberg-Quinn asked when the report goes out for vetting how much room is there for change? Ms. Spross noted the MSDE does not take recommendations of the committees or the workgroup out. There may however be additions. If the MSDE adds recommendations, it will be noted.

Ms. Gronberg-Quinn asked who vets it.

Ms. Spross indicated that there is an internal review, and that the MSDE will continue to provide updates to our consistent groups. Furthermore, if anything is regulatory, it goes through the complete regulatory process including publication in the Maryland Register and opportunity for public comment.

Dr. Laurie Mullen asked if members of this group can distribute the recommendations. Ms. Spross reiterated that you can, as the representative, share with your constituents. We are a public meeting, so we cannot have individual meetings, but as a representative of a public 4-year institution, you can talk to the people you represent. Dr. Mullen asked if we can distribute the documents. Ms. Spross said we need to talk to our legal team. Dr. Mullen responded that with the timeline we are concerned about this. Ms. Spross acknowledged the concern and replied she will talk to our legal team. Ms. Spross, spoke with Derek Simmons by phone and informed individuals that they may share the documents with their specific communities.

Linda Gronberg-Quinn motioned to end meeting of the workgroup at 5pm. In advance so as to allow the committees to work until that time. Jennifer Frank seconded the motion.

**Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016**  
**Workgroup**  
July 25, 2017 Meeting  
**Committee #1- Certification Restructuring**

**Committee Members Present:** Dr. Karen Robertson, USM; Christopher Lloyd, MSEA; Mary Tillar, PSSAM; Jessica Cuches, PSSAM; Linda Gronberg-Quinn, Director/Dept. Chair CCBC; Kelly Meadows, MSDE, Nancy Shapiro, UMES

**Committee Members Absent:** Audra Butler, MADTEC; Margret Trader, MICUA, Carrie Conley, MAESP; Nomsa Geleta, USM

**MSDE Staff:** Ruth A. Downs

---

**Discussion**

Ms. Spross shared a brief update on the progress of Committee I.

**Dr. Robertson** stated that we should push forward with the recommendation for EdTPA. The committee agreed that a rubric assessment such as EdTPA or PPAT could be an alternative to the Praxis pedagogy assessment.

**Mr. Lloyd** stated that he had the understanding that the rubric assessment was an option. He asked a question in regards to the Praxis Core test, cut off scores without the composite score.

**Ms. Meadows** stated that she had reached out to ETS, regarding composite scores for the Praxis Core. ETS stated that no state is using a composite score for the Praxis Core.

**Ms. Meadows** stated that the committee has discussed the following with regard to the basic skills requirement:

- Eliminating the need for the basic skills assessment if you have a Bachelor's degree.
- Look at multiple measures to determine if an applicant has the basic skills required to teach
  - Course based option – Reading/Math college level – credit bearing. (This does not solve the issue for PTE folks with an Associates or HS diploma.
- Portfolio – statewide certification needs to be monitored at the state so this may not be a viable option.
- Continue with SAT, GRE, ACT as options for those who must present a basic skills measure

**Dr. Robertson** asked “How did Maryland choose the Praxis test scores?”

**Ms. Meadows** stated that the ETS Multi-State panel study chose the scores for each state and the State Board of Education determines if those scores are adopted. The SBOE may choose a different score.

**Dr. Robertson** stated that the Praxis is keeping diverse students out of the teaching field. She asked if there was some remedy with the Praxis Core to look at composite scores or change the scores?

**Ms. Shapiro** asked if there were other measures?

**Ms. Meadows** stated that the recommendation to drop the basic skills assessment requirement will be made by Committee 1. Additionally, She stated that she had been reading about the use of the SAT/Praxis Core. Her understanding after reading the information, is that the tests are used for determining whether or not a student

will succeed in the first 2 years of college. Ms. Meadows questioned why MSDE requires both a Bachelor's degree and passing scores on a basic skills test that purports to measure the likelihood of success in college. If GPA is the issue, should the committee be discussing using a sliding GPA scale to determine if a basic skills measure is necessary?

**Dr. Robertson** stated that a 2.0 GAP is needed to get into most fields, but a 3.0 GAP is needed to get into internship at Towson.

**Ms. Gronberg-Quinn** stated that at the community college level need a 2.75 GPA to get into a field placement.

**Ms. Tillar** asked if the other states had alternatives for basic skill measures?

**Dr. Shapiro** stated that CAEP does not recognize Praxis Core as they do SAT or ACT.

**Mr. Lloyd** asked that by accepting the Bachelor's degree in lieu of a basic skills measure, how would that affect the cohort of the people who don't hold a bachelor's?

**Ms. Meadows** stated that it would mostly be the PTE folks, with a minimum requirement of an high school diploma.

- Much of the PTE areas are performance based.
- Would it be appropriate to use an industry license or a credential?
- What exactly should be measured?

**Ms. Shapiro** inquired about the SAT scores. Do the applicants need to be good at everything or just need to communicate?

**Mr. Lloyd** stated:

- Written communication/oral communication be proficient.
- Level of math that allows one to interact with the children.
- Have a basic content knowledge.

**Ms. Shapiro** asked several questions regarding the Praxis.

- Is the Praxis math aligned with what is being taught?
- Do we think that the Praxis is the right test?

ETS shared that test takers who take a test multiple times but do not pass may request a breakdown of where they were weak and an analysis of their score performance.

**Mr. Lloyd** stated that at some point, PTE folks will become frustrated by not passing and will quit. A course option may be better for them as we can work with them to take a basic math/reading class. He also stated that some states have made revisions in their requirements. Delaware has changed from 5 years to 3 years and New Hampshire uses an alternative program portfolio. He stated that Maryland needs to make it flexible and allow the people to grow in the job.

**Ms. Meadows** stated that she felt like they were saying the same thing.

- Courses: option for basic skills (Associate/High School Diploma – PTE people)
- Under Graduate degree: not require basic skills with a Bachelor's degree or higher (would not hold BA holders to basic skills requirements)
- Certification: Dismiss basic skills assessment requirement for certification. Programs may still have the requirement but it would not be a certification requirement.
- Conditional Certificate
  - Look to see if current requirements are appropriate.
  - 2-year certificate – one time if you present 12 credits

- Full time teacher
  - Requirement – Bachelor’s Degree
- Adjunct Teacher
  - Requirement – minimum of a Bachelor’s Degree and 5 years of experience

**Mr. Lloyd** inquired as to how many people have conditional certificates? He stated that we need more RTC programs across the state. We should have multiple systems work with the state. He asked, how do we convince people with BA’s to become teachers? Cohort courses?

**Ms. Shapiro** stated that adjunct is one category and CDC is another category.

**Mr. Lloyd** asked, if there was a way that systems could work with the state to develop various modules to use across the state? Can there be a partnership with IHE. What would it take for certification? How long?

**Ms. Shapiro** asked about the ACTT and how did the state get them to pass Praxis?

**Ms. Meadows** stated the conversation seems to be centered around basic skills.

- How to get more RTC or alternate in certification.
- Transcript analysis break down (credit count).

**Ms. Shapiro** stated that we need to provide some way to fill the gap.

**Ms. Spross** stated the following

- 2 year/4 years – offering test support
- Some sort of state based development
- CPD credit

**Ms. Spross** asked the following questions.

- How do we bridge the students coming in from a 4 year program?
- How do we differentiate Maryland’s program?
  - Statewide PD
  - Statewide application

**Ms. Meadows** stated the following:

- It is not a branding problem. Accountability measures are high.
- What are the expectations of adjunct compared to conditional?
- The committee will make recommendation for conditional certificate
- Certification is a set of minimum standards and should not be confused with employment requirements.
- Recommend that the committee discuss and put final recommendations down at next meeting.

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

No materials of interest were requested for the next meeting.





**Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016**  
**Workgroup**  
**July 25, 2017 Meeting**  
**Committee #2- Incentives**

**Committee Members Present:** Althea Pennerman (USM); Justin Heid (MSEA); Fran Kroll, (MADTECC); Alexandra Cambra, (MSDE),

**Committee Members Absent:** Monique Sloan (MAESP); Tayna Williams (MICUA), Tony Navaro (PSSAM), Jeanne-Marie Holly, MSDE

**MSDE Staff:** Ruth Downs

**Alternates Present:** None

---

**Approval of Minutes:** Approved

**Discussion:**

The committee reviewed their previous recommendations and began the discussion of fleshing out some additional details for each recommendation.

1. Loan Forgiveness

- Should be open to all, not limited to educators working in particular schools, content areas or regions
- Consider requiring a time commitment for achieving loan forgiveness – 10 years suggested, with loan forgiven beginning in year 11
- Concern from members over the delay in pay back; “millennials” not able to look that far ahead
- Desired outcome is to increase the number of years for teachers to remain in the field; by increasing the number of years for repayment, we increase the number of years one is invested
- Committee considered incremental increases over time for repayment (i.e., 10% forgiven after 3 years, 20% after 5 years, 80% after 10 years, etc.)
- Educators will be eligible if they work in a public school for at least 10 years
- Loan forgiveness should be up to \$15, 000 based on data collected by MSDE

2. Quality Teacher Incentive Act

- Continue funding for National Board Certificated teachers (NBC) and add funding for Advanced Professional Certificated teachers (APC)
- Committee considered an extension of the time a candidate is eligible to receive the stipend; should extend beyond when a school is no longer identified as a Comprehensive Needs School (CNS)
- Committee would like to link to Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) by using same criteria for CNS or “Priority Schools”

- Committee considered expansion beyond those working in CNS to also address those working in geographic need areas
  - Committee members are concerned with the incentive not being equitable; other members note that if you overextend the incentive you may not have the funding available
  - Committee undecided on the number of years beyond which a school is identified as a CNS to allow the stipend to be awarded
3. Statewide Common Application
- Jessica Bancroft (MSDE) presented this concept as learned of through the Urban Schools Human Capital Academy
  - Committee considered the creation of an online application that allows an applicant to apply for teaching vacancies throughout Maryland by only filling out one application
  - Districts would access the database of candidates to search for appropriate candidates
  - South Carolina and Pennsylvania currently utilizing this concept
  - Committee agrees this is an ideal way for the State to support employment in all counties
4. Maryland Alternative Teaching Opportunity Program
- MSDE presented Education Article §6-120, a previously unfunded statute, that was created in order to encourage the use of alternative preparation programs to meet the demand for qualified teachers in science, mathematics, and special education
  - Funding could be used to support participation in the pre-residency internship required for between 4-8 weeks
  - Committee members would like additional time to consider this idea; some consternation from members over the need for such an incentive was discussed
5. Teacher Academies of Maryland (TAM)
- MSDE reminded the committee of this idea from previous discussions
  - Committee has discussed recommending that all counties engage in articulation agreements for having TAMs in schools across each county
  - Committee wishes to discuss this idea again at the next meeting

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

Mr. Heid will bring example of Pennsylvania's statewide application printout to demonstrate the usefulness of this type of system

**Next Steps:** Committee will meet to determine final recommendations. Fran Kroll shared that she has not shared the recommendations or discussion of the committee with her stakeholder group and has only represented herself in the committee due to a misunderstanding of the Open Meetings Act allowances. Justin Heid stated that he has consistently shared with his stakeholder group throughout the process, as he understood that to be the direction given. Althea Pennerman made no comment regarding her stakeholder group. All members tasked with explicit directions to share the recommendations of the committee with their respective groups to garner feedback for the next meeting.

**Teacher Induction, Reduction and Advancement Act 2016 Meeting  
Committees 3 and 5  
July 25, 2017  
Minutes**

**Important Dates:**

Next Sub-committee meeting- August 29, 2017

Workgroup meeting- September 25, 2017

Draft (Final from September Work Group Meeting) Report to Dr. Salmon- October 1, 2017

State Board meeting- due to Annapolis General Assembly- November 1, 2017

**Present:** Dan Capozzi, MSDE, Jasmine Stewart, Teacher/ MSEA; Deb Poese, MC/MADETECC, Kathy Angeletti, UMD, Yi Huang, Coppin State, Henoach Hailu, Teacher/MSEA, Jessica Bancroft/ MSDE, Laura Liccione/MSDE

**Meeting Minutes:**

- Introduction of members  
Review of Recommendations- pulled together Committee III and V
  
- Reviewed research- Ingersoll and Strong- hyperlinked in review of recommendations  
Teacher Turnover Cost- reviewed

**Opening Remarks:**

Kathy Angeletti will look at Linda Darling Hammond and Maria Hyler's research around recommendations and may be able to provide information to support recommendations. If so, information will be provided to Jessica Bancroft.

Kathy Angeletti asked the question- How are we getting public feedback? Jessica Bancroft and Deb Poese both advised the best way is to visit the website. It's a one-month cycle because minutes must be approved before posting on website.

Review of the Open Meeting policy. The group can share the approved minutes; Much of our recommendations are around induction and mentoring. Kathy Angeletti asked about sharing this information with the PDS partner in P12 schools. She noted the time constraint and the ability to share the work particularly with IHEs.

**Our Work for Today:**

1) Resources to add to Recommendations 1-3 should be provided to Jessica Bancroft; hyperlinks will be available in final document for Subcommittee III and V.

2) COMAR on mentors: Sensitivity in language used in recommendations written in such a way that would not preclude mentors with fewer years of experience.

### Discussion Highlights:

- ❖ Agreement in accuracy of Recommendations in general; however, the committee offered a concern on whether the [Kirwan Commission](#) is looking at this? This should be reflected with highest need and a possible inequity in funding. It becomes problematic not having a quality mentor. Committee member noted it could be a quality issue with mentors. The committee shared anecdotal information around how a poor mentor adversely affected the future of teacher candidates. Other concerns included the inequity of teacher mentors across Maryland- some mentors are full-load, while others are released. In some districts, some mentors have taught two years and become mentors; how is this a best practice for Maryland's non-tenured teachers?
- ❖ Correction needed from preceding minutes to: 2c- Establish a quality assurance framework that meets state and national guidelines such as National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, Standards for Professional Learning and [Model Code of Ethical Standards for Educators](#).  
*It should read:* Establish a quality assurance framework that meets state and national guidelines such as National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, Standards for Professional Learning and [Model Code of Ethics for Educators](#)
- ❖ Some counties do a very good job of preparing mentors and providing feedback to mentees. How do we ensure non-biased feedback? An example included anonymous surveys.
- ❖ Do we have an additional recommendation on funding? i.e., 20% more time for planning with mentors?
- ❖ Where does the money come from that we ensure equity? That is the core issue, decentralizing the state. We need a robust accountability on each LEA on how funds are being used? There are contextual issues in each district.
- ❖ Discussion on possible revision to Recommendation 3 to include language on Equitable funding distribution to LEAs

*Based on above comments, Committee concluded it was essential to draw out the equitable distributions of funds and resources across districts to form a new recommendation\**

### **Recommendation 4\*-**

Provide appropriate funding and infrastructure to ensure equitable and accountable implementation of the above recommendations in compliance with statewide policies, eg. COMAR 13A.07.01 and local operations.

**Additional revisions to Recommendations include:**

*Revise:* For Recommendations 1 and 3, add the word “equitable” preceding the word statewide to read:

*Recommendation 1*-Create statewide and equitable professional

*Recommendation 3*- Create statewide and equitable mentoring training pathways

**This concludes the discussion highlights. Changes are reflected in the formal Recommendations below.**

**TIRA Recommendations from Committee III and Committee V (As of 6/20/2017; revised 7/25/17)**

**Recommendation 1:** Create statewide and equitable professional development pathways with career-wide learning opportunities for educators across the state.

- a. Leverage state, LEA, Union, and two- and four-year higher educational expertise and resources to increase quality, transparency, and portability of professional learning.
- b. Leverage new knowledge, promising practices, and advanced technologies to increase access and success, including an online repository for professional development, mentor training, and induction programs.
- c. Leverage statewide and regional partnerships, resources, and delivery structures to ensure equitable access across the state.

**Recommendation 2:** Establish LEA-IHE partnerships in developing, delivering, and ensuring high quality professional development programs that link but are not limited to certification regulations for renewal.

- a. Establish shared vision, responsibilities, and resources for professional development, mentor training, and induction programs that meet LEA and school priorities and address individualized needs for teachers.
- b. Establish professional development, mentor training, and induction programs that incorporate evidence-based practices with context, content and pedagogical currency, such as cultural proficiency and technology integration, to increase teacher effectiveness and student achievement.
- c. Establish a quality assurance framework that meets state and national guidelines such as National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, Standards

for Professional Learning and [Model Code of Ethical Standards for Educators](#)  
[Model Code of Ethics for Educators](#).

**Recommendation 3:** Create state-wide **and equitable** mentoring training pathways among IHEs, LEAs and regulatory agencies to support teacher preparation and teacher leadership development.

- a. Co-develop and implement high-impact mentorship training programs which embed innovative evidence-based strategies and practices, such as adult learning theories, cultural competencies, and peer coaching, to support teacher development.
- b. Provide appropriate time and resources to address professional needs and support individualized learning for mentors and mentees.
- c. Establish mentoring networks and provide theme-based (such as EL and special education), role-based (such as department chair and resource teacher), and or/context-based (urban and rural schools) opportunities to improve effectiveness mentorship in diverse school settings.
- d. Match mentees with mentors who have similar experiences serving specific student populations, such as student with disabilities, EL, and socio-economic background.

***For these three recommendations to be implemented, funding is necessary to the degree to which the committee added an additional recommendation:***

**Recommendation 4\*:** Provide appropriate funding and infrastructure to ensure equitable and accountable implementation of the above recommendations in compliance with statewide policies, eg. [COMAR 13A.07.01](#) and local operations.

**Research:**

An excellent summary of the research on teacher induction is provided by Richard Ingersoll and Michael Strong's in their [2011 academic journal article](#). In addition, past analyses by New Teacher Center for the states of [Colorado](#) and [Minnesota](#) also distilled the research to demonstrate benefit afforded from specific aspects of induction and mentoring. [The NCTAF Teacher Turnover Cost Calculator](#) can be used to estimate a financial price tag of teacher turnover and estimate potential savings.

## COMMITTEE 4 – REVISING THE Institutional Performance Criteria

JULY 25, 2017

### MEETING NOTES

#### **In Attendance:**

Lisa Booth – Maryland Elementary Principals Association

Stacie Burch – MADTECC

Laurie Mullen – Towson U – USM

Gene Schaefer – UMBC – MACTE

Jennifer Frank – MICUA

Minutes from June 20 were approved unanimously.

#### **Discussion**

There was a question from Laurie Mullen re: dissemination of recommendations prior to posting on the website. This concern was that all institutions do not know what is in the document regarding recommendations from the committee.

Michelle – The document reflects what the committee recommended at each meeting since the committee began meeting in January. We made a decision in January that this was a representative group that would not go back and re-discuss decisions that had been made, but that it was the responsibility of the representatives from each stakeholder group to give and get information from its members. This revision is scheduled to be presented to the Board in October which leaves very little time to complete this work.

Laurie said she started thinking that as the recommendations are representing all institutions, there will be some institutions that will not agree with the standards because it does not meet CAEP standards, so we may have a dilemma.

Michelle stated that the charge was to take advantage of the opportunity for MD to decide what MD wanted and to leverage CAEP, particularly for entrance requirements and the GPA.

Laurie said it was also in our minutes that CAEP was in our charge.

Michelle responded that legislative changes (General Assembly 2017) made CAEP no longer a part of charge. Reviewing the changes Laurie made to document, Michelle noted that not a lot had changed but some had been moved around. A number of colleges and universities do not require the same things at the same times although everything is required at the end if a candidate is to be certified, so is the committee saying the state is going to set the requirements in order to meet the CAEP requirements? That was not the directive for the committee.

Laurie asked, do we want MD to have a lesser standard than CAEP?

Michelle replied that, as a community, we need to deal with all institutions, both nationally accredited and not nationally accredited.

Laurie stated that, as a Dean that wants to be CAEP accredited, the bar is too low. IPC is less rigorous than CAEP standards.

Michelle responded that the recommendations are not flushed out yet regarding data. Please remember that CAEP is not yet an accreditor. The outcomes may be different, perhaps not less rigorous.

Gene said the current IPC was not rigorous and much depended upon who showed up at the meetings to give input.

Michelle said the next step would be to make clear definitions of what data would fulfill what requirements.

Laurie expressed concern about having multiple pathways into teaching when rigor needs to be high.

Stacie interjected that there should be multiple pathways, but no easy pathways.

Michelle said that what we currently have is multiple pathways. Our concern is to determine the standards that all pathways would use. Rigorous is a floating term, defined, like “proficient”, with different agreed-upon measurements to support the term.

The following was in response to questions about the Open Meeting Act (OMA) and the fact that the most recent document said *Do Not Disseminate*.

Sarah joined the committee to offer opinion from attorney. To meet the OMA requirements, we can send out information, get feedback from various stakeholder groups, and bring those comments to the committee for discussion by the committee as a whole; or committee members can send the comments from each respective community to MSDE prior to the meeting, so that MSDE can send them to the workgroup and committee in advance of the next meeting. The discussion regarding the specific standards must happen at the meeting in a public forum per the OMA. All documents have been published on website after each meeting, and Sarah repeated that at each meeting she had advised members to share with their constituents and to bring reactions, suggestions, etc., back to committees.

Laurie said the, because she had felt restrained by the “no dissemination” flag, she had not been able to get feedback from constituents.

Sarah said that after today’s meeting, we will turn around any comments from the meeting to send out to committee to share with constituents to be shared in advance of the next meeting , one time out and one time back, then share with stakeholders represent. Sarah can then send out comments to all committee members as part of the packet that is sent prior to the meeting.

Laurie wanted to know what should be done with her suggested edits to the IPC revision document?

Discussion re: Components/Recommendations (suggested recommendations from Laurie):

Component I – clarified evidence of entrance and exit requirements.

Discussion followed regarding edTPA as a valid assessment of intern performance in the internship, and its relative validity to PPAT and home-grown performance assessments.



Michelle – requires that use validated assessment by all institutions.

Gene – is the system validated? Don't we need to validate home grown assessments?

Michelle – EdTPA is only valid if it is nationally scored.

Laurie – performance evaluation is a better indication of ability to teach than Praxis II. Can we make changes in IPC (*to reflect use of performance assessment in lieu of pedagogy test*)?

Michelle – remember that the standards must be achievable and represent all 23 colleges and universities, including the small independent colleges and anyone that has teacher education. For example – putting in a requirement for EdTPA or PPAT for places like MICA or Peabody that are currently performance based, may not be the best approach for Maryland.

Emily Dow – we will get push back from these institutions. We need a model that fits most in a way that moves us forward successfully.

Laurie – the IPC rigor is not quality enough. We need to have conversations to balance out CAEP. Providing evidence does not mean that it is good evidence.

Michelle – can it just be demonstrate proficiency without a common agreement as to the definition of “proficient?” One person's definition and observation might be different from another when it comes to judging its demonstration from a new teacher. Laurie added that this made a good argument for validated performance instruments. Anecdotally, we here there is a huge misalignment between MCCRS relative to what we are currently teaching in math at the IHE level and what is required in the school system. There is a chasm between what being asked to teach and what they are teaching teachers to teach. Perhaps the – language has to be changed to trigger what proficiency should be.

Laurie suggested a major change, removing the MTTs and to suggest acceptance of ISTE (national standards). Gene asked as a provider, which set of standards do we use? Are the international standards close enough to what we see as appropriate?

Michelle agreed they are outdated. Laurie replied that the new ISTE standards, just released, are very focused on student learning. No decision was made but there was little dissent to removing and replacing with ISTE.

Lisa suggested that a bigger problem is that teachers need stronger content knowledge as well to recognize where it is going wrong and be able to correct kids' misunderstandings, particularly in math. t

Michelle reiterated that math appears to be the main problem. We get hung up on the 12 hours required when we may need to say that additional classes are needed beyond the 12 if a potential teacher does demonstrate those deficiencies early on.

Stacie said that teaching at the college level, she sees students really just plug in numbers instead of really understanding math. This makes the difference between doing math and teaching math.

Michelle said we need to add something about defining proficiency. Rigor is linked. Rigor is the outcome. How do we define proficiency at every content area. The thinking at MSDE is that higher education needs to be directed by the needs of the K-12 community and the alignment and the

definition of proficiency. TO DO – at some point we need to get Debbie Ward (Math) and other content specialists at MSDE involved in the conversation.

Laurie – at Towson, we would agree.

Gene said we need to look at the 12 credits that currently only faculty members in math dept. can teach math, which is often not the case.

Michelle asked if we can reasonably have a plan by October 1 to define rigor and proficiency.

Gene said we need to re-visit with more experts when we put forward recommendations.

Lisa noted the difference between elementary educators and high school educators.

Gene said that many entering math programs have taken calculus, but that does not mean that they can teach math.

Lisa suggested that a change in thinking in how we teach math is required.

Gene suggested that that committee note where a series of revisions need to take place over the next year and expand the committee to include more content experts, every elementary content.

Gene said we should build in a process for the IPC to be reviewed every X number of years – would like a recommendation for a build-in review system for this document. Michelle said this would be perfectly placed in the final IPC Standard.

Gene – also those who reviewed can make comment re anything they had difficulties with, with a pilot process the best way to begin to use the new IPC. Lisa said we should include all stakeholders in that pilot review process. Michelle said we would concentrate on developing the framework, adjusting standards documents, process for review, establish a pilot system that collects data on both content and process and uses it for immediate revision of one or both.

Laurie – CAEP standard 3 asks that schools have a diverse candidate pool ; how to add to IPC.

Gene said we should ask institutions to look at both diversity and rigor – who coming in and who is going out? IHE can build a system that supports them so that they are stronger when they graduate.

Michelle said we have to add the demonstration of recruitment of candidates of diversity, including gender. Gene said we have to look at all elements of diversity – expand the concept. Laurie said that the reality is that the vast majority of the candidates do not look like the students they will teach.

Gene asked, should the teacher population look like the current students or the current university or the ones graduating from high school. What is the standard working toward? Movement of standard to get to the diversity of the institution. What about the current induction for universities and college?

Michelle said that K-12 is looking for a teaching population more reflective of the students.

Lisa suggested maybe offer scholarships to encourage diverse students to choose teaching as a profession.

Michelle – ESSA listening groups – feedback was that the focus was around culture and poverty more than race. Teachers do not know what to do with the cultural differences as well as race differences.

Lisa – teaching candidates need to be poised in their approach when learning to thrive in new cultures and experiences.

Michelle said the instruction and direct experience with diverse candidates we have included in the IPC cannot limit to only racial diversity. Most modern teachers may have fewer problems dealing with racial differences, but do not understand widely disparate culture and real poverty.

Laurie – for CAEP, we have go show evidence on student learning so we might need to include. Often it is pre-post type of internship.

Gene – need a series of responsibilities in their content areas for program completion. Would love to change the certification for middle schools.

Michelle agreed, adding that the grade bands make it difficult to find teachers qualified to teach all of middle schools.

Michelle, equating PDS to the medical models, what competencies will be seen in a level 1, should there be a base line? How do we structure the four levels?

Stacie said we need a broader range of PDS in order to hit all of cultural areas of diversity. PDS leveled in a sense that can provide a particular experience.

Michelle said we have to relate the competencies of InTASC to the PDS standards. Strong, great idea but will take longer than November.

Michelle said this requires that we develop a system that can be set up like a medical model.

Gene, we need a flexible model so that teachers can have different experiences.

Lisa shared that there is cultural proficiency training throughout the county. (Howard) Needed in order to understand the kids they are teaching. Combine with high quality cultural proficiency training.

Gene said we would call it a PDS because it represents a growth process.

Laurie, it would be helpful to draft what competencies would have in the PDS.

Michelle, align with InTASC. Consider changing term to PDC (communities instead of schools).

Gene suggested we build in experimental model.

Laurie asked what would it mean for schools if we tell them they are not a PDS anymore?

Lisa – all schools want PDS but want them to be different—schools would love to be PDS school. This is a process that would need to be managed.

Gene said we could to get the PDS coordinators and the principals together.

At the end of the meeting, Laurie Mullen suggested that she or a group of people would begin to draft InTASC competencies related to field experiences and assignment of PDS levels.

Michelle will post, along with the minutes and other documents, Laurie's suggested revisions. Any changes made by MSDE will be in the form of comments, not changes to the document.

