

The MARYLAND STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
200 West Baltimore Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND TEACHER EDUCATION BOARD

December 5, 2019

Minutes

The 442nd meeting of the Professional Standards and Teacher Education Board (PSTEB) was held at the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), 200 West Baltimore Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21201 on December 5, 2019. Mr. Christopher Lloyd called the meeting to order at 9:31 a.m.

The following members were in attendance: Ms. Jennifer Berkley, Ms. Linda Chinnia, Mr. Louis D’Ambrosio, Dr. Debi Gartland, Mr. Charles Hagan, Mr. Darren Hornbeck, Ms. Maleeta Kitchen, Mr. Christopher Lloyd, Ms. Kelli Midgley, Dr. Kindel Nash, Ms. Debra Poese, Ms. Karen Saar, Ms. Sarah Spross and Dr. Winona Taylor.

The following members were absent: Mr. Peter Baily, Dr. Kris McGee, Dr. Patricia Saelens, Ms. Sandra Skordalos, Dr. Jack Smith and Ms. Geralda Thompson.

The following Maryland State Department of Education staff members were present: Ms. Alexandra Cambra, Ms. Kelly Meadows, Mr. Robert Eccles, Dr. Hsin-Yuan Chen, Ms. Ruth Downs (recorder) and Ms. Carla Boyd, Esq., Attorney General’s Office.

PRELIMINARY ITEMS

Recognition of Guests

Ms. Tina Dove, MSEA
 Ms. Geraldine Duval, MSEA
 Ms. Jennifer Frank, MICUA
 Mr. Courtney Gabes, BTU
 Ms. Lindsey McCormick, PSSAM

Public Comments

None

Announcements

None

State Board Update (Attachment I)

Dr. Miya Simpson presented the December 3 State Board summary to the Professional Standards and Teacher Education Board (PSTEB).

ACTION ITEMS

Approval of November Minutes

The November minutes were not available to be approved. The November minutes will be posted in draft format on the website until approved at the January meeting.

Mr. Christopher Lloyd entertained a motion to publish the draft of the November minutes on the website.

MOTION: Dr. Winona Taylor/Ms. Linda Chinnia to approve the publication of the November minutes in draft format.

Approval of Proposed Agenda Items for January 2020

- Approval of Minutes
- State Board update
- Regulations as appropriate

Mr. Christopher Lloyd entertained a motion to approve the January Agenda items with some flexibility.

MOTION: Ms. Maleeta Kitchen/Dr. Debi Gartland To approve the January 2020 Agenda items with some flexibility.

Commission On Innovation and Excellence in Education Update Discussion

Mr. Lloyd stated that there were two items that he wanted to discuss with the Board. The first item was related to the Commission on Innovation and Excellence Education and the second item was related to the State Board Action.

Mr. Lloyd said that what he was going to do was because his mind operates best chronologically, was to pick up where the

Board left off which was prior to the November 12 meeting date of the Kirwan Commission. He informed the members that he had a series of things to provide to them, that he asked to be included as part of notes for the meeting. He also informed the members that after he introduced the items, he was going to pause to see if there were questions and/or comments which he will try to answer as best as he can.

Mr. Lloyd stated that as the members recall at its November, the State Board reiterated their question to the Kirwan Commission regarding whether or not the regulations as proposed align with the Kirwan Commission’s recommendations. The State Board believed that the regulations that they proposed were aligned with the Commission’s recommendations and wanted to validate that belief. So the Department of Legislative Services on November 12 provided this document, which he provided to the Board members. The document compares the proposed State Board regulations to the Kirwan Commission’s recommendations. The document is divided into two parts, the first part is the Teacher Preparation Program regulations and the second part is related to the Educator Licensure regulations.

The teacher preparation is on page 1 and the educator licensure runs from page 2 through page 11. He gave the members an opportunity to briefly review the document as they had not seen it before. He informed them that the document is publicly available on the Kirwan Commission’s website, but he wanted to provide the opportunity for them to review and then he would talk a little bit about what transpired on November 12 so that they had an understanding of what happened in that meeting.

Continued Discussion

Mr. Lloyd told the members that the Department of Legislative staff had been assigned to work with the Kirwan Commission and in that capacity, the Chair of the Commission asked the Department of Legislative services to conduct the analysis. The report was presented to the commission at its meeting on November 12, as well as to the general public. The report provided what the commission’s view is on the alignment with its recommendations compared to the proposed regulations. Mr. Lloyd stated that he understands that the regulations sent for permission to publish have been rescinded, but he thought that it would be valuable within the context of this conversation and the members understanding to see where the commission’s views were related to the comparison.

On November 12, the commission requested that Dr. Salmon and Ms. Spross presented the regulations as well as the thinking behind the regulations and the development. Dr. Salmon and Ms. Spross presented a power point and a chart that

that describes how the regulations were aligned with Kirwan based upon the design. Both of these documents can also be found on the website, but I am going to hand out copies. Mr. Lloyd stated that following the presentation from Dr. Salmon and Ms. Spross, he had the opportunity to present on behalf of the Professional Standards Board. He expressed the Board's concerns and views of where it was based upon some of the conversations that he had had with commission members. It was suggested that Mr. Lloyd serve as an introductory lead role and so he stressed in the process we believe that it was problematic for this board where the State Board overrode our desire to have a conference committee. The PSTEB believes that the investment of all parties is better than compliance and that we were headed down a compliance route. Mr. Lloyd tried to stress how high level themes to the commission, because he wanted the commissioners to understand where this board was in this process, rather than simply the technical details which were available to them in multiple other written documents. Mr. Lloyd provided the members with a copy of the comments from the PSTEB, as well as a copy of the comments made by the University System of Maryland and the Maryland Independent Colleges and Universities Association as presented by Dr. Rice and Dr. Thrift.

Dr. Rice is the Dean of Education at Maryland and Dr. Thrift is the Dean of Education at Notre Dame. They are both co-chairs of the Maryland Education of Deans and Councils. Dr. Rice, Dr. Thrift and Mr. Lloyd served on the second panel and the first panel was comprised of Dr. Salmon and Ms. Spross. Following the panel presentations, the commissioners had an opportunity to ask questions and seek clarity around anything that was presented or they had concerns about. It was a robust discussion that went on for approximately two hours. It was scheduled for only 45 minutes. Mr. Lloyd felt that the commission expressed a great deal of interest in this and in the process.

Continued Discussion

Senator Pinsky, the Chair of Education in the Senate, had a motion on the floor to be able to direct the state Board to rescind the regulations because he had concerns about the process. There was some discussion of that. Delegate Luedtke at the time asked to table that motion and that request was acted upon and granted. Mr. Lloyd stated that this takes us through the November 12 meeting and that he was not going to capsule the conversation because it was robust and he felt that it was best if they watched it for themselves. He stated that there were multiple views expressed. Dr. Salmon expressed concerns that she did not think that this was the appropriate venue for this conversation and Secretary Brinkley agreed with that. This is best suited at AELR. He believed that the commission heard that but acted in a way because he thinks that Dr. Kirwan and the others have a keen interest in the Kirwan Commission's recommendations. So they thought that it was appropriate to have that conversation at the commission table. He stated that all of the documents that he presented to them were available on the Kirwan Commission website and he urged them to look at that as well. Mr. Lloyd concluded his discussion in regards to the November 12 meeting. He asked the members if anyone had questions in regards to that day, because there was a great deal of interest from the commission members that got PSTEB to this point and prior to that meeting, he stated that he could tell that there was a lot of interest by the number of Commissioners that had reached out to him to have conversations around the process that had led to this. Mr. Lloyd thinks in part it is because of the letter that the PSTEB had transmitted to AELR, as well as conversations he knows that legislators had and Dr. Kirwan had had related to this. Mr. Lloyd thinks that the idea is to implement with fidelity and with smoothness. Mr. Lloyd stated that in his comments, he alluded to Massachusetts and the success of the Massachusetts model. They created an investment which took time, it took energy and it was very messy. Mr. Lloyd asked Ms. Spross if she had anything to add or comment on in regards to the November 12 meeting.

Ms. Spross stated that the PowerPoint that Mr. Lloyd had talked about not only outlined the process behind the regulations, but also the number of meetings and events that occurred in preparation over the past 2 ½ to 3 years at both the State Board and this Board with the Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016 workgroup and a second document were part of the materials provided with the PowerPoint in addition to the comparison that Mr. Lloyd shared with you with the regulations and each of the design assumptions. There was also a chart of all of the meetings that occurred between both the State Board and PSTEB as well.

Mr. Lloyd stated that this takes us through November 12. Mr. Lloyd informed the members that he was going to briefly stop there, because he wanted to make sure that he could answer questions so that there is clarity at the table about the actions up to this point, so that the Board can make strategic and careful decisions going forward.

Ms. Kitchen stated that she knew that the Board had talked about this in great detail, but she doesn't know where the conversation ended. She was referencing page 3 on the comparison chart, in regards to the whole 65% nationally. She asked Mr. Lloyd to refresh her memory about the previous conversation regarding that. Was there any discussion around that?

Continued Discussion

Mr. Lloyd stated that the conversation around NBCT pass rates was extended into the Kirwan Commission meeting on November 12, because the revised calculations on those pass rates. They felt that they had been a little too aggressive and that we would not be able to meet that threshold in the amount of time. They did the analysis based upon looking at other states who have relatively high rates of National Board attainment. They were particularly looking at Washington State and North Carolina as having a relatively high number of National Board teachers. What they found was that the Initial numbers that they put out of this 65% pass rate by a certain date, was recommended that they were to aggressive and that likely Maryland would not be able to do that. That has had relevance for the conversation that we have had at this Board, because part of what the conversation at the Kirwan Commission has been in an interim process as we move to that level of certification. What do we do in that time period related to APC, Master's and the like? He stated that we have had those conversations at this table. There is a transition that needs to take place in order to get there. Mr. Lloyd stated to kind of indirectly answer your question, the conversation here and the conversation at the Kirwan Commission has been at what point would one achieve a kind of tipping point for national board-certified teachers in the state. When would that occur? How long would that take and the various design assumptions to that? And they are just design assumptions, which have made it impossible to predict this with any degree of accuracy because no state has achieved the level that Maryland is seeking. Mr. Lloyd stated that he was not saying that it is impossible, but given that it is a strict assumption that one is making. Dr. Joe Doctor of the National Board was brought in. Dr. Doctor provided his department's analysis of how that would transpire. So this is an area that Mr. Lloyd thinks is going to be in flux and quite frankly, he thinks that it is going to be a topic conversation given that Senator Pinsky is a strong proponent of National Board certification. Senator Pinsky has made it very clear that the National Board certification, as part of the career ladder, is a vital part of what is going to happen. Mr. Lloyd was not saying that is how it is going to end up, but he was saying that it is how the Chair of the Education Committee feels and he has made those feelings very clear.

Ms. Berkley, referencing page 2 of the comparison report. She stated that the analysis says that it is unclear that the career ladder aligned with the new regulations. She asked, how are the states going to address that?

Mr. Lloyd stated that this was part of the discussion that the commission had. Mr. Lloyd stated that he thinks that they would like to see more regulatory language that further describes how a career lattice might fit into that. Mr. Lloyd thinks that there is a difference of opinion between the department and the commission on what should be and what should not be in regulatory language. Mr. Lloyd thinks in large part that this will most likely be fleshed out in larger legislative conversations. House Bill 1 and 2 are still in their relative infancy. The commission funded lattice in FY 2025 and that is the first year you will see the funding for it. Mr. Lloyd's stated that his expectations would be that in some way shape or form if that level of funding goes through at that timeline, my assumption would be that they would expect the regulatory language will be in place in advance of that because you would not be able to implement the lattice without the appropriate regulatory language. Mr. Lloyd thinks that they see it as regulatory, but he thinks that the department does not see it as regulatory. He asked Ms. Spross if his statement was correct.

Continued Discussion

Ms. Spross said that based on the regulations and how they have been developed, very clearly as it was presented to this Board and presented to the State Board, were the regulations that went through. The career lattice, which is in the period Level I, is clearly identified as state licensure. If you read through all the design assumptions, design elements and design implications, you are going to see where they talk about state license teachers and nationally board-certified teachers will make up the first two runs of the career lattice. Licensure is your base line process for how you get into the teaching profession, just like any other trade and/or profession. Board certification is in addition to licensure and is an advance of it. While there was debate and differences of opinion about that, there is very specific language in the Kirwan Commission design assumptions that is specific to that there will be licensed teachers, that they will be nationally board certified. It is 50% with an additional 20% that are nationally board certified. It is done in that way so that not all

teachers are forced into an administrative pathway and have opportunities on the teacher leader track, but don't have to pursue the teacher ladder track if that is not the case. Ms. Spross also thought that it was important to note, even though this was not discussed on November 12, but had been discussed. Is that in order to become nationally board certified, one must hold a license from a state to teach and must have 3-years of experience. So, if the implication is that all new teachers have National Board Certification in order to teach in Maryland, we will cut off our pipeline to only state teachers. So, we need to be very careful about where we head with that and that does have direct implications with both this Board and the State Board. So when you are reading those design assumptions and looking through all of them, the other piece that is very clear in those design assumptions and I was quite outspoken during the testimony about this, is that promotion to teacher leader, master teacher or professor master teacher is based on performance and experience. Those are not functions of licensure, those are functions of employment and in order to be recommended as a lead teacher, master teacher or master professor teacher in those design assumptions. One must have a recommendation from a principal and be supported by the superintendent. Ms. Spross reiterated again that this is not a function of licensure, but a function of employment. Ms. Spross stated yes that there are some differences and competing languages within the design assumptions in the Kirwan Commission report. So when we are talking about licensure, just like she had said at the State Board, just like she had said at PSTEB, and just like she said on November 12th down in Annapolis, licensure is level I and that is the first level on the Commission's lattice.

Continued Discussion

Ms. Spross stated that she wanted to say only the departments view on that, but the regulations were based on that and put forward based on the function of level I from the State Board that was granted permission to publish and now have been rescinded.

Mr. Lloyd asked Ms. Spross, so it's the State Board and the Department's view? Am I correct in saying that?

Ms. Spross stated that she does not like to speak for the State Board but that is the basis.

Mr. Lloyd stated to Ms. Spross that is what it seems she just did. He wanted clarity on that, so that will be the assumption of the Department and the State Board.

Dr. Taylor – page 3 of the comparison report, the Kirwan recommendations. I am confused because it appears that they are saying here that teachers must go after National Board Certification after 5 years. If they don't go after whatever in this career lattice, they are not going to be eligible for salary increases based on years of experience and degrees by credit. By the tenth year of teaching they must achieve national board certification. So, what happens if a teacher says I don't want to do that. Is that going to be a problem for the State of Maryland, because we could lose teachers?

Mr. Lloyd informed them that this was part of our conversation. I am going to draw our attention to the italicized *and* in the third line, because that was a critical component of the Kirwan conversation that none of that takes place until you have, first of all no sooner than 5 years after the legislative enactment and when the Maryland pass rate for National Board Certification reaches the national average which is 65%. So, in order to get the pass rate to that, the extrapolation that the analysis that national board did, we are talking a long-time horizon. It is not the matter of a year or two, it is a matter of more than 10 years to get to that. So, the idea would be that once you achieve that level of certification rate that the supports would be in place. Now I believe based upon some conversations with legislature that this will be a topic of conversation within the legislation and will likely be an ongoing topic of conversation in Annapolis for many years, because as you suggest where the concern is, how do you raise standards and not yet cut off the pipeline? Mr. Lloyd stated that that is a concern that the legislators hold, and the commission holds. The first threshold is obviously a chronological threshold time bound. The second threshold is actually, I am going to say a performance, but it is a performance related threshold and it largely depends on those who are Nationally Board Certified know it takes a level of support and a system of support structures in that state, that we do not have. Mr. Lloyd's belief stating personally that you would not get to that level of National Board Certification in the state of Maryland especially when you start to mandate it. It is different now because it is a volunteer process, certain people opted in. When you start to add in mandatory, the pass rate drops.

Continued Discussion

Ms. Midgley stated, in addition to this potentially disqualifying piece of obstacle that is being put in place, this comes on top of the already significant obstacle of those baseline tests that we have discussed at length here. So, we are caught in the pipeline on the way and then caught in the pipeline for mid-career educators. So, I am not quite sure who they are thinking will be teaching our kids.

Mr. Lloyd stated that on November 21, the commission reconvened, and on that day, he had the opportunity to meet with Brigadier General Warner Sumpter and Dr. Justin Hartings to talk through the licensure regulations. We don't agree on everything, but it was a fruitful discussion to be able to at least extend some dialogue. Mr. Lloyd told the members that he would share how that comes back to the meeting on December 3, because it was part of what he was trying to do. Mr. Lloyd stated that he thinks that those who know him that it is his belief that we seek to build an investment. That if Massachusetts was originally successful in the work that they did, it was because they created a grand bargain and involved stakeholders. It does not mean that everybody got what they wanted, but it does mean that there was a forum under which people were able to kind of move the work together. As he expressed, at times views expressed at the State Board table that this table and those represented at this table are defenders of the status quo and are therefore obstacles and is a theory of action. It is a theory of action that one would say a group, is a system in place. Does that system promote a status quo and are they not open to change? Mr. Lloyd suggested that is not the case. Folks are of good intent, which I made in my comment to the State Board on December 3, which I will provide to you. Mr. Lloyd believes that we have to approach with an understanding of honorable intent. There is honorable intent. I have to assume that there is honorable intent of the President of the State Board of Education. I have to assume, and I asked him to assume honorable intent of our Board. We are seeking to do the right thing for children and to do that will require relationships and will require a conversation to this point that has not transpired. Absent of that, it is going to be very difficult to be able to build an investment model. It will be very easy, but we will build a compliance model. A compliance model and compliance does not get us to where we need to be. He shared with them that when Montgomery County revamped their curriculum several years ago, prior to the purchase of new curriculum just last year. They revamped the curriculum and it was not a good curriculum and so teachers started to use a variety of other resources because they did not feel that the curriculum met the needs of their children. In an audit conducted by Johns Hopkins University, that Dr. Steiner led that. In the audit they found that the curriculum was lacking in several ways and also found that a majority of the teachers were not using the curriculum. Mr. Lloyd stated that he used this as an example as one could say a compliance model that we are going to have everyone use this curriculum. The fact that you say it doesn't mean that people will do it. Mr. Lloyd's concern as he shared with the Board is that he would rather have investment. He would like investment of the Higher Ed partners and the Superintendents of the Board of Education. That is hard, it is very difficult to be able to get all the interest together. He stated that the way that you do that is through dialogue with the understanding that at the end of the day there is going to have to be some level of compromise that people are going to have to be able to advance for the benefit of the children. This is not black and white. Mr. Lloyd stated that he sometimes believes that the hyperbolic language is not helpful to advancing the larger reform. That is what he tried to share with the Board and that is why you will see many of my comments are not related to the specifics of trying to get to point A or point B, but to talk about this fundamental belief. We have to have that dialogue to be able to advance what we think is best for public education. Each one of us have a very powerful perspective based upon our experience and our current representation of an association and we honor and respect those experiences. Mr. Lloyd thought that the meeting was very productive and as he said, they did not agree on everything. That is fine, life is not built around agreeing on everything.

Continued Discussion

Mr. Lloyd said, simultaneous to the meeting the Kirwan Commission met and took back off the table a modified motion that Mr. Pinsky had put forward. This was the motion presented by Delegate McIntosh and seconded by Delegate Luedtke. It passed unanimously with one abstention. Dr. Salmon noted for the record with Dr. Kirwan that she felt that she could not vote on this motion, given that she was an employee of the State Board that promulgated the regulations that she did not feel comfortable voting on this. So this motion passed unanimously and there was no discussion. It was a relatively short agenda. It was three or four minutes. So that was the motion and I will share with you what transpired from that motion. Mr. Lloyd stated that he had noted the time on the document, 1:02:15 to 1:05:34, that is on video one of the Kirwan Commission site should you wish to watch it at your leisure. Mr. Lloyd stated that what he has done here is just a direct transcription of what Delegate McIntosh moved and that is all that is. Stemming from that, Dr. Kirwan

transmitted the following letter to the State Board on November 27 and I want to give you an opportunity to review the letter. Mr. Lloyd informed the members that this letter was as a result of Delegate McIntosh's motion on November 2, written and transmitted by Dr. Kirwan. I will draw your attention to a couple of areas on page 3, those items highlighted in bold at the top of page 3. So the commission is requesting and again this is a request by the commission. The commission has no directive power over the State Board, but I will guess as Dr. Hartings said at the State Board meeting on December 3, that there is an acknowledgement that all of us operate in a political process and we must acknowledge that we are operating in a political sphere. So the commission wants the State Board to work collaboratively with both the K12 and Higher Ed stakeholders to revise the proposed regulations to be fully aligned with the Commission's recommendations. As you heard from Dr. Simpson this morning in her summary, the State Board moved to rescind the regulations for Higher Ed. Dr. Salmon had said at the table that she would bring up the conversation on December 11 in a workgroup that she has, that met once in September and is meeting again. The charge of Dr. Salmon's committee, as articulated in September, is to provide policy recommendations to the MSDE for consideration. So that meeting in September is to provide policy recommendations to the MSDE for consideration. So at the meeting in September, Dean Rice sought to bring in conversation at the meeting that was related to regulatory language that was in front of both PSTEB, as well as the State Board. Dr. Rice stated that it was noted in the minutes that Dr. Salmon believed that it was premature to have those conversations because both Boards had not yet fully acted upon it. And given the charge of the committee, I think differs a little bite from the charge of the committee as constituted. Mr. Lloyd stated that he would get to that in a little bit and that was the first order.

Continued Discussion

The second order in bold is that the commission requested that the State Board of Education not move forward with the proposed Educator Licensure regulations. I think underneath that the thinking of the commission, which was reflective of the conversation I believe on November 12, was that they wanted to ensure that the regulations were aligned with the recommendations as exacted in legislation to be introduced in the 2020 session. He assumed that it will be a part of House Bill 2 or it may be a different bill, but his assumption at this point it is going to be part of House Bill 2. They talked about how it will alleviate any confusion and their concern that if the State Board proceeds with the regulations now, it will likely necessitate the Board needing to go back through the lengthy regulatory process in 2020 after the enactment of legislation implementing the commission's recommendation. Several commissioners said that they did not think it made sense promulgate regulatory language at this point only in six months having to go back. You will note in Delegate McIntosh's verbal motion that didn't seem to make sense, let the legislators work and then come back. So those two are kind of relative in there. This letter was transmitted and shared with the commissioners as a part of their work. Also, in the final event, and I am sorry to be lengthy in this, but a lot has transpired since the last time I saw you.

The final event, the President of the State Board of Education invited me as I did share with you last time, for 5 minutes of testimony as a part of the public comment. Given that I provided public comment on December 3, some of the comment was consistent, word for word with my comments to the Kirwan Commission on November 12 because I wanted to have a very clear message from us. So of that comment was new but in essence what the request was that we come together in a conference committee to be able to do this work together. Meet regularly, seek to be invested, and I also extended on our behalf an invitation for President Sumpter to visit and speak at our Board meeting. So he said that he had interest in that. He and potentially some other members of the State Board had some interest in that. I stated that that is one of the things that could be part of the January agenda with flexibility. I shared with President Sumpter, that if they are interested, we would allow ample time as he sees fit to be able to engage with us in dialogue. I think that is really important and I would like to hear from him. Part of the conversation that I had with some State Board members deals with core values as they see it around the entrance testing requirements and the timeline for implementation. Mr. Lloyd reiterated again, that Boards do not necessarily agree with this. He stated that he does not think that this is the most productive way to proceed and so that is why he extended an invitation to President Sumpter because he thought that it was important to engage in direct dialogue.

Dr. Nash asked Mr. Lloyd to clarify what he meant by the entrance testing requirements?

Mr. Lloyd explained that some part of the discussion that PSTEB has had is the State Board has a very strong interest as having as a part of licensure the passing of certain test that one would be able to do. PSTEB has expressed some level of reservation related to that in particular, because this Board had expressed at times the test could be discriminatory towards black and brown candidates. That is a strongly held belief of the State Board and I think that absent of that kind of conversation, we are stuck in positions. Mr. Lloyd shared with the President that he and the Board appreciate hearing from him directly about the rationale, the thought, and the why behind it. Not in a combative setting, but in a conversational setting. A collegial setting where we could seek to develop understanding and seek to move ideas through regulations that would make sense. So this was the testimony I provided to the State Board on December 3 in the 5 minutes that I was allocated to be able to share with them the thinking and the why. Which brings us to today.

Mr. Lloyd drew the Board members attention to the fifth paragraph. The end of the fourth paragraph, I would say that there is no doubt that the State could have unilaterally enacted a variety of reforms based on a compliance model, but system thinkers such as Peter Senge and Peter Drucker have demonstrated that such moves are not impactful as ones that invest all parties. One of the state board members in a prior meeting had reference Peter Drucker and had referenced him in a way that it said culture eats strategy for breakfast. That is actually something that was utilized when Ford Motor Company was seeking to turn around. It is an acknowledgement that no matter what strategy one puts forward that the culture, if you don't intend to change the end culture, it will eat the strategy and you will therefore not be successful. He does not believe that there is where PSTEB would want to go as a group. It is not about the block, but what I have said is that this theory of action is significant. Policy and regulations stem from a point of view and this is why I try to make clear that we can believe the educators are content with the status quo and that change must therefore be opposed upon them for them to take root. We could acknowledge as Senge writes that people do not fail as much as system fail. That is one of the key components of Peter Senge's thinking and many system thinkers. People don't fail, it is systems that fail then one has to address the systems.

Continued Discussion

Mr. Lloyd said that he then put forward based upon the conversations that the PSTEB does not subscribe to the belief that people who have spent their lives in service of children are content with the status quo. That social justice demands that we do better and our theory of action is that we reform system. The most effective way to do it is to create investment among all stakeholders. To create a bargain that we can sustain. He referenced the Division of Legislative Services analysis because that is a public document and it is something the frankly points to our continued discussion that we believe that continued conversation is beneficial. In reference to both Teacher Preparation Programs and Educator Licensure, in the second to the last paragraph. Mr. Lloyd stated that he tried to reference that in both of these areas, that the professional standards board has the necessary stakeholders by statute to be able to build such a workgroup. He stated that he understands that the two boards do not agree on every item and that historically we have had periods of collaboration and robust disagreements as boards do. But we believe that it is better to do this work here together rather than have legislative mandates make us all compliant in the end. He used that not as a threat but based upon what the letter from Dr. Kirwan had stated, as well as what Delegate McIntosh had stated.

Mr. Lloyd stated that he could not predict the future, but in conversation with legislators, it is very clear that there is a level of concern that could be raised to the level of legislative concern. We have seen this in the past where we end up with the legislative concern and then thing are thrust upon all of us and we will implement them. He shared with the legislators that he did not believe that that is the right path forward. The legislators believe that it is not the right path forward but to get to the right path is through collaboratively working together. Mr. Lloyd informed the members that he tried very hard to be able to craft again a relatively high level message.

Ms. Kitchen thanked Mr. Lloyd for taking the Board through the events, they were very enlightening.

Mr. Lloyd stated that he was trying to fulfill his duties as the Chair of PSTEB that represents a wide diversity of people of interest. He stated that he was going to make a couple of motions, that he would like the members to consider, debate and act upon if they feel it is appropriate. He stated that he was going to base the motion on the letter from the Kirwan Commission, because in continued conversations with folks of the commission, as you noted by Delegate McIntosh's

motion that there is an urgency around this and I think that we have to be responsive to that urgency. We also know that the commission noted that they understand that there has to be as they termed it, real collaboration between parties.

The first motion is going to be in reference to the teacher preparation programs and the second motion will be in reference to the teacher licensure regulations. Both of which have been rescinded from publication at this point and both of which there is a high degree of interest in. He stated that he would provide the motion, seek a second, and would speak to the motion. The board can debate the motion, seek to modify the motion, or reject the motion.

Mr. Lloyd put forth the first motion, related to the teacher preparation program regulations, that is to create a workgroup of K-12 stakeholders and higher education stakeholders for the purpose of working with the state board to revise the proposed regulations to be fully aligned with the commission's recommendations. So that is my motion. I will need a second. Dr. Gartland seconded the motion. Mr. Lloyd stated that that will allow him to speak to the motion and then the members could have some conversation around it.

A motion was put forth for the teacher preparation program regulations, to create a workgroup of K-12 stakeholders and Higher Ed stakeholders for the purpose of working with the State Board to revise the proposed regulations to be fully aligned with the commission's recommendations.

MOTION:

Mr. Christopher Lloyd/Dr. Debi Gartland to approve the creation of a workgroup of K-12 and Higher Ed stakeholders to work with the State Board.

Vote: 14 – Affirmative; 1 – Abstained; 0 - Opposed

Discussion

Mr. Lloyd starting speaking on the motion. He stated that Dr. Salmon had referenced a committee that is meeting on December 11. When he went back and looked at the committee's charge. The charge of the committee is to provide policy recommendations to the MSDE for consideration. Given Dean Rice's concerns as noted in the notes, related to the regulatory language. He stated that he believe that, as he stated in his testimony to the State Board, this group has available stakeholders. He informed the members that he was not suggesting that the workgroup not necessarily be comprised of members of this Board but of representatives from our various groups and to bring them together to be able to have robust and vigorous conversations and to involve the State Board in that process. Mr. Lloyd stated that Dr. Salmon's group does not contain the K-12 stakeholders. It does contain some Higher Ed stakeholders and so based upon the letter as transmitted from Dr. Kirwan, I believe that the stakeholder inclusion is important across the spectrum. Mr. Lloyd believes that if they were able to build such a workgroup, in particular working closely with both Dean Rice and Dean Thrift, that it would be valuable to the work ahead of us to be able to build that level of investment.

Ms. Spross stated that she needed to correct Mr. Lloyd's statement that Dr. Salmon's group does not contain the K-12 community. She informed the members that there were 12 committee members. From the Higher Ed community, there are two representatives from MICUA, our private college institutions, two representatives from USM, one representative from a historically black college and university, and a representative from the 2-year colleges and universities. So those are the Higher Ed representatives. From the K-12 community, there are two superintendents on the committee, there are two representatives from the certification or HR community or our certification authorized partners from the local school systems, there are two representatives from the MASP workgroup, which is the HR in the hiring community. There is one representative from the MANSEF community which is our non-public special education programs and they are serving our special needs K-12 students and there is one representative from the alternative preparation community.

Mr. Lloyd inquired if there were any principals and teachers on the committee and that they have met one time already?

Ms. Spross stated that there are not any teachers or principals on the committee at this time. The name of the committee is the Educator Preparation and Certification Advisory Group. She informed Mr. Lloyd that yes the committee has met already one time and that there was another meeting scheduled for the following week on December 11.

Mr. Hornbeck asked what the name of the committee was. He also inquired about the charge of the committee and questioned the fact that Dr. Salmon chairs a committee that gives her policy recommendations.

Mr. Lloyd stated that the committee provides policy recommendations to MSDE for consideration. Ms. Spross stated, yes to Mr. Hornbeck's question in regards to Dr. Salmon chairing the committee.

Dr. Taylor asked Mr. Lloyd if he wanted to modify his motion to include the legislation.

Mr. Lloyd stated, no not necessarily. He thinks that they work with them on this and he was trying to be consistent with the Commission's letter that the workgroup of K-12 stakeholders and Higher Ed stakeholders I think constitute at this table. Mr. Lloyd thinks that principals and teachers will be important in that.

Ms. Kitchen asked if the group that Ms. Spross previously talked about will be working with this workgroup or are we talking about two separate groups? Need clarity.

Continued Discussion

Mr. Lloyd stated that he did not think so. Dr. Salmon had built that workgroup prior to the Kirwan Commission letter. He stated that he did not anything beyond the charge of the group and was not invited to the group nor was he taking part in the group. He does not believe that anyone from PSTEB is on the workgroup. Ms. Spross stated that no one from the Professional Standards Board or the State Board is on the committee. The group was formulated by Dr. Salmon after a meeting that was held in May to discuss issues pertaining to teacher preparation and provide a forum for feedback and discussion about those areas.

Ms. Spross asked Mr. Lloyd how this workgroup would be different from the makeup of PSTEB. Mr. Lloyd just Identified every member of PSTEB. If we are forming a workgroup of stakeholders that includes teachers, principals, the K12 community and the Higher Ed community, we have representation from every single one of those communities here and all of you that have been appointed by your organizations bring the discussion back to your organizations for feedback. Ms. Spross stated that this is that forum. She suggests that they are setting up a second PSTEB group.

Mr. Lloyd stated that he thinks that it does not include every member's conversation with some our Higher Ed partners, and I think that there is a desire, on the part that we heard through public comment here, is the desire for greater inclusivity and for a greater voice in the process, since we are a board that can move regulatory language. The idea here is to try to create a forum where we are working together rather than working in silos.

Mr. Lloyd stated that Dr. Salmon has not reached out to him or to PSTEB. He thought that after the letter from Dr. Kirwan that there would be an opportunity to figure out how to involve K-12 stakeholders and Higher Ed. He reiterated that he has not heard anything. Mr. Lloyd asked Ms. Spross if she would recommend that PSTEB meet more frequently to accomplish that work.

Ms. Spross stated that she does not know if this group should meet more frequently, but that is a decision for the Board to make. If we are talking about having those kinds of discussions, my understanding and the discussion that we've had here and considering the make-up of the group, this board is very different from the State Board. It is made up of representatives of stakeholder groups and is the balance to the state board. We have teacher representation from both teacher unions that are able to speak with their constituents. We have representation from higher education through MATE and MACTE. We have representation from the elementary and secondary principals. We have representation from our superintendents on this board. So we have those players and those components. And maybe it is that we have very good attendance now, something we haven't had historically, but for the past 1-1 ½ years we have had very good

attendance. We need to review the responsibility of going back to our organizational groups, gathering feedback, and bringing that feedback to this group for consideration. We need to look at how the structure of the meeting is setup. That we have more time whether it is the 3 hours that are currently scheduled in the morning or extending the sessions. We had those discussions as well. I don't know about more meetings, maybe a longer meeting. I am concerned that you are now going to have a workgroup that is a microcosm of what we have right here, of representatives that have been appointed by the very groups that you are asking for more representation from. Ms. Spross stated that she was not opposed to more dialogue. She thinks dialogue and collaboration is how we worked historically. This has not happened with these two sets of regulations and we have talked about that, but I have to raise the question, how is this group going to be different?

Mr. Lloyd stated that his intent was to make it smaller, so that it can be more agile. I am happy to entertain a motion that we could accomplish this work here at this table. My concern is that it has to be done in a relatively short time frame. If we were to do that, it would require us to be able to meet more frequently because my sense is when you are moving something, it is not necessarily the length of it. It is about the interactions within. He stated that he does have an interest in both Dr. Rice and Dr. Thrift being a part of these conversations, because he thinks that they are representative of many of the Higher Ed partners. Mr. Lloyd felt that it would be significant to have their voices in the room and he thinks that it will amplify what the commission had heard.

Dr. Nash wanted to echo what Dr. Gartland had said. Perhaps it is just a taskforce. It is just a matter of tweaking the language. You suggested a taskforce or a conference committee?

Ms. Chinnia stated that she agreed with that. In light of the letter and the date of the letter which is relatively recent, that perhaps our group extending the invitation once again, because the request is clearly indicating as you said collaboration. So for us to form another group among ourselves, I don't think reaches that goal. Perhaps given that the letter is dated November 27, that perhaps we could reach out to the state board in terms of creating this taskforce.

Continued Discussion

Ms. Poese asked about the phrase "conference committee". She said that the conference committee, by definition, includes only representative members in PSTEB. That is what I was getting from your response. The difference is what you are suggesting and what would be the historically represented conference committee. It would be that we would seek representatives that wouldn't necessarily be members of PSTEB.

Ms. Spross stated that she also thought that it was important, like Ms. Chinnia said, that at the State Board meeting on Tuesday, the state board President and members of the State Board were responsive to your invitation to be a part of that. I think there was general interest in partnering. She stated that both General Sumpter and members of the Board would be more than willing to attend the meeting of PSTEB, but I don't think that they realized that the next meeting was two days later. Ms. Spross stated that the State Board was clear about wanting to have a conversation regarding the principles that they hold firm and to putting together a document.

Mr. Lloyd stated that they realize that and that he told them that that was not expected, obviously. He stated that there is potential interest in the creation of a taskforce. Reaching out to the State Board creating a taskforce of K-12 stakeholders and Higher Ed stakeholders to revise the proposed regulations related to the teacher preparation programs to be fully aligned with the Kirwan Commission recommendations. He stated that if that is the request, then I think we would work to create that taskforce in a timely fashion such that we could then, and my recommendations would be that the Presidents of the two boards sit down together to figure out the composition of this taskforce and the work of that group so that we could bring something back to both boards in a way that reflected the conversation and language that would be generated by the taskforce.

Dr. Nash asked how this is different from the conference committee idea that was floating around.

Mr. Lloyd explained that the conference committee would be composed of a few of us and a few of the State Board

members with no external partners. The taskforce is a group that could include members from both the boards but would not necessarily have to include them. Mr. Lloyd stated that part of what he was trying to get here is in speaking with Dr. Thrift and Dr. Rice there is an interest under part to be able to be part of a meaningful elaborative process. He is trying to create the venue for that because he has great faith that that could lead to a good agreement around language that both the State Board and PSTEB could be able to move together in a parallel and reach a destination. Ms. Spross is right, the State Board did express an interest at the end of the meeting and even prior to that had expressed interest in a meeting and that is why I frankly extended the invitation, because I wanted to have that level of conversation.

Ms. Spross stated that she also felt that it was also important to mention that Dr. Salmon indicated that the advisory meeting is scheduled for next week that this would be a topic of discussion with that group as well.

Mr. Lloyd stated that, yes Dr. Salmon did express an interest in the meeting, but that his concern was that as he articulated that he does not think that it contains teachers and principals and he thinks that it is going to be significant in this work for either one of the regulations.

After entertaining other comments and questions from the Board, Mr. Lloyd stated that he would withdraw the first motion and substitute it with a new motion.

Mr. Lloyd put forth a motion to work with the State Board to create a joint taskforce of K-12 stakeholders and higher education stakeholders to revise the proposed regulations to be aligned with the core values/principles of the PSTEB and the State Board of Education.

MOTION:

Mr. Christopher Lloyd/Dr. Debi Gartland to approve the creation of a workgroup to work with the State Board.

Vote: 14 – Affirmative; 1 – Abstained; 0 - Opposed

Mr. Lloyd stated that you make the road by walking. So if PSTEB wants to create a road together, we will have to that by walking together and doing a task together. If the task is substantial, it builds a level of trust and cohesion. It is not guaranteed that that will happen but I do believe that it is the way to build what you have suggested. I am trying to be very careful in the language that I am using as I approach this, because I am trying to avoid ending up in other places in April. I would rather not end up in certain places.

Mr. Lloyd put forth a motion to work with the State Board to create a joint taskforce of K12 stakeholders and High Ed stakeholders to revise the proposed regulations for teacher licensure that are aligned with commission's policy recommendations as enacted in legislation introduced in 2020. This I think includes the more legislative angle to it that we have to be mindful of. My sense is that I heard from our board the desire to use a taskforce with a certain defined group of people to be able to work with the state board, to be able to make recommendations to this board and the state board related to teacher licensure.

Vote: 14 – Affirmative; 1 – Abstained; 0 - Opposed

Ms. Spross abstained from the vote. She was concerned about taking a vote and motion to align to something that we don't have. That would be of concern to me, because you indicated that the letter has been sent and the regulations have been pulled back from publication. We do not know how that language changes or how that language looks. That will be my concern.

Mr. Lloyd stated that in that case, he might recommend that we consider that taskforce of K-12 stakeholders and Higher Ed stakeholders in consultation to some degree with legislative staff. You stated that Ms. Spross was right, that we are not clear what House Bill 2 will look like in its final form. In this view, I am trying to create a parallel taskforce working

with the State Board, K-12 partners, Higher Ed stakeholders that revise the proposed regulations to be, and maybe I should be aligned with the core values the State Board of Education and the PSTEB. We use the same structure to the first motion. Substituting that.

Adjourned

Mr. Lloyd adjourned the meeting without objection at 11:35 a.m.

Attachments:

1. State Board December 3rd Meeting Summary
2. Letter to State Board
3. Letter from Brigadier General Sumpter
4. Motion presented by Delegate McIntosh
5. COMAR 13A.07.06 Programs for Professionally Certified Personnel
6. Letter from the University of Maryland (MICUA)
7. Kirwan Commission presentation