

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

OFFICIAL MINUTES

September 21, 2015, 10:00 a.m.

Kansas State Department of Education, 900 SW Jackson Street, Room 102, Topeka, KS

1. Call meeting to order

The meeting was called to order at 10:02 a.m. by Deb Mercer, Chair.

2. Roll call

Attending: Shelley Addis, Kathryn Beougher, Bill Biermann, Amy Compton, Jamie Finkeldei, Jonathan Goering, Gwen Landever, Deb Mercer, Rudy Perez, PJ Reilly, Kyle Stadalman, Rod Stewart, Kathy Wagoner, Mike Wilson, Maria Worthington

Absent: Adam Bancroft, Tammy Bartels, Paul Erickson

KSBE: Jim Porter

KSDE: Scott Myers, Susan Helbert, Bill Bagshaw, Kelly Dempewolf, Catherine Chmidling, Jessica Noble, Jenna Cook, Diana Stephan, Jan Williams

3. Approval of Agenda

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

4. Approval of Minutes of April 13, 2015

Motion: It was M/S (Addis/Wagoner) to approve the minutes of June 18, 2015. Motion carried.

5. Open Forum

No one was available to speak at the open forum.

6. New Business

Opportunity for announcements

The committee took this opportunity to welcome and introduce new members. Training for new members will be offered at 9 am before the Nov. 16 Professional Standards (PSB) meeting. The committee reviewed their mission statement. The date of the April 14, 2016 PSB meeting was changed to April 18, 2016. It was also decided that subcommittees will submit end-of-the-year reports instead of an annual report.

Reappointment to the Regulations Committee (Regs)

Motion: It was M/S (Goering/Beougher) to approve the reappointment of Cheryl Shepard-Adams, representing secondary classroom teachers to the Regulations Committee, with terms to begin July 1, 2015. Motion carried.

Accreditation Technology Tools

a. Building Report Card

John Baranski, Information Technology Operations Manager, presented a demonstration of the Kansas Building Report Card and the local education agency authenticated reporting system.

The Building Report Card version that the field will use and see is very mobile friendly. Some fields will prepopulate and the information is very customizable to each user. Tool tips are also customizable. Hopefully this will end entering data multiple times. Other features included a pull down menu to view districts with similar populations. Discussion about the data collected and how it could be used in the wrong manner such as comparing apples to oranges. Information technology staff is making an effort to consolidate data into one system. Their estimated launch date is Dec. 1, 2015. Chairman Mercer commented that anyone working with this report card will be ecstatic over the improvements.

b. LEA Authenticated System

Bill Bagshaw and Kelly Dempewolf presented the new accreditation home page as it looks now. This is an electronic data collection system used to collect information for districts and it is very similar to the collection system already used by districts for their evaluation processes. The Non-negotiables and Foundations were developed by all stakeholders and the advisory committee. Users will be able to include evidence artifacts. Data collected in this system will appear in the Building Report Card system that John Baranski previously demonstrated. Leadership will be able to sign-off on the report and an outside evaluation team will also be able to comment as they rate or recommend a district for accreditation. After the five year cycle the accreditation recommendation would be a State Board of Education (SBoE) decision. There was discussion about moving towards the estimated launch date of July 1, 2016 and how the districts can be more prepared for this SBoE decision. Scott reported on available resources that school districts can be using to prepare in advance by following this link <http://ksde.org/Default.aspx?tabid=941>. Scott also announced that our division of the agency will begin having Brownbag Topics on the first and third Wednesday from noon to 1:00 pm with Adobe Connection beginning Oct. 7. It is hoped that the webinars will create dialog between the field and KSDE. Concerns about the implementation and transition time for the new accreditation were discussed. Bill Bagshaw stated that it will be a way for each district to tell their story. Every district will not begin in the same place but will be able to use the same data collection system. Outside validation stakeholders have not been determined.

Program Standards Approval

Technology and Engineering, English Language Arts 5-8, English Language Arts 6-12 and Reading Specialist
Catherine provided handouts of the draft Technology and Engineering, English Language Arts program standards middle level 5-8 and secondary 6-12, and the draft Reading Specialist program standards as well as crosswalks for each program. She explained the process of revising these standards. Maria questioned how committee members were supposed to grasp all of this information in time to vote on the new standards. It was explained that they had been available for thirty days for public comment.

Motion: It was M/S (Wagoner/Goering) to approve the Technology and Engineering program standards. Motion carried.

Motion: It was M/S (Biermann/Perez) to approve the secondary level 6-12 English Language Arts program standards. Motion carried.

Motion: It was M/S (Biermann/Perez) to approve the middle level English Language Arts program standards. Motion carried.

Motion: It was M/S (Biermann/Perez) to approve the Reading Specialist program standards. Motion carried.

The approved program standards will now be forwarded to the State Board of Education for their approval. The committee was asked if they would like to have the information before the meeting so that members can review the information before the meeting. Everyone agreed that the crosswalks were very beneficial for reviewing the previous standard with the revisions. Catherine will provide information to the PSB members when the comments are available online for public comment and Susan showed where that would be on our KSDE website. The committee would like to see the old, new and crosswalk program

standard documents with date stamps so members know which version is which. Both the revised Elementary and Gifted program standards were held for the November 16 standards board meeting.

“In Effect” Licensure Issue

Scott explained most of our agenda comes from the field as we try to adjust to their input. Susan explained that applicants have to present a current valid out-of-state license when applying for licensure in our state. If the applicant has an expired out-of-state license they have to update their out-of-state license prior to applying for the KS license, thus accumulating the costs of renewing a license they may never need or use again. The intent of the regulation is to prevent applicants who are unable to achieve a license in their home state to bypass their state requirements and receive a Kansas license. Staff proposes that the intent of the regulation would be met if we require only that the applicant has achieved a standard license in the home state (standard license as defined in the regulations). It will require a regulation change to amend this issue.

Motion: It was M/S (Wilson/Biermann) that Susan work with the regulations committee to amend this regulation to provide flexibility for out-of-state applicants if a standard license was achieved but has now expired. Motion carried.

The meeting was recessed for lunch in room 509 at 12:10 pm. During lunch members heard the following committee reports: Susan reported for Regulations; Catherine Chmidling reported on Evaluation Review Committee (ERC) and Policies and Procedures (P&P); Scott reported on Teacher Licensure and Accreditation; and Jim reported on the SBoE. The meeting resumed at 1:05 pm, in room 102.

Adjustment of “Initial” License to “Foundational”

Now that the approval of mentoring guidelines and programs has been implemented, the “initial” license needs to be reviewed regarding the name of the license, the term of the first license and the recommendations of the Professional Development (PD) Task Force during that first license term. Progression to a professional license from an initial license is a year of mentoring during the initial license period. However, many teachers start employment under a pre-standard license such as a one-year nonrenewable license or even a waiver. It is critical that these new teachers are mentored, so “banking” of mentoring during a pre-standard license has been allowed. However, combining some of the pre-standard licenses and requirements under the first license, renaming the first license and extending the time period of the license would simplify the progression to the professional license and the field’s understanding of what requirements need to be completed. The board was asked to consider changing the term of the initial license to “foundational” license. Under the suggested changes, some new teachers will complete mentoring and support during the first license; others may need to take test(s) as well as complete mentoring and support.

Motion: It was M/S (Perez/Biermann) to allow the Regulations committee to work on regulatory language changes to allow this to happen. Motion carried.

7. Old Business

CISD Update

Continue to be mindful of the Coalition of Innovative School Districts. The procedure for the certification of their staff who cannot be licensed under current regulations require that the district approve the certificate, then the CISD committee approves, and then the SBoE has to vote on the approval/issuance of the certificate.

Mentoring Update

Districts have to offer mentoring to their educators. If the district fails to provide an approved mentor program, their educators will not be able to advance from the initial to the professional license.

Licensure Issues

a. Online endorsement: Do we want one? The Regulations Committee will begin work if we do. This issue was previously discussed. Jessica Noble is the TLA consultant who can answer questions and provide information for the committee. The Legislative Post Audit team states that online schools work. Institutions of higher education are ready to address this issue. Jessica gave info to the committee about virtual schools in Kansas and explained that virtual course monitors are different than virtual teachers. Bill Biermann does not see the need for an online endorsement as a superintendent. His program has to be successful to continue and the professional development is beneficial for virtual teachers. PJ added to Bill's comments. Let's not put restrictions where they are not needed. Kathy said that administrators may put a teacher in a virtual online assignment when the teacher does not want to teach it. If they had to have a license, it would give them some protection against becoming a virtual teacher. Susan said this could be approached as providing for an added endorsement for those who desire to show they have that expertise, without requiring the endorsement in order to be placed in a virtual assignment – similar to the teacher leader license that is available. Creating an endorsement for online teaching would require developing a set of program standards. Also, adding such an endorsement by testing only could be considered if a test is available. Deb said that the professional education standards should be addressing this also. Course monitors facilitate the online studies when the student is doing self-directed study and not learning from a teacher. Jamie said that all new teachers should have the knowledge and skills to be a course monitor. Gwen said technology is embedded in all of the professional education standards so it would be a matter of adjusting the language.

Motion: It was M/S (Goering/Finkeldei) to address the language of the professional education standards to strengthen knowledge and skills of teaching online at the initial level. Motion carried.

b. Math

Susan provided information from previous discussions regarding math. Should we change the regulations to allow for an upper advanced math endorsement to teach calculus and trigonometry? The secondary math 6-12 could cover algebra II and geometry whereas the upper endorsement would cover calculus and trig. This could get more teachers to teach math at the secondary if there was another endorsement. Testing would be changed, too. We currently have math endorsements for 5-8 middle level and 6-12 secondary math. Should we change to 5-8 middle level, 6-12 secondary and 6-12 advanced math endorsements? Or would we have math 6-9 and then advanced math?

Motion: It was M/S (Finkeldei/Wilson) moved to have the regulation committee work on adjusting the regulations to reflect having a 5-8 level, a 6-12 level and a 6-12 advanced math endorsement. Motion carried.

C. Middle level generalist

Deb said this change would help smaller districts. Pedagogy would be there but there would be a generalist content test as opposed to the educator taking separate content tests. Discussion was in favor of this move. The current four core content middle level endorsements would remain as an option.

Motion: It was M/S (Reilly/Perez) to have the Regulations Committee pursue a middle level generalist endorsement. Motion carried.

D. Director of Special Education

Susan provided information about the issue. We support a separate license for a director of special education. The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) is supportive of a director of special education endorsement. Program coursework could parallel the building leader program core but would include an emphasis in special education. Either a director of SPED or a building leadership program would be appropriate to subsequently pursue a district leadership license. Regulation changes would be required and new program standards would have to be developed.

Motion: It was M/S (Biermann/Beougher) to have the Regulations Committee pursue a Director of Special Education endorsement that would also qualify a person to pursue a district leadership license without having to complete a building leadership program. Motion carried.

E. Adding an Endorsement through Testing plus a Safety Test/Class

Follow-up discussion from a previous meeting about adding an endorsement through just passing a test. Concerns have been raised for certain subject areas. For example, safety issues are a concern for many of the CTE areas. ESOL has also expressed concerns that these teachers need additional professional learning. The CTE areas of FACS, Agriculture, and Technology education proposed draft language for a regulation change as discussed previously. There would be an additional requirement for completing a module or some other validation requirement in addition to passing the test. More discussion followed on whether to pursue this and what the additional requirement(s) might look like.

Motion: It was M/S (Wagoner/Stewart) to have the Regulations Committee explore options and formulate regulatory language to require, in addition to passing the content test, a requirement such as additional professional learning/study module/safety assessment for the endorsement areas of FACS, Agriculture, technology education and ESOL. Motion carried.

F. PreK-6, PreK-9, EC-K Endorsement/Regulation work

Susan updated the PSB on this work. She had handouts to summarize the state board policy that was adopted to allow elementary licensed teachers to teach PreK and EC licensed teachers to teach kindergarten. Handouts included the message sent out on list serves. PSB had proposed steps to provide flexibility in this area at the June meeting. The PSB proposal was the basis for the state board policy adoption. In addition, PSB recommended regulation changes to provide long-term flexibility by changing the level of elementary education to PreK-6 and to create an add-on endorsement for PreKindergarten. These proposals were also shared with the state board. Regulations committee will begin work on the regulatory language.

Jenna Cook provided an update on the License Review Committee (LRC). Their case load is very small with only a small portion of the cases having to schedule an appeal as a result of the last regulation changes. Catherine reviewed the work of the pre-condition audit committee and reported that they needed members. The committee audits new IHEs wanting to pursue Kansas accreditation and reviews annual reports to ensure IHEs are on track with their programs.

Diana Stephan handed out information on educator ethics obtained from NASDTEC.

10. Adjournment

Motion: It was M/S (M. Perez/Goering) to adjourn. Motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 2:58 pm.