

**Teaching and School Administration Professional Standards Advisory Board**

**It is the mission of the Teaching and School Administration Professional Standards Advisory Board to promote excellence in the education profession and develop and review professional standards to ensure quality preparation and continued professional growth experiences.**

**Kansas State Department of Education  
Board Room**

**OFFICIAL MINUTES**

**February 11, 2013, 10:00 a.m., KSDE Board Room**

**1. Call meeting to order**

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by Rick Ginsberg, Chair.

**2. Roll call**

Attending: Shelley Addis, Adam Bancroft, Ralph Beacham, Rick Ginsberg, Laura Kaiser, Gwen Landever, Lori Martin, Deborah Mohler, Alice Morris, David Myers, Denise O’Dea, David Patterson, Michele Perez, Rudy Perez, Linda Stecher, Kate Thompson, Kathy Wagoner, Mike Wilson

Absent: Nick Compagnone, Tim Knoles, Bill Meek

KSDE: Scott Myers, Susan Helbert, Lynn Bechtel, Diana Stephan, TJ Boeckman

KSBE: Steve Roberts

KNEA: Karen Godfrey

**3. Introductions**

Members introduced themselves and stated their representation.

**4. Approval of Agenda**

**Motion:** It was M/S (Beacham, M. Perez) to approve the agenda. Motion carried.

**5. Approval of minutes from the November 19, 2012 meeting**

**Motion:** It was M/S (Beacham/Stecher) to approve the minutes of November 19, 2012. Motion carried.

**6. Citizens Open Forum**

No one was available to speak at the open forum.

Due to schedules of staff, the agenda was rearranged in order to discuss Old Business, Items, A, B, and C, before taking action on the New Business items.

**7. Old Business**

**B. Professional Learning – comments from PSB members with possible board action**

Lynn handed out a paper entitled “Professional Learning System for Kansas Educators” outlining recommendations and overarching beliefs. She stated that the five recommendations were adopted by the State Board of Education in the spring of 2012. Changes will be coming. Members are being asked for input today.

Several questions were asked by Standards Board members. The Questions and Responses are listed.

Question: Will there be a district support team?

Response: Each individual will have a district learning team to guide the process for creating an individual professional learning plan. This team will take the place of the current PDC's. These new teams will help strengthen the support provided for professional learning and promote a continuous growth model. The make-up of the team will be decided locally, with the individual's supervisor being a required member. For beginning teachers and administrators in a new role, we would encourage the mentor be a team member and academic coaches might serve on teams for veteran educators. An IHE representative might also be a member to consider for beginning teachers and those in a new role as a result of completing a new endorsement area. At this point we don't see any requirement for meeting a certain number of times per year. We want support and continuous growth.

A concern was expressed that, as a result of new evaluation requirements, more time will be needed to meet with individual staff and that he would need to let go of other tasks in order to have time to complete the new requirements.

Response: We hope that the processes would occur simultaneously and that the goals for an evaluation will also be goals on a professional learning plan. There are software programs available. There will no longer be Professional Development Councils.

A concern was expressed that an evaluator would have control over whether an educator could renew his/her license.

Response: An evaluator doesn't determine whether a license can be renewed. Because several on this board share that concern, additional dialogue will be had about the topic, but it's absolutely appropriate for the evaluator to be involved in an individual's professional learning process.

A concern was expressed by Rick Ginsberg about cost and process for record-keeping/notification to the state for renewal requirements.

Response: We don't anticipate there to be any more record-keeping than is occurring now. Because the details for notification haven't been determined, it's possible the amount of district involvement in tracking their staff's professional learning will lessen. There will still be some tracking, as one of the renewal requirements will be around district/school needs; however, issuing points as we do now will cease to exist. Many districts currently use vendor software to track this (i.e. My Learning Plan, Greenbush's Tool Box, etc.) and there will still be a use for that software, but it will probably look different.

Question: Will service to the profession points still be allowed? Will serving on the Professional Standards Board still be considered service to the profession?

Response: Service to the profession points more than likely will not continue. This category was probably the least understood, in terms of whether it was appropriate for points to be given on that basis. It's very likely a number of points issued as "service to the profession" don't actually meet the definition in regulation. There is a large paradigm shift needed regarding the purpose of professional learning. The predominant mindset currently is that the purpose is to renew a license. The purpose we are communicating is that professional learning is to increase our effectiveness as educators so that

student learning increases. It's just what we do in this profession. Secondly, part of that learning can be used to help renew a license – that's a bonus.

Question: If there are no points awarded, what would be used?

Response: There will still be some type of indicator used to determine whether specific regulatory and renewal requirements are met. There hasn't been a final determination made regarding what that indicator will be, but points as they are currently used (i.e. one point per hour) will not be it. It's possible the concept of points might be utilized in some way, but not in the current manner. In this system, the educator will need to assume more responsibility for his/her license. The district responsibility will decrease, although there will still be some tracking of professional learning. The state licensure renewal requirement will likely be some evidence of completion and won't be part of what the district tracks.

Question: Is there anything wrong with the current system? Will there be additional funding available in order to assist with the new professional learning system?

Response: A PD Audit Committee made up of stakeholders across the state reviewed all these issues. The final report will be sent with the minutes so you can have the historical perspective. The first Teaching in Kansas Commission (TKC) had recommended that the Professional Development Taskforce come up with recommendations regarding professional learning. New teachers are provided mentoring for a longer period of time before moving to the professional license. The novice teachers are supported and encouraged.

Question: How do college hours fit?

Response: How credit hours might fit into licensure renewal requirements is still under consideration. There won't be a different renewal requirement based on the type of degree held, so those with undergraduate degrees won't be required to have a certain number of hours. Those either working out of state or not working but still wish to maintain their KS license will do so via credit hours. The current process of these individuals working through district PDC's or the Licensure Review Committee will go away.

Question: Is the supervisor always the principal or could it be a coach. Could it be a teacher leader?

Response: We don't define how districts assign supervisors; however, the teacher leader role is not intended to be evaluative or quasi-administrative.

Question: What about confidentiality?

Response: Confidentiality is an expectation. For the new evaluation system, only the evaluator, evaluatee, and district superintendent have access to that information. The question was raised whether the district learning team would also see that information if professional learning goals are to be consistent. We do not intend to give evaluation information access to anyone else, but the point is well-taken if we are to embrace a continuous growth model. Additional dialogue will be needed.

Question: What is the timeline and next steps?

Response: There is no timeline yet. The next steps will be to communicate with large groups such as Council of Superintendents and Curriculum Coordinators and others via the listservs. Subcommittees could address the issues expressed here today. The regulations would be written following the receipt of all feedback gathered.

Question: When close to finalization, what will the plan look like so that each district receives the same information?

Response: The state department will bear the responsibility to ensure that there is enough professional learning for everyone to understand the process. We could have regional meetings.

Chair Ginsberg suggested that all Standards Board members share information with their member organizations.

### C. Crosswalk from mentoring to professional license and teacher preparation programs

Lynn Bechtel handed out a document entitled *Professional Teaching Standards-A Comparison*. Professional Standards Board members were asked to bring back comments to our next meeting. Questions concerning this document can be directed to Lynn Bechtel at [lbechtel@ksde.org](mailto:lbechtel@ksde.org)

Scott briefly talked about the current KSDE teacher mentoring process for licensure using form 21. The Kansas Educational Leadership Institute (KELI) program works with superintendents and the New Teacher Center is currently working with principals, special education administrators, and teachers, with coordination through the KSDE. He noted that there is inconsistency regarding mentoring across the state at this time.

## **8. New Business**

Scott spoke briefly about the importance of the ERC and the Annual Report and Preconditions Audit Committee. Training is available for new members who are selected and approved according to the PSB bylaws.

### A. New Appointment to the Evaluation Review Committee (ERC)

**Motion:** It was M/S (R. Perez/Wagoner) to approve the appointment of Lorie Cook-Benjamin to the Evaluation Review Committee, representing higher education, to her first full 3 year term of office to begin July 1, 2013. Motion carried.

### B. New appointments to Preconditions and Annual Audit Committee

**Motion:** It was M/S (Morris/Addis) to approve the appointment of the following persons to the Annual Report and Preconditions Audit Committee: Michele Peres and Allen Jantz, representing ERC; John Rhodes and Sandy Tutwiler, representing BOE; Gwen Landever, representing PSB. Motion carried.

## **9. Old Business**

### A. Code of Ethics Follow-up

Diana Stephan handed out information on various states and their Code of Ethics.

Cheryl Whelan, General Counsel, KSDE, explained the two approaches of moving forward. The non-regulatory approach is when the State Board adopts guidelines which will not affect licensure. This process involves an information segment at the State Board of Education meeting. The following month an action item would be submitted and, if adopted, would state what we want an educator to follow.

The other option is to adopt new regulations, which is a very stringent process. The first step is for an organization to come before the State Board and bring public input. The final document is presented as a recommendation from the organization. At the following meeting of the State Board a vote is taken on whether to send the regulations through the administrative process. The regulations are first sent to the Department of Administration and reviewed very closely. The regulations are then forwarded to the Attorney General's office. This process can take from two weeks to a few months. Once both the Department of Administration and the Attorney General approve, there is a public comment timeline of 60 days from first publication in the Kansas Register, then forwarding to the Secretary of State a week before publishing and setting a public hearing date which is typically a Tuesday of a State Board meeting. Then on Wednesday, the KSDE staff will submit the response before the State Board. The State Board will discuss and can make modifications which could add another 30 days. If there are no changes, the State Board can vote to adopt and the regulations are then sent to the Secretary of State for publication. The regulations become final 15 days later. The entire process can take seven months to a year for final regulations to be adopted. If the Code of Ethics is to be enforceable, regulations will be needed.

Diana Stephan followed up by stating that the handout that she had given to members earlier reflecting the Code of Ethics from other states is mixed, some are regulations and some are aspirational.

Question: What does our state law say about dismissal of teachers? If we go the regulation route, is that already addressed in the law? What about district contract?

Response: The only aspect that the State Board can regulate is licensure. The Professional Practices Commission (PPC) makes recommendations to the State Board. The PPC is meeting today and will be discussing rewriting the State Board regulations governing the PPC. Employment issues are left up to individual districts. Whether or not a district would use for disciplinary action or employment is up to the district.

Chair Ginsberg asked the PSB members which direction they want to go-aspirational or regulation?

Steve Roberts responded that he leans toward less regulation. He prefers the aspirational route. A true professional in the classroom would adhere to a Code of Ethics.

Diana Stephan stated that aspirational is not enforceable. In order to enforce, regulations will need to be written. Enforcement does not necessarily mean loss of the teaching license. It could mean public censor or suspension (other states use this). The Kansas statute would remain the same for certain types of crimes and punishment. For example, there could be situations such as test fraud that the State Department may not even know about.

Ralph Beacham expressed concern that it would be difficult to list each incident separately.

Cheryl Whelan pointed out that there could be two subcommittees working on this, one for the aspirational ethics and one to work with the PPC on the regulatory portion.

Lori Martin suggested using the 1986 Code of Ethics as a starting point.

Chair Ginsberg suggested two subcommittees, one to work with Diana on the aspirational and the other to work on revising the state regulation. The following persons volunteered to serve on the two subcommittees.

Aspirational Code of Ethics subcommittee: Diana Stephan, Lori Martin, Michele Perez, Rudy Perez – Will bring back information for discussion at the next Standards Board meeting.

Regulatory Code of Ethics subcommittee: Diana Stephan, Ralph Beacham, Laura Kaiser, Lori Martin, David Myers, Denise O’Dea.

**Break for lunch at 11:30am.**

**The meeting resumed at 12:00 noon.**

## **10. Standing Committee Reports**

### A. Executive Committee

Chair Ginsberg reported that the Executive Committee met this morning and reviewed the agenda. Items III.A and B were moved up on the agenda to follow Citizens Open Forum.

### B. State Board of Education Report

Steve Roberts is the new State Board of Education liaison to the Standards Board. He has been appointed for two calendar years to run from January 2013 through December 2015. Mr. Roberts reported that the State Board has much to do in the areas of common core, next science standards, PSB issues and much more.

### C. TLA Leadership Report

Scott Myers reported that the TLA team has hired Bill Bagshaw as an assistant director to work with the Kansas Educator Evaluation Protocol (KEEP). TLA staff has been traveling around the state attending 11 regional forums. All PSB members are welcome to attend any of these forums. The TLA team will be interviewing this week for two Education Program Consultants to assist Bill with KEEP and Accreditation. Currently we do not know how many districts will be using KEEP. The KEEP website offers much information for districts. The development of the training protocol has begun. A group of 14 service center personnel and 16 practitioners will be conducting the training by regions. If a district chooses to use another evaluation system, such as McRel, there will be a vetting process. The group that will review consists of practitioners composed of superintendents, principals and teachers. The KSDE website for more information regarding KEEP:

<http://www.ksde.org/Default.aspx?alias=www.ksde.org/evaluationproject>

Scott also reported that the Accreditation system is being field tested focusing on the 5 R’s (relationships, relevance, responsive culture, rigor, results). Districts have been asked to rate their individual district on one of the five R’s. All information will be compiled for a pilot that will take place in 2014-15.

Scott reported that KSDE/TLA is working with the higher education institutes regarding transition of the expenses of the Kansas Performance Teaching Portfolio (KPTP) to the IHEs. The KPTP will serve as a work sample under the new accreditation stipulations under the new CAEP (NCATE and TEAC merger).

The TLA office has recently hired Nicolette Geisler as the executive director for the Kansas Volunteer Commission (KVC). She replaces Shelby Hoytal who left the agency last year. Part of the work of the KVC is mentoring. The TLA office will be communicating with the field regarding the Kansas Mentors and KVC programs.

Susan Helbert reported that the Regulations Committee will be meeting soon to review and discuss regulation changes. She stated that she will no longer be working with the KEEP. She also stated that the licensure staff of TLA is fully staffed. We are preparing to launch two new online license applications,

the provisional and the restricted. The authenticated applications will create a link to districts. Superintendents will have access to the authenticated application.

Susan talked about upcoming regulation work. There are critical regulations relating to career and technical education, language related to the old vocational license, occupational skill and experience, that need to be upgraded to include Career Pathways. We also anticipate looking at the out of state regulations. Some minor adjustments will be made to the teacher leader endorsement regulations. We also will be looking at the special education program to be completed as the initial teacher preparation program.

#### D. Evaluation Review Committee

Ralph Beacham reported that the Evaluation Review Committee (ERC) met in January and reviewed programs from Mid America Nazarene. Training was provided to the committee regarding the fundamentals of an accreditation visit for a higher education institute. Committee members felt this training was very informative and helpful.

#### E. Policies and Procedures Committee

Linda Stecher reported that the committee met in January and updated their goals and the Program Approval handbook. A section on Accreditation will be added to the handbook during the April meeting.

#### F. Licensure Review Committee

The committee met last week for 2 days and reviewed 20 new appeals and saw 10 personal appearances. The next meeting will be April 3 and 4. We have two members that have completed their two three-year terms. Nominations will be requested for those two openings. The majority of the appeals relate to alternative licensing.

### **11. Next meeting date**

Members discussed changing the date from June 17 to another date. Alternate meeting dates will be sent to members by TLA.

### **12. Announcements**

Chair Ginsberg announced that this year's KU Summer Conference is scheduled for June 14 at Lawrence with teachers, principals, and board members and will concentrate on the ESEA possible rewrite. There is a limit of 300-400 people.

### **13. Adjournment**

**Motion:** It was M/S Beacham/Stecher to adjourn. Motion carried.