

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BOARD

Retreat Meeting of Saturday, March 8, 2008

Atlantic Sands Hotel & Conference Center
Rehoboth Beach, DE

MINUTES

Members Present: Joanne Christian, Marilyn Dollard, Sandra Falatek, Karen Gordon, Barbara Grogg, Les Holden, Lori Hudson, Dorothy McQuaid, Mary Mirabeau, Wendy Murray, Gretchen Pikus, Karen Schilling-Ross and Kathleen Thomas, Chair.

Members Absent: Cathy Cathcart, Michael Thomas and Carol Vukelich.

Others Present: Charlie Michels, PSB Executive Director, Pearl Carrington, Secretary, Paula Fontello, Deputy Attorney General, Vicky Cairns, DSEA, and Judi Coffield, State Board of Education

Retreat Call to Order:

Ms. Thomas, Professional Standards Board Chair called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m.

I. Certification Regulation Expiration Dates

Mr. Michels reviewed with the PSB Members his completed 1500 certification regulation list of expiration/review dates. Ms. Fontello inquired whether the dates referenced were actually expiration dates within the regulation or are the dates referred to the 5 year review dates. Ms. Fontello explained that she did not believe that all the regulations listed had expiration dates within their language. She explained that generally a regulation will 'stand' until it is either repealed or amended. Ms. Fontello further explained that DOE was mandated by law to review their regulations on a five year cycle, however she was not sure that the PSB was included in that mandate. Ms. Fontello advised she would look into the matter, review the statutes, and provide future clarification. Ms. Fontello advised that even if the DOE's 5 year review cycle was applied to the PSB regulations, she believed that absent a expiration date in the regulation, the Board would need to determine to amend, repeal or let stand each regulation. Mr. Michels has been working through connected certification groupings to bring their language into the newly adopted

abbreviated format. Some of these groupings have been reviewed and amended short of the 5 year review cycle.

~ 5 Year Review year and date: 2007

- 1 #1552 Career and Technical Specialist – 10/1
 - o This certification regulation is currently being reviewed.

~ 5 Year Review year and date:2008

- 2 1580 School Library Media Specialist – 11/1
 - o This regulation needs to begin with review in late spring, 2008
- 3 1582 School Nurse – 11/1
 - o This regulation needs to begin with review in late spring, 2008
 - o 1572 Teacher of Students who are Gifted and Talented – 12/1
 - o This regulation is currently being reviewed by DOE personnel and Mr. Michels

II. Clusters

Mr. Michels gave an updated status report on the cluster system and the new Professional Development Management System. Mr. Michels built an extensive spreadsheet with every approved cluster and their replications, with dates of sections and numbers of successful participants. He stated that the vast majority of providers/instructors submitted sections with fewer names than the cluster was approved for and that the vast majority kept their sections to the approved times per year. Some clusters have been offered but once or twice. At present there are 106 original clusters and 36 replications. There have been no cluster reauthorizations as of March 1, 2008.

The Board Members indicated in writing/posting activity positive aspects and concerns of the cluster system, and cluster system components that need a critical look.

Mr. Michels posed the following topics:

~ Provider Compensation

- 1 Should providers be allowed to receive a salary supplement (once), if they complete all of the work and are not otherwise compensated? If one writes the cluster application should they be eligible for the knowledge and skills supplement?
- 2 Mr. Michels suggested that language mandating cluster providers/instructors to follow all details specified in the application be placed in regulation 1501.
- 3 Mr. Michels spoke to the issue of cluster data entry timelines: both for registration

and completion of clusters.

The Board agreed that Providers must approve successful participants and submit the single completed roster through the PDMS within 30 days of the stated cluster completion date. It was felt that this timeline should be placed within regulation 1501.

Ms. Fontello reminded the Board that all salary supplements and knowledge and skills stipends are subject to an annual appropriation. Ms. Fontello indicated that the test mandated by statute for an additional responsibility assignment is that as specified in DE Code, it must impact student achievement. Ms. Fontello questioned whether the cluster provider by writing a cluster proposal is indeed directly impacting student achievement. Ms. Fontello further stated that the law requires that the activity has to be academic in nature and may not include extra curricular activities or non-instructional supervisor's responsibilities.

Mr. Michels stated that the only additional salary stipend that both the PSB and SBE have approved is within the required Mentoring system wherein the Lead Mentors and Mentors are paid.

The Board did reiterate that it was acceptable for a cluster instructor to be eligible for the accompanying salary supplement (once) if they have indeed completed all of the assignments and have attested that they received no other compensation for the delivery of the cluster. This component would need to be added to the language in regulation 1501.

~ Annual Cluster Review

1. Should the Board consider looking at clusters on an annual basis for the validity of offerings?
 - o Two possible choices were noted for reducing total cluster system numbers
 1. Reduce the number of participants to ten (10)
 2. Cancel the cluster if the Provider is not going to offer the cluster.

Mr. Michels indicated that several providers have already contacted him and he has gone through the process of cancelling their clusters and notifying the OMB.

A discussion followed with concerns about setting the criteria for an annual cluster review, which could include an annual report. It was expressed that even if a cluster has had few participants, that in and of its self does not mean the cluster that should be cancelled. Some targeted clusters have a small prospective audience to start with. The other concern is the time required to manage the forms, etc. If the Board were to move in this direction it was felt that a June 15 date might be a date/timeframe to work with. It was also felt that the potential Annual Cluster report requirement would need to be included in an amended 1501 regulation.

~ Prioritizing Clusters

- 1 Mr. Michels asked the Board if in order to maintain the viability of the current cluster system as a whole, considering the financial situation the State of Delaware is presently in, the Board might consider prioritizing clusters that could be offered. Some possible criteria for determination could be: student achievement evidence, cluster enrollment and evaluation results, variety in different cluster categories, number of clusters offered per school district.

There were concerns expressed that it appeared that some districts were substituting the cluster system for what historically has been the professional development responsibility of the district. The question posed was should the state truly be underwriting these?

The Board's consensus was that prioritizing clusters for educator availability was not a direction the Board was comfortable with or that needed to be implemented.

~ Process of PDAC / PSB review for reauthorization

- 2 Mr. Michels indicated that the Professional Development and Associated Compensation Committee has looked at a variety of criteria for the reauthorization of clusters.
- 3 The Board reviewed the application process and the requisite documents.

The Board felt that the *Cluster Reauthorization Justification* would be very helpful in the review process. The *Justification* would require the provider/instructor to speak to the latest components of best practice and current research, cluster connections to District Strategic Plans, building level Success Plans and/or Delaware's Recommended Curriculum. Evidence or data collected should be included in the *Justification* to support the premise of skills and knowledge attainment by a successful participant.

The Board understands that this is a work in progress felt comfortable that the Committee is capable of making the determinations.

The Board felt that if there had been a major change in the cluster from the original application that the revised cluster should go through the process as a new cluster.

~ Limitations on number of clusters

- 4 Mr. Michels asked the Board if a potential solution for maintaining the viability of the current cluster system would be to limit the number of clusters an educator might take simultaneously.

In the discussion following, Members indicated that there should not be any process

to prevent educators from participating in professional development opportunities. It was also mentioned that completing clusters was one of a limited number of ways currently to increase educator salaries.

The consensus by the Board was not to limit cluster participation by Delaware educators.

~ Replications: Should the Replicator have taken the cluster from original provider ?

- 1 Mr. Michels asked the Board if they felt that in order to maintain the fidelity of a replicated cluster, that the 'replicator' should be required to take the cluster from the original provider.

In the discussion following, the Board felt that it should be left up to the original provider to stipulate the requirements for replication in the application. There is currently a place on the original application to indicate replication requirements. This area might be amended to provide a check-box that the original provider would indicate the necessity of the replicator to take the cluster from the original provider. It was thought that the original provider needs to have a serious conversation with the potential replicating individual and then make their decision based on the conversations and connected promises. It was also mentioned by the Board that the original provider should be available to the replicator provide counsel and continued support.

~ Requisite Provider training

- 2 Mr. Michels asked the Board if they felt it should be a requirement that all providers/instructors take some type of training prior to offering a cluster. He did mention that there will be some type of training for all providers/instructors and other interested parties relative to the new online Professional Development Management System. It has not been determined how this PDMS training will be facilitated.

The Board felt that a required training was not a viable option for providers/instructors, but could be offered as requested. Mr. Michels continues to spend time with various potential providers in stepping them through the application, complete with helpful hints, and helping them understand the cluster approval process. Mr. Michels would need to work with the PDAC on the topic of a formal training workshop to garner their support and expertise.

~ Encourage replications and/or discourage new clusters

- 3 Mr. Michels spoke of a potential solution to maintain the integrity of the cluster system which would be to encourage replications in lieu of new clusters.

The Board was not in favor of this idea.

~ Short-term hiatus of PSB/SBE cluster approvals

- 4 Mr. Michels suggested that the Board consider a temporary, short-term hiatus of cluster approval to maintain the integrity of the current cluster system.

After a short discussion, the Board's consensus was to continue the cluster approval process with no limitations.

BREAK (LUNCH)

III. Master Teacher Certification

After an initial activity where Board Members indicated in writing/posting what some attributes a Master Teacher should have, criteria for attaining a certification and the consequent responsibilities and perks, the Board had a discussion.

Mr. Michels indicated that he and PSB Chair Ms. Thomas were going to Louisville, KY on March 13 and 14 as guests of the Wallace Foundation's Teacher Leader initiative and are part of the small representative Delaware team. There will be 4 other states at the workshop: Alabama, Kansas, Kentucky and Ohio.

Questions arose as to whether a Master Teacher certification would be available and what it would look like. It was asked if this potential certification would differ from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards attributes. Mr. Michels expressed his concern that a Master Teacher certification should have attached to it, especially if there is a financial award, the requisite responsibilities to maintain the potential salary supplement. It was noted that the current 12% NBPTS salary supplement carries no requirements after attaining the significant certification to maintain the salary supplement. Mr. Michels noted several other states which require for example, educators working in a high need building or building, for an educator to receive a Master Teacher or NBPTS financial award.

Another component to consider is would a Master Teacher certification be considered another step on the relatively compact educational career ladder, between that of a teacher and an administrator? The Board felt that it may be a critical step for a cohort of Delaware educators to attain.

Several states' requirements for a Master Teacher certification were shared with the Board. It was mentioned that North Carolina and Rochester NY also had Master Teacher certifications and that Mr. Michels might look into them.

It was the consensus of the Board to continue these discussions and to hear from Ms. Thomas and Mr. Michels upon their return from Louisville.

IV. Continuing License Renewal Requirements

- Mr. Michels had done some considerable research in the area of Delaware's and 17 neighboring and other states' requirements for maintaining or continuing educator's license/certification. These requirements were presented to the Board. Mr. Michels expressed his concern as the PSB Executive Director that compared to other states, Delaware has relatively minimal requirements. Mr. Michels stated from experience that a Delaware educator need not take any other professional development outside what their local district or charter school is requiring within their district or charter school on an annual basis to attain the present requisite 90 clock hours within the 5 years. He felt that it was incumbent upon himself to ask the Board to consider looking at 'raising the bar' for Delaware educators. The original intent of this relicensure requirement was to 'push' educators to seek a variety of professional development opportunities from across the state that would enhance their knowledge and skills and have a positive impact on their students. If the Board was committed to amending regulation *1511 Issuance and Renewal of Continuing License*, it would also require the effort to amend the current language in the DE Code.

After a brief discussion, the Board verbally opted to maintain the present requirements for the renewal of a Continuing License.

IX. Legislative Priorities

After a discussion surrounding possible directions of Legislative priorities, the idea of looking at the possibility of bringing back to the PSB's responsibilities the original components of Teacher Preparation, Recruitment and Retention, and the Delaware Performance Appraisal System II was discussed. It was felt by some Board members that this would be at the top of PSB legislative priorities.

Board Members spoke of the need for the PSB to have more direct connections to all aspects of education in Delaware, perhaps even being fully autonomous.

It was mentioned that perhaps the initial step would be to form a Legislative Ad Hoc Committee with the initial emphasis on bringing the responsibility of Teacher Preparation, Recruitment and Retention back within the purview of the PSB. Several Members volunteered to be on this Committee. Establishing this Committee would require a stated purpose and timeline for completion. This item will be placed on the April 3 PSB agenda for Discussion.

X. Other

PSB Retreat Mtg Minutes 3.8.08

(None)

A. XI. Adjournment

A motion was made by Ms. Hudson and seconded by Ms. Pikus to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

During the course of this meeting, the Professional Standards Board may enter into Executive Session to consider strategy with respect to pending and potential litigation or with respect to personnel issues. The Professional Standards Board may also take breaks.

The times designated on the agenda are approximate and are listed for administrative purposes only. The Professional Standards Board reserves the right, pursuant to Section 10004(e) of the Freedom of Information Act, to hear any matter out of its order during the meeting.