

Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016 Workgroup

Final Report



**Annapolis, Maryland
November 2017**

Table of Contents

Workgroup Members.....	Page 3
Executive Summary.....	Page 4
Workgroup Charge and Process.....	Page 13
Committee Members and Assignments I.....	Page 15
Committee Members and Assignments II	Page 16
Summary of Meetings.....	Page 17
Meeting Attendance I	Page 29
Meeting Attendance II	Page 30
National and Local Perspectives on Teacher Recruitment and Retention.....	Page 31
Committee Reports	Page 35
Committee 1 Certification.....	Page 35
Committee 2 Incentives.....	Page 44
Committee 3 & 5 Professional Development and Mentoring...Page 52	
Committee 4 Institutional Performance Criteria Revision.....	Page 59
Workgroup and Committee Recommendations.....	Page 62
Committee 1 Certification.....	Page 62
Committee 2 Incentives.....	Page 63
Committee 3 & 5 Professional Development and Mentoring...Page 65	
Committee 4 Institutional Performance Criteria Revision.....	Page 68
Bibliography.....	Page 70
Appendix.....	Page 75

Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016

Workgroup Members

Ms. Sarah Spross, Maryland State Department of Education, Chair

Ms. Tess Blumenthal, Maryland Association of Elementary School Principals (MAESP)

Ms. Amanda Conn, Esq., Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE)

Dr. Emily Dow, Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC)

Ms. Marietta English, Baltimore Teachers Union (BTU)

Ms. Linda Gronberg-Quinn, Maryland Association of Directors of Education at Community Colleges (MADTECC)

Dr. Deborah Kraft, Maryland Independent Colleges and University Association (MICUA)

Dr. Sylvia Lawson, Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE)

Dr. Nancy Shapiro, University of Maryland System (USM)

Mr. Jin Schrattenecker, Alternative Preparation Community (MAAPP)

Ms. Rowena Shurn, Maryland State Educators Association (MSEA)

Dr. Jack Smith, Public School Superintendents Association of Maryland (PSSAM)

Ms. Annette Wallace, Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals (MASSP)

Ms. Laura Weeldryer, Maryland State Board of Education (SBOE)

Maryland State Department of Education Staff

Ms. Jessica Bancroft

Ms. Alexandra Cambra

Mr. Daniel Cappozzi

Ms. Ruth Downs

Ms. Michelle Dunkle

Ms. Jeanne-Marie Holly

Ms. Kelly Meadows

Ms. Cecilia Roe

Mr. Derek Simmons, Esq.

Executive Summary

In response to Senate Bill (SB) 493 Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016 (Appendix I), this report provides a national perspective on the best practices regarding recruitment, induction, and retention of teachers while providing context for how these trends are manifesting in Maryland. Stakeholder groups from across the Prek-12 and Higher Education Communities have determined that current practices in Maryland may be hindering our recruitment and retention efforts designed to place the most proficient teachers in front of Maryland's students.

Enacting the reforms and recommendations included in this report will require adjustments to how current resources are used, revision to current regulations and policy to allow for greater flexibility regarding the certification of teachers, higher standards and accountability for Maryland's teacher preparation programs, increased differentiation and availability for professional development and induction opportunities for educators, and the investment of additional resources geared toward increasing teacher recruitment, retention, and student achievement.

Key recommendations from this report fall into four categories:

1. Certification of Maryland teachers;
2. Financial incentives for the recruitment and retention of teachers, both to the profession and to the state's most needy schools;
3. Mentoring and professional development for current educators, including increased collaboration with Institutions of Higher Education (IHE); and
4. Standards and accountability for educator preparation programs in Maryland.

The report includes committee and workgroup recommendations as follows:

Recommendations

Committee 1 Recommendations: Certification

- **Recommendation 1:** The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) should develop a direct pathway for initial certification for those individuals who have achieved National Board Certification.
 - To be eligible for National Board Certification, a candidate must possess a bachelor's degree from an accredited institution, complete three years of successful teaching, and hold a valid state teaching license.
- **Recommendation 2:** Support regulation allowing local education agencies (LEAs) the ability to request adjunct certification from the MSDE for those individuals who meet the following eligibility criteria:
 - Hold a minimum of a bachelor's degree from an accredited university/college
 - Hold industry licensure, when applicable, for that profession
 - Have five years of successful experience in the field

Local education agencies (LEA)s would be required to provide the following to those individuals who hold an adjunct certificate:

- Mentoring
- Full time, side by side coaching with a professionally-certified educator (for a minimum amount of time). Note that language choice here was not agreed upon by the committee as a whole; Maryland State Education Association (MSEA) representative(s) prefer “co-teacher”
- Professional development, both prior to entry into the classroom and throughout the school year
- Regular evaluations

The certificate should have the following limitations:

- Non-transferable
 - Part-time
 - One-year validity period
 - Renewable, upon the request of a LEA
 - Issued by the MSDE
 - Limited to certification areas identified by the MSDE
-
- **Recommendation 3:** Support the acceptance of either a traditional measure or standards-based performance measure (e.g., EdTPA, PPAT) to fulfill the pedagogy assessment requirement for certification.
 - **Recommendation 4:** Amend current regulation to allow those individuals seeking certification, who have a conferred bachelor’s degree or higher from an accredited university/college and a minimum GPA of 2.75, to be exempt from submitting passing scores on a basic skills assessment.
 - **Recommendation 5:** Amend current regulation to allow those individuals seeking certification, who do not hold a bachelor’s degree (i.e., specialized and professional technical area candidates), the ability to present credit bearing coursework to fulfill the basic skills requirement in lieu of an assessment.
 - **Recommendation 6:** The MSDE, with input from stakeholder groups, should explore the current structure and content of the certification regulations to determine if they remain appropriate.

Workgroup Recommendations: Certification

The workgroup concurred with all committee #1 recommendations with the following clarifying language:

- **Recommendation 2:**
 - Mentoring should target pedagogy and professional development; and

- Issuance of the certificate should be closely monitored as not to circumvent traditional and nontraditional teacher preparation programs.
- **Recommendation 4:**
 - Clarify to all that the recommendation to accept a bachelor’s degree in lieu of Praxis Core is solely for certification requirements and does not impact entrance and exit requirements for teacher preparation programs
- **Recommendation 5**
 - Clarify that the option in #4 is only available to Professional Technical Educators (PTE) and specialized teachers;
 - The MSDE will evaluate the impact and conduct research on student learning outcomes as a result of implementation; and
 - The MSDE will study the number of teachers impacted by this recommendation.

Committee 2: Incentives

- **Recommendation 1:** Recommend that loan forgiveness, the committee’s number one recommendation, be open to all teachers, in all certificate areas, in all public schools. Educators should have loans repaid at a rate of \$25,000 for those prepared in Maryland Approved Programs, and at a rate of \$17,500 for those prepared in approved, out-of-state programs. Repayment should begin on day one of the 6th year of teaching, after five years teaching in a Maryland public school.
- **Recommendation 2:** Expand the Quality Teacher Incentive Act (QTIA) as follows:
 - All Nationally Board Certified Teachers (NBCT) and Advanced Professional Certificated (APC) teachers who qualify to be mentors, based on revised Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) language, will be eligible for the \$1000 stipend for serving as mentors to early-career educators.
 - If the early-career educator works in a comprehensive needs school (CNS), the mentor is eligible for an additional \$1000 stipend.
 - No extension of time is recommended but there is now eligibility in more than one area.
 - See the recommended awards summary below:
 - NBCT: \$2,000 in CNS or \$1,000 non-CNS
 - If APC and/or NBCT and a mentor, awarded an additional \$1,000
 - If a mentor in a CNS, an additional \$1,000
- **Recommendation 3:** Recommend the creation of a statewide recruitment database that acts as a central hub for information on eligible candidates for educator positions. Local education agencies would pay a fee to access the candidate database.

- **Recommendation 4:** Fund the Maryland Alternative Teaching Opportunity Program, a previously unfunded statute, created in order to encourage the use of alternative preparation programs to meet the demand for qualified teachers in science, mathematics, and special education. Funding could be used to support participation in the pre-residency internship required for between four to eight weeks. Committee members agree that this is a low-priority recommendation and only make the recommendation if there is adequate funding that does not pull funding from other recommended incentives.
- **Recommendation 5:** Recommend that all LEAs implement the Career Technology Education Teacher Academies of Maryland (TAM) programs of study. Encourage all IHEs in Maryland with teacher preparation programs to enter into statewide articulation agreements with TAM. Recommend each county ensure their TAMs are located strategically across each county and not geographically misrepresented.

Workgroup Recommendations: Incentives

The workgroup concurred with all committee #2 recommendations with the following clarifying language:

- **Recommendation 1:**
 - Clarify that loan forgiveness should include those individuals that already are employed;
 - Align with Kirwan Commission recommendations; and
 - Support loan forgiveness, but with no consensus on details of deferment, amount, years in service, type of school, and retroactive model.
- **Recommendation 2:**
 - Include APC teachers in Quality Teacher Incentive Act;
 - Create new levels of incentives for recognizing mentors in both comprehensive and non-comprehensive needs schools; and
 - Consider increased monetary incentive amounts as present amounts do not appear to be enough to fulfill the program’s objectives.
- **Recommendation 3**
 - Database to be developed by the MSDE; and
 - Costs of database are not passed on to LEAs.
- **Recommendation 4:**
 - Amend language to include funding teacher internships in traditional and nontraditional teacher preparation programs.

Committees 3 and 5: Induction and Mentoring

- **Recommendation 1:** Create statewide and equitable professional development pathways, with career-wide learning opportunities, for educators across the state.
 - Leverage state, LEA, union, and two- and four-year higher educational expertise and resources to increase quality, transparency, and portability of professional learning.
 - Leverage new knowledge, promising practices, and advanced technologies to increase access and success, including an online repository for professional development, mentor training, and induction programs.
 - Leverage statewide and regional partnerships, resources, and delivery structures to ensure equitable access across the state.
- **Recommendation 2:** Build capacities and establish protocols for development and implementation of innovative educational approaches, such as micro-credentials and micro-degrees, to strengthen teaching effectiveness and career advancement.
 - Create contexts and conditions for research and development of micro-credentials and micro-degrees with high-tech, high-touch, and hi-impact approaches to increase equitable access and improve teacher effectiveness and career advancement.
 - Establish state-wide quality assurance policies and procedures for validating and awarding micro-credentials and micro-degrees among stakeholders such as the MSDE, Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC), University System of Maryland (USM), LEAs, IHEs, and industry leaders.
 - Establish an innovation and improvement collaborative on micro-credentials and micro-degrees that leverages expertise and resources among stakeholders to build capacity and linkages for sustainable advancement.
- **Recommendation 3:** Establish LEA-IHE partnerships to develop, deliver, and ensure high-quality professional development programs that link, but are not limited to, certification regulations for renewal.
 - Establish shared vision, responsibilities, and resources for professional development, mentor training, and induction programs that meet LEA and school priorities and address individualized needs for teachers.
 - Establish professional development, mentor training, and induction programs that incorporate evidence-based practices with context, content and pedagogical currency, such as cultural proficiency and technology integration, to increase teacher effectiveness and student achievement.

- Establish a quality assurance framework that meets state and national guidelines such as National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, Standards for Professional Learning, and Model Code of Ethics for Educators.
- **Recommendation 4:** COMAR 13A.07.01.06.F Mentoring Component of the Comprehensive Induction Program shall include the following:
 - Mentors shall:
 - Have received tenure;
 - Have a minimum of three years of “satisfactory” experience teaching (five years teaching experience preferred);
 - Be in good standing with a rating of "highly effective" or the equivalent, depending upon the rating scale used by the LEA;
 - Receive a recommendation from a principal or administrator that includes evaluation of content, pedagogical, and interpersonal skills;
 - Express a willingness to participate in professional development specific to mentoring;
 - Receive training in best practices related to mentoring; and
 - Agree with the administrators to the mentorship position.
- **Recommendation 5:** Create state-wide and equitable mentoring training pathways among IHEs, LEAs and regulatory agencies to support teacher preparation and teacher leadership development.
 - Co-develop and implement high-impact mentorship training programs which embed innovative evidence-based strategies and practices, such as adult learning theories, cultural competencies, and peer coaching, to support teacher development.
 - Provide appropriate time and resources to address professional needs and support individualized learning for mentors and mentees.
 - Establish mentoring networks and provide theme-based (such as English Learners and special education), role-based (such as department chair and resource teacher), and or/context-based (urban and rural schools) opportunities to improve effectiveness mentorship in diverse school settings.
 - Match mentees with mentors who have similar experiences serving specific student populations, such as students with disabilities, English Learners, and socio-economic backgrounds and content areas.
- **Recommendation 6:** Provide appropriate funding and infrastructure to ensure equitable and accountable implementation of the above recommendations in compliance with statewide policies (e.g. COMAR 13A.07.01 and local operations).

- Strengthen COMAR implementation with resources and accountability measures for teacher induction and mentor training, including sufficient release time to engage in non-instructional, evidence-based professional development opportunities, and documentation of evidence-based practices, that are consistent with the recommendation of SB 493.
- Strengthen LEA infrastructures and capacities to ensure equitable and accountable implementation, leading to full compliance with COMAR 13A.07.01 and the above recommendations, no later than 2023.

Workgroup Recommendations: Induction and Mentoring

The workgroup concurred with all committees' #3 and 5 recommendations with the following clarifying language:

- **Recommendation 1:**
 - Clarified language to assure greater communication and dialogue within the education community, i.e. pre-K12 and Higher Education;
 - Emphasized the need to allocate financial resources; and
 - Identified recommendation #3 supports recommendation #1.
- **Recommendation 2:**
 - The MSDE should assure micro-credentials can be converted to Continuing Professional Development (CPD) credits for certification renewal;
 - The MSDE should create a teacher leadership pathway through micro-credentialing; and
 - The MSDE consider requiring mentoring endorsement for certification purposes.
- **Recommendation 5:**
 - Identified that bullets 2, 3, and 4, should be moved under recommendation 4.
- **Recommendation 6:**
 - LEAs identify and share best practices used for professional development.

Committee 4: Institutional Performance Criteria Revision

- **Recommendation 1:** With unanimous agreement, the committee recommends to the Work Group that it seek the adoption of the *Maryland Educator Preparation Standards* to replace the *Institutional Performance Criteria (IPC)* as the framework for all state-approved educator preparation programs. (Appendix II)
- **Recommendation 2:** The committee further recommends that a representative stakeholder group revise the *Professional Development School (PDS) Standards*, the *PDS Implementation Manual*, and the *PDS Framework for Assessment* between November 1, 2017 and November 1, 2018.

- **Recommendation 3:** The committee recommends that a concurrent work group of representative stakeholders focus on the alignment of the *Maryland Approved Alternative Preparation Program Standards*, currently aligned with the *Institutional Performance Criteria*, with the *Maryland Educator Preparation Standards*.
- **Recommendation 4:** The committee recommends that the MSDE, with its educator preparation programs (EPP), LEA and other partners, develop a “Glossary of Terms” that incorporates commonly used terms that do not always lend themselves to a common definitive understanding. Such terms as “rubrics,” “performance assessment,” and others require a clear, common understanding of meaning to maintain the critical balance between EPP performance and State Program Approval and assure program excellence.
- **Notes:**
 - The word “mastery” is used in the document to replace commonly used, but ill-defined and often meaningless, words such as “rigorous” and “proficient”. In the context of this document, EPPs will be required to provide evidence that teacher candidates demonstrate mastery of certain instructional elements and competencies. An EPP will be required to define the measurement of mastery in its assessment system, defend that measurement with a rationale, collect and use resulting data to validate the rationale, and systematically engage in ongoing program improvement as a result of data analysis.
 - Significant changes to the IPC are found in Standard II, in relation to the Professional Development Schools implementation, and in Standards I and III with increased requirements for program completion/certification eligibility.

Workgroup Recommendations: Institutional Performance Criteria Revision

While workgroup members recognized the considerable improvements made to the IPC, members were split on its adoption. Four (4) individuals abstained from voting: Dr. Dow, MHEC; Dr. Kraft, MICUA; Dr. Shapiro, USM, and Ms. Shurn, MSEA. One abstaining member asked for more time for deliberation on the IPC. All other members present: Ms. Blumenthal, MESP; Ms. Gronberg-Quinn, MADTECC; Dr. Lawson, MSDE; Mr. Jin Shrattenecker, Alternative Preparation Community; and Ms. Spross, MSDE, support the committee’s recommendations.

- **Recommendation 1:**
 - Remove the word unanimous.
- **Recommendations 2, 3, and 4:**

- Abstaining members expressed concern about the timelines associated with the implementation of the IPC, the membership of the workgroups identified in recommendations 2, 3, and 4, and the specifics regarding the IPC oversight.

Workgroup Charge and Process

Introduction:

During the 2016 Maryland General Assembly, legislation was passed concerning teacher retention and induction. Chapter 740 (SB 493) - Teacher Induction, Retention and Incentive Act of 2016 altered the incentives provided for teachers and created a new voluntary pilot program for first-year teachers to allow more time for planning, peer observation, and mentoring. Additionally, the Act required the MSDE to convene a group of stakeholders, to include representatives of primary and secondary education, higher education, and education policy experts, to determine effective recruitment, retention, and promotion of quality educators at all levels. The workgroup convened by the MSDE was required to deliver an interim report to the Governor and the General Assembly on November 1, 2016 (Appendix III) and a final report on November 1, 2017.

Charges:

The workgroup shall determine how:

- to recruit, retain, and promote quality teachers at all levels of education in the State;
- to incorporate and interweave the principals of National Board Certification with the Advanced Professional Certificate, Master of Education programs, and other teacher preparation programs;
- to make the teacher recertification process more valuable, including an exploration of how to link recertification to career ladders and content or high need areas/specializations;
- to link loan forgiveness to teaching in high need schools;
- to incorporate induction best practices into professional eligibility certificates; and
- to determine if, or how, existing state laws and regulations impact recruitment, retention, and promotion of quality educators for each of the following areas:
 - a. individual and team competency;
 - b. performance measurement and management;
 - c. reward and recognition for excellent work; and
 - d. discipline in the classroom.

The workgroup shall make recommendations regarding:

- 1) The findings of the above referenced items;
- 2) Legislative changes that will ensure that teacher academies, as authorized under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), will be of the highest quality and rigor if they are implemented in Maryland, and that the individuals that participate in these academies will be fully prepared and trained to be in a classroom in Maryland;
- 3) A coordinated statewide strategy for recruiting, retaining, and promoting quality teachers at all levels of education; and
- 4) The best methods of incentivizing effective teachers to choose to teach in low-performing schools and schools with a critical mass of economically disadvantaged students in light of federal regulations that require the equitable distribution of effective teachers.

Process:

To effectively and efficiently manage its charge, at the first meeting (June 22, 2016), five committees were formulated and workgroup members were asked to identify one individual to represent their organizations on each of the committees, focusing on specific aspects of the charge. Each group was responsible for using the data provided to all workgroup members and to independently collect additional data to formulate sub-recommendations to be presented to the workgroup members as related to their assigned topic. The committee assignments and responsibilities through November 1, 2016 can be found on page 15.

To facilitate the work, initial meetings were rich with materials and presentations by speakers suggested by workgroup members and the chair. Materials included numerous newspaper articles, studies from a number of educational organizations addressing various related topics, incentive information from each of the fifty states, teacher attrition data from Maryland, and state laws and regulations pertaining to teacher certification, induction, and preparation. Workgroup members were given the opportunity to request additional speakers or information from the chair and staff.

Beginning on July 19, 2016, the committees were given time to discuss their topics, how to use the information provided to them, and to identify additional information needed in order to make clear and concise sub-recommendations concerning how to recruit, prepare teacher candidates, facilitate induction, and retain quality teachers in Maryland.

In August 2016, the committees presented their sub-recommendations to the full workgroup and the workgroup members adopted its interim recommendations. Workgroup members had the opportunity to review and discuss the draft interim report at the October 4, 2016 meeting. The interim report was submitted on November 1, 2016.

On November 14, 2016 and January 20, 2017, the workgroup convened to assure that the interim findings and recommendations continued to be aligned to the parameters of the SB 493 and to reestablish the framework for the committees to continue their work. As a result, workgroup members decided to restructure the committees to address specific issues affecting Maryland teacher recruitment and retention. New committees identified by the workgroup and can be found on page 16.

Beginning on January 31, 2017, the five newly formed committees began meeting with a more refined focus on outcomes. Committees met over the following nine months to fully develop recommendations to be presented to workgroup for consideration at its September 25, 2017 meeting. Workgroup members had the opportunity to review and discuss the draft recommendations at their September 25, 2017 meeting. Workgroup recommendations were shared with the Professional Standards Teacher Education Board on October 5, 2017 and the State Board of Education on October 24, 2017. The final report was submitted on November 1, 2017.

Committee Assignments and Responsibilities - June 22, 2016

Committee 1: Determine how to recruit quality teachers at all levels of education in Maryland

Audra Butler	Anne Arundel Community College	MADTECC
Carrie Conley	Montgomery County Public Schools	MAESP
Matthew Record	Worcester County Public Schools	MASSP
Tanya Williams	Hood College	MICUA
Jeanne-Marie Holly	Division of College and Career Readiness	MSDE
Mary Tillar	Anne Arundel County Public Schools	PSSAM
Nomsa Geleta	University of Maryland Eastern Shore	USM

Committee 2: Determine how to prepare quality teachers at all levels of education in Maryland

Debra Poesé	Montgomery Community College	MADTECC
Monique Sloan	Prince George's County Public Schools	MAESP
Chris Merson	Carroll County Public Schools	MASSP
Stacey Brown-Hobbs	Mount St. Mary's College	MHEC
Chadia Abras	Johns Hopkins University	MICUA
Michelle Dunkle	Division of Educator Effectiveness	MSDE
Robin McNair	Prince George's County Public Schools	MSEA
Laurie Mullen	Towson University	USM

Committee 3: Determine how to induct quality teachers at all levels of education in Maryland

Deanna Stock	Chesapeake College	MADTECC
Phylis Lloyd	Baltimore City Public Schools	MAESP
Lance Pace	Prince George's County Public Schools	MASSP
Stacy Williams	Loyola College	MICUA
Cecilia Roe	Division of Curriculum, Assessment and Accountability	MSDE
Cathy Carpela	Montgomery County Public Schools	MSEA
Heather Lageman	Baltimore County Public Schools	PSSAM
Kelly Fiala	Salisbury University	USM

Committee 4: Determine how to retain quality teachers at all levels of education in Maryland

Stacie Burch	Anne Arundel Community College	MADTECC
Lisa Booth	Howard County Public Schools	MAESP
Conrad Judy	Retired Principal	MASSP
Judy Jenkins	Goucher College	MICUA
Justin Heid	Frederick County Public Schools	MSEA
Gene Schaffer	University of Maryland Baltimore County	USM

Committee 5: Education Article §11-208

Fran Kroll	Howard Community College	MADTECC
Sister Sharon Slear	Notre Dame University	MHEC
Margret Trader	McDaniel College	MICUA
Maggie Madden	Division of Educator Effectiveness	MSDE
Kathie Walasik	Baltimore County Public Schools	MSEA
Kathy Angeletti	University of Maryland College Park	USM
Derek Simonsen	Office of the Attorney General	OAG
Amanda Conn	Executive Director, Legislative Services	MSDE

Committee Assignments and Responsibilities - January 20, 2017

Committee 1: Certification Restructuring (Recruitment and Retention)

Audra Butler	Anne Arundel Community College	MADTECC
Carrie Conley	Montgomery County Public Schools	MAESP
Margaret Trader	McDaniel College	MICUA
Kelly Meadows	Division of Educator Effectiveness	MSDE
Darren Hornbeck	Fredrick County Public Schools	MSEA
Mary Tillar	Anne Arundel County Public Schools	PSSAM
Karen Roberston	Towson University	USM

Committee 2: Quality Teacher Incentives (Recruitment and Retention)

Fran Kroll	Howard Community College	MADTECC
Monique Sloan	Prince George's County Public Schools	MAESP
Tanya Williams	Hood College	MICUA
Alexandra Cambra	Division of Educator Effectiveness	MSDE
Jeanne Marie Holly	Division of College and Career Readiness	MSDE
Justin Heid	Prince George's County Public Schools	MSEA
Tony Navaro	Calvert County Public Schools	PSSAM
Althea Pennerman	Salisbury University	USM

Committee 3: Expansion of Professional Development and Induction (Induction and Retention)

Deanna Stock	Chesapeake College	MADTECC
Phylis Lloyd	Baltimore City Public Schools	MAESP
Judy Jenkins	Goucher College	MICUA
Daniel Capozzi	Division of Curriculum, Assessment and Accountability	MSDE
Henoch Hailu	Montgomery County Public Schools	MSEA
Heather Lageman	Baltimore County Public Schools	PSSAM
Yi Huang	Coppin State University	USM

Committee 4: Institutional Performance Criteria Revision (Recruitment and Induction)

Stacie Burch	Anne Arundel Community College	MADTECC
Lisa Booth	Howard County Public Schools	MAESP
Chadia Abras	Johns Hopkins University	MICUA
Michelle Dunkle	Division of Educator Effectiveness	MSDE
Robin McNair	Prince Georges County Public Schools	MSEA
Laurie Mullen	Towson University	USM
Japera Parker	Urban Teachers	MAAPP

Committee 5: Mentoring (Recruitment and Retention)

Debra Poese	Montgomery Community College	MADTECC
Justin McConaughy	Frederick County Public Schools	MAESP
Stacey Williams	Loyola College	MICUA
Cecilia Roe	Division of Curriculum, Assessment and Accountability	MSDE
Jasmine Stewart	Prince George's County Public Schools	MSEA
Sarah Malory	University of Maryland College Park	USM

Summary of Meetings

June 22, 2016

This was the first meeting of the workgroup. Eight members were present. Sarah Spross, Chair and Dr. Karen Salmon, then Acting State Superintendent, opened the meeting with introductions and expectations. Ms. Spross introduced Senate Bill 493, the legislation passed by the General Assembly, which required the MSDE to create the workgroup.

Ms. Spross advised the workgroup members that the workgroup is considered to be a public body, and under the Open Meetings Act, the work conducted must be done in the open and must be transparent to the public. She counseled members to expect observers at the meetings and advised the group that there will be time for public comment at future meetings.

Ms. Spross introduced the charge and outlined the reporting requirements. Five committees were formulated and workgroup members were asked to identify one individual to represent their organizations on each of the committees, responsible for focusing on specific aspects of the charge. (Appendix IV)

Materials of Interest

At this meeting, workgroup members were given 25 documents, including SB 493, the Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Articles §6-112 State and Local Aid Program for Certification or Renewal of Certification, §6-202(b) Probationary Period, and §6-306 County Grants for National Certification, §6-705. Also included were Reciprocity in Certification of Teachers, §11-208 National Accreditation, COMAR 13A.07.01 Teacher Mentoring Programs, COMAR 13A.07.06.01 Program Approval, COMAR 13A.07.08 Incentive Programs for Certification by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, COMAR 13A.12.01.04 Options for Obtaining Initial Certification in Maryland, a chart of Teacher Preparation Program Reform Efforts, the December 1, 2015 Joint Chairmen Reports on Teacher Development and Ensuring High Quality Teachers, the 1995 *Redesign of Teacher Education*, *The Maryland Institutional Performance Criteria*, Teacher Attrition Data, seven studies, and newspaper articles focused on the topics of teacher induction, retention, and advancement. (Appendix V)

July 7, 2016

This was the second meeting of the workgroup. Seven members were present. Two speakers were invited to present information and to respond to questions at this meeting.

Ms. Jeanne-Marie Holly, Program Manager, Career and Technology Education Systems, MSDE, presented the Teacher Academies of Maryland and their relation to the workgroup. Teacher Academies of Maryland are state-approved CTE Programs of Study. The program was developed in 2005-2006 with representatives from LEAs, community colleges, baccalaureate degree granting institutions, the Maryland Higher Education Commission, the University of Maryland System, and the MSDE.

Teacher Academies of Maryland prepares high school students for further education and careers in the education profession. It is currently offered in 18 of Maryland's 24 LEAs and there are currently five statewide articulation agreements with various IHEs. In 2015, there were 2,105 students enrolled in this program and over 90% of the TAM students passed the industry recognized credential, the *ParaPro*, which was 11% higher than the state average for all industry credentials for all CTE programs.

All members agree that this was a great example of collaboration between the Higher Education and the Maryland PreK-12 Communities and is a unique approach to engaging students early with the education profession.

Ms. Cecelia Roe, Director of Instruction Assessment & Professional Learning, Division of Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability, MSDE, summarized the COMAR Regulations that pertain to teacher induction in Maryland. Furthermore, she provided an overview of how LEAs provide professional development to their teachers. While each county's professional development plan may be different, Ms. Roe reported that all LEAs offer pre-school year orientation, provide mentors some sort of professional development throughout the year, and focus on discipline, planning, and assessment.

Workgroup members expressed interest in the qualifications required of mentors and whether or not the MSDE and LEAs have collaborated with IHE's for professional development. Members indicated that further research and discussion are needed on both topics. (Appendix VI)

Materials of Interest

At this meeting, workgroup members were given information from each of the presenters, documents exploring teacher retirement programs, causes for educator separation, information regarding Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), and various reports and articles. (Appendix VII)

July 19, 2016

This was the third meeting of the workgroup. Ten members were present. During this meeting, the five sub-committees: recruitment, preparation, induction, retention and Education Article §11-208, met for the first time.

Ms. Spross briefly reiterated the charge of the workgroup and recommended providing the opportunity for public comment at both the August 2nd and August 16th meetings. Workgroup members agreed that this would be beneficial.

The five committees were given approximately one and a half hours to discuss their topics. At the conclusion of the work session, each committee provided an update to the workgroup

members. Committee reports and workgroup discussions are reflected in the July 19, 2016 minutes. (Appendix VIII)

Materials of Interest

At this meeting, workgroup and committee members were given information that pertained to the work of each committee: recruitment, preparation, induction, retention and Education Article §11-208. Documents primarily included articles, but additional information was also provided on National Board Certification and CAEP. (Appendix IX)

August 2, 2016

This was the fourth meeting of the workgroup. Ten members were present. Time was allocated for public comment; however, no one signed up. Notice was provided for public comment at the August 16, 2016 meeting and notice was provided for public comment on the MSDE website. Multiple opportunities for public comment had been provided.

Ms. Spross addressed confusion that was expressed by both committee and workgroup members at the July 19th meeting. Some committee members expressed confusion regarding their assignments (member vs. alternate) and there was misunderstanding about how many representatives could participate in the work of each committee. As had been previously shared, each stakeholder group had an equal voice, and with that understanding, will have equal representation on both the workgroup and the committees. This meant that each committee shall only have one representative from an organization at the table as a participant at any given time. The alternate would fill in for that member if he or she was unable to attend a meeting or needed to leave early.

The five committees were given approximately one and a half hours to discuss their topics. Committee reports and workgroup discussions are reflected in the August 2, 2016 minutes. (Appendix X)

Materials of Interest

During the meeting, workgroup and committee members were given information that pertained to the work of each committee: recruitment, preparation, induction, retention, and Education Article §11-208. Documents provided include statutes, regulations, and articles. (Appendix XI)

August 8, 2016

A committee meeting was held. The meeting afforded committee members the opportunity to work in their groups to begin formulating their interim recommendations.

August 16, 2016

This was the fifth meeting of the workgroup. Nine members were present. The location for the meeting was changed to the Baltimore County Library - Arbutus Branch due to space

constraints at the Odenton Regional Library. This meeting also had time allocated for public comment. However, no one appeared to give testimony. Notice was provided for public comment on the MSDE website. There would continue to be additional opportunities for public comment.

Time was allocated on the agenda for the committees to meet briefly to review their interim recommendations. The majority of this meeting was dedicated to committee presentations of their work and for initial recommendation(s) to be presented to the workgroup. All five committees reported out, and the discussions are reflected in the August 16, 2016 minutes. (Appendix XII)

Materials of Interest

At this meeting, workgroup and committee members were given information that pertained to the work of each committee: recruitment, preparation, induction, retention, and Education Article §11-208. In addition to various articles, workgroup and committee members were provided data regarding National Board Certified Teachers in Maryland, a chart comparing the Maryland IPC to the CAEP standards, and the 2014-2016 Teacher Staffing Report. (Appendix XIII)

October 4, 2016

This was the sixth meeting of the workgroup. Nine members were present. The date for this meeting was changed from Wednesday, September 28, 2016 to Tuesday, October 4, 2016 to accommodate the schedules of several workgroup members. In addition, the meeting location was changed to the MSDE because none of the facilities formerly used: the Odenton Regional Library, the Baltimore County Library - Arbutus Branch, and the Baltimore County Library - Owings Mills Branch, were available.

Workgroup members reviewed and discussed the draft interim report. The workgroup's interim recommendations can be found in the Interim Recommendations section of the interim report, located in Appendix III.

The Chair advised the work group to consider the draft confidential and not for dissemination. (Appendix XIV)

Materials of Interest

At this meeting, workgroup members were given information pertaining to the work of each of the committees: recruitment, preparation, induction, retention, and Education Article §11-208. In addition to other reports and articles, members received a number of reports recently generated by the Learning Policy Institute. (Appendix XV)

November 14, 2016

This was the seventh meeting of the workgroup. Seven members were present. Workgroup members participated in a robust discussion about the direction and steps toward which the workgroup would be moving in order to meet the requirements of SB 493. Participants agreed that the final report should include, but not be limited to, how to recruit, retain, and promote teachers at all levels, the principles of National Board Certification interwoven into incentives for teachers in high need schools (and possibly expand it to leadership), determination of how teacher certification affects the recruitment and retention of teachers, and incorporation of induction best practices. Members also addressed the need to discuss and revise the standards for teacher preparation to include what all teachers need to know regardless of their preparation route. The workgroup decided it would meet one more time before committees rejoined, and an additional meeting was scheduled for January 20, 2017. Workgroup discussions are reflected in the November 14, 2016 minutes. (Appendix XVI)

Materials of Interest

At this meeting, workgroup members were provided a number of articles related to the Kirwan Commission efforts, federal teacher preparation regulations, and the Maryland Teacher Staffing Report 2016-2018. (Appendix XVII)

January 20, 2017

This was the eighth meeting of the workgroup. Seven members were present. Members were informed that the proposed legislation concerning CAEP, developed by committee #5, had not yet “dropped”, and an update on the MSDE ESSA Listening Tours was provided to committee members. The ESSA comments related to this workgroup included the need for more relevant internship experiences for pre-service teachers, inclusion of cultural competency standards for teacher preparation programs, concerns regarding teacher certification tests, and the need to provide differentiated professional development that meets the individual needs of teachers.

Workgroup members concurred that the internships currently provided in teacher preparation programs do not provide enough exposure to different types of schools, students, and communities. Furthermore, concern was expressed that the current internship model is focused on input, rather than outcomes, and IHEs may need to use multiple measures to qualify teachers for entrance into a program. The idea of expanding teacher preparation programs to five years was explored, but concerns about money and time were raised.

The workgroup reviewed the current IPC and routes to certification. It was determined that both areas need revision to better meet the needs of today's classrooms. Specifically, certification regulations need to be reviewed in order to insure the removal of barriers to the recruitment of specialty educators and to examine the need for a complete regulatory overhaul to assure certification standards are aligned with national standards and the current needs of Maryland schools.

Workgroup members identified five new committees: certification, incentives, professional development, mentoring, and revision of the IPC. Workgroup discussions are reflected in the January 20, 2017 minutes. (Appendix XVIII)

Materials of Interest

None provided as this was a work session.

January 31, 2017

This was the ninth meeting of the workgroup. Eight members were present. Time was allocated for public comment; however, no one signed up. Notice was provided for public comment on the MSDE website. Multiple opportunities for public comment had been provided.

Members were provided a brief ESSA update, feedback from the workgroup meeting held on January 20th and new committees were identified. Dr. Shapiro emphasized that there will be overlap in the committees' work as teacher preparation, recruitment, induction, and retention are all interrelated.

The five committees were given approximately two hours to discuss their topics. Committee and workgroup discussions are reflected in the January 31, 2017 minutes. (Appendix XIX)

Materials of Interest

At this meeting, workgroup members were provided information that pertained to teacher retention, admission standards in teacher preparation programs, the Teaching, Empowering, Leading and Learning Survey, the impact of teacher unions, and micro-credentialing. (Appendix XX)

February 21, 2017

This was the tenth meeting of the workgroup. Seven members were present. Time was allocated for public comment, and one individual provided testimony.

Mr. Charles Hagan, Principal, Harford Technical High School, President of the Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals, and member of the Professional Standards Teacher Education Board (PSTEB)

Mr. Hagan indicated that the current certification requirements for Professional and Technical Education (PTE) teachers are presenting barriers for LEAs, particularly technical high schools, from hiring specialized teachers, such as welding and auto mechanics. He emphasized technical schools are seeking experts in a particular trade to teach those specific skills and the educational experience of potential candidates is typically high school. The validity period of the conditional certification for which these teachers qualify is two years. In their first two years as a teacher, they are expected to learn everything the school system does, earn 12 credits from an IHE, or through

continuing professional development credit, and pass a basic skills assessment. Principals of technical high schools are losing great people because the certification requirements do not provide an adequate amount of time for these teachers to meet the requirements of certification. Mr. Hagan asked the committee to allow conditionally certified teachers an additional two years to pass the basic skills assessment by requiring the test at the end of the validity period of the second conditional certificate. He emphasized this is not about lowering standards but allowing individuals two additional years to pass the test.

Workgroup members discussed co-teaching options, sought clarification regarding the conditional certificate requirements, and indicated that a strong statement needed to be made by the workgroup that the testing requirements for PTE need to be changed to reflect demonstrated experience in the skill being taught.

Workgroup members were provided updates concerning the CAEP legislation (House Bill 715), and proposed funding changes to the incentive programs identified in SB 493. The five committees were given approximately two hours to discuss their topics. Committee reports and workgroup discussions are reflected in the February 21, 2017 minutes. (Appendix XXI)

Materials of Interest

At this meeting, workgroup members were provided information that pertained to teacher test requirements in Utah. (Appendix XXII)

March 29, 2017 Workgroup Cancelled

This workgroup meeting was cancelled in order to allow Ms. Sarah Spross, Chair, to provide testimony on HB 715. Committee #4, Institutional Performance Criteria Revision, continued with their scheduled meeting at the Baltimore County Library Arbutus.

Committee discussions can be found in the March 29, 2017 minutes. (Appendix XXIII)

April 26, 2017

This was the eleventh meeting of the workgroup. Seven members were present. This meeting had time allocated for public comment and three individuals were present to provide comments.

Ms. Barbara Matthews, Coordinator of Certification, Harford County Public Schools

Ms. Matthews indicated she had over 23 years of experience, including time at the MSDE and as a local certification specialist in two LEAs. During her career, she reported being involved twice in restructuring the certification regulations. She was present at this meeting to support changes to the certification regulations, in particular those to PTE. Ms. Mathews provided an LEA perspective on the challenges of hiring PTE teachers and the barriers they face in achieving full certification. She indicated that PTE teachers

present with a high school diploma, are career changers, and that no second conditional certificate is awarded if they fail to meet the Basic Skills test requirement, even though the coursework requirements have been met and their principal reports they are effective teachers. Without the second conditional being awarded, the PTE teacher leaves and the cycle repeats.

Ms. Deborah Carter, Retired Nationally Board Certified Teacher of Latin and English, Fredrick County Public Schools

Ms. Carter came to the workgroup to provide perspective on why she is leaving the classroom after 30 years of teaching. She reported that she did not love teaching in her later years and she is now leaving because there is no autonomy given to educators, there is less time to teach due to all of the testing requirements, there are limited opportunities for individuals to become teacher leaders, and teachers are in need of supervisors that have more than three years of experience.

Mr. Charles Hagan, Principal, Harford technical High School, President of the Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals, and member of the PSTEB

Mr. Hagan shared his concerns regarding the certification requirements for PTE teachers. In addition to his testimony at the last meeting, he indicated that in the last three years in Harford County, thirteen PTE teachers have been let go, or are on their way out, because they could not meet the PTE certification requirements. “Thirteen teachers, at six schools, in not even four years”, he reported. He further noted that these are hard to fill positions in the areas of automotive, masonry, and machines. Anything that can be done to get these teachers and keep them should be done.

Workgroup members were provided updates concerning the CAEP legislation (HB 715). The five committees were given approximately two hours to discuss their topics. Committee reports and workgroup discussions are reflected in the April 26, 2017 minutes. (Appendix XXIV)

Materials of Interest

At this meeting, workgroup members were given information that pertained to teacher preparation, the importance of leadership in a school, teacher test requirements, and specific incentives for teachers in Maryland. In addition, committees #1 and #4 were provided documents specific to their efforts. (Appendix XXV)

May 30, 2017

This was the twelfth meeting of the workgroup. Eight members were present. This meeting was scheduled for workgroup members; however, committees #1 and #4 chose to conduct a work session during the workgroup meeting.

Workgroup members discussed data that the Maryland Longitudinal Data System Center (MLDS) had compiled regarding Maryland teachers. It appears that the data supports a loan forgiveness incentive for Maryland teachers. Dr. Dara Shaw, Director of Research at the MSDE would join the next meeting to provide a comprehensive data overview. The workgroup concurred that the committees have made significant process and that their draft recommendations, at this point, appear to be on target.

Workgroup discussions are reflected in the April 26, 2017 minutes. (Appendix XXVI)

Materials of Interest

At this meeting, workgroup members were given information that pertained to teacher shortages, scholarships, and information pertaining to Minnesota's teacher certification and preparation, as well as teacher's reflections on professional development. (Appendix XXVII)

June 20, 2017

This was the thirteenth meeting of the workgroup. Eight members were present. This meeting had time allocated for public comment; however, no one signed up. Notice was provided for public comment on the MSDE website. There continued to be opportunities for public comment.

Dr. Dara Shaw provided an overview of the data obtained from MHEC and the MLDS. She reported that there are multiple influences related to policy that can potentially influence teacher shortage areas. The goal is to determine the policy on which to focus. Data points discussed are as follows:

- Table 1 shows the number of students graduating from four-year Maryland public institutions with a teaching degree. There are 1200-1300 each year. Of those, 40% enroll with the intent to earn teaching degree. Another 60% decide sometime after they enroll. These numbers indicate that a larger number of teachers that become employed in Maryland's LEAs have been "recruited" from within the college or university.
- Table 4 shows the Maryland Teacher Staffing Report data. It shows that Maryland is not meeting the needs of the local districts. There is additional data that shows that the percentage of beginning new hires prepared out-of-state was comparatively higher in CTE (93%), computer science (92%), and English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) (93%). The percentage of beginning new hires prepared out of state was comparatively low in early childhood (Prek-3) (60%) elementary education (64%), and physical education (93%). This may indicate a need to expand CTE, computer science, and ESOL programs in Maryland.

- Table 5 reflects salaries. Graduates who become teachers have higher salaries. It shows that if they did not become teachers, they went into other fields including health care, early childhood, and elder care. This information indicates that the recruitment problem may not be caused by a salary issue.
- Table 7 represents geography. Data shows graduates are working in the LEA in which they went to school, another LEA, or never attended public school in Maryland. There is not complete data available in order to determine exactly who these teachers are; however, those who went to school in Maryland are divided between teaching in the LEA in which they attended school or another LEA.

Workgroup members engaged in robust discussion concerning the data presentation. An overview of committee draft recommendations to date was provided and each committee was given feedback from workgroup members regarding their progress.

The five committees were given approximately two hours to discuss their topics. Committee and workgroup discussions are reflected in the June 20, 2017 minutes. (Appendix XXVIII)

Materials of Interest

At this meeting, workgroup members were given information pertaining to why teachers leave the classroom, a report on teacher pensions, recruitment in other states, and teacher shortage areas. (Appendix XXIX)

July 25, 2017

This was the fourteenth meeting of the workgroup. Eight members were present. This meeting had time allocated for public comment; however, no one signed up. Notice was provided for public comment on the MSDE website. Multiple opportunities for public comment had been provided.

Workgroup members were provided updates regarding the report's submission and presentation dates, CAEP and the HB 715 provision of IHE's being held harmless while the IPC is revised, and history regarding the realignment of the five committees. Dr. Shapiro asked for more clarity regarding the charge and membership of committee #4 due to her stated concern that the right stakeholders have not been at the table to discuss the changes to the IPC. Workgroup members were reminded that it was each of their organizations that identified individuals to represent them on the workgroup, and it was those workgroup members that identified the individuals to serve on each of the five committees. As has been the practice for the duration of the workgroup, members have been encouraged to participate on any committee(s) they choose.

As requested by committee members, the workgroup and committees heard presentations regarding the EdTPA and PPAT assessments.

EdTPA Presentation by Kellie Crawford, Manger, Educator Relations, Evaluation Systems Group of Pearson

EdTPA is a portfolio assessment out of Stanford Center Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE) to support teacher preparation programs. Currently, 14 Maryland schools are using EdTPA in some capacity. Ms. Crawford indicated that one person typically scores the assessment and that some are double scored based on need. In response to another question, Ms. Crawford indicated that candidates pull together artifacts and are required to provide rationalization for everything they do with respect to cultural proficiency. She further indicated that the assessment uses two or three rubrics to assess implicit bias.

PPAT Presentation by Cathy Owens-Oliver, Ph.D., Director of Client Relations, Educational Testing Services

PPAT is an assessment published by ETS that evaluates test takers on their abilities to impact student learning as it relates to the InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards, demonstrating that they have the basic pedagogical content knowledge and application for the classroom to begin teaching as an entry-level teacher (ets.org). The PPAT uses a distributed scoring model. During her presentation, Dr. Owens-Oliver indicated that the PPAT lends itself to identifying what it looks like to demonstrate mastery of teaching.

The five committees were given approximately two hours to discuss their topics. Committee reports and workgroup discussions are reflected in the July 25, 2017 minutes. (Appendix XXX)

Materials of Interest

At this meeting, workgroup members were given information that pertained to alternative preparation programs, scholarships in other states, year-long residency models, and increasing diversity in the teacher workforce. (Appendix XXXI)

September 11, 2017

This was the fifteenth meeting of the workgroup. Seven members were present. The date for this meeting was changed from August 29, 2017 to September 11, 2017 in order to accommodate the post Labor Day start date and its effect on the availability of teacher representatives appointed to the workgroup and committees. This meeting had time allocated for public comment; however, no one signed up. Notice was provided for public comment on the MSDE website.

Workgroup members were provided updates regarding the submission and presentation dates of this report. In addition, the provision in HB 715 to hold IHE's harmless while the IPC is revised was discussed. The five committees were given approximately two hours to discuss their topics. Committee reports and workgroup discussions are reflected in the September 11, 2017 minutes. (Appendix XXXII)

Committees 3, 4, and 5 identified the need for one more work session before the workgroup's last meeting on September 25, 2017. Conference calls for each committee were set up for September 20, 2017.

Materials of Interest

At this meeting, workgroup members were given information that pertained to TAM, the Kirwan Commission, professional development, and equitable access to teachers. (Appendix XXXIII)

September 20, 2017

Committee meetings were held for committees 3, 4, and 5. These meetings afforded committee members the opportunity to work in their groups to finalize their recommendations. (Appendix XXXIV)

September 25, 2017

This was the sixteenth meeting of the workgroup. Eight members were present.

Workgroup members reviewed and discussed the final recommendations. The workgroup's final recommendations will be found in the recommendation section beginning on page 62 of this report. (Appendix XXXV)

Meeting Attendance I

Name	Organization	6/22/16	7/7/16	7/19/16	8/2/16	8/8/16	8/16/16	10/4/16
Amanda Conn Executive Director Governmental Relations	Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE)	Absent	X	X	X	X	X	X
Emily Dow Assistant Secretary	Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC)	X James Fielder	X	X	X Jon Enriquez	Absent	X	X Michael Kiphart
Marietta English President	Baltimore Teachers Union (BTU)	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent
Linda Gronberg-Quinn Chair	Maryland Association of Directors of Teacher Education at Community Colleges (MADTECC)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X Fran Kroll
Deborah Kraft Dean, School of Education, Stevenson University	Maryland Independent College and University Association (MICUA)	X	X	X Jennifer Frank	X	X	X	X
Tess Blumenthal Member, Executive Board	Maryland Association of Elementary School Principals (MAESP)	Absent	Absent	X	X	X	X	X
Nancy Shapiro Associate Vice- Chancellor	University of Maryland System (UMD)	X	X	X	X Donna Wiseman	X Donna Wiseman	X	X Kathy Angeletti
Jack Smith Superintendent	Public School Superintendents Association of Maryland (PSSAM)	X Renee Spence	Absent	X Gail Bennett	X Gail Bennett	X Renee Spence	X Gail Bennett	X Gail Bennett
Sarah Spross, Chair Assistant State Superintendent	Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Annette Wallace Principal, Pocomoke High School	Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals (MASSP)	X	Absent	X	X	X	Absent	Absent
Rowena Shurn Teacher	Maryland State Education Association (MSEA)	X	X	X	X	X Geraldine Duvall	X	X
Laura Weeldryer Member	Maryland State Board of Education (SBOE)	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent

Meeting Attendance II

Name	Organization	11/14	1/20	1/31	2/21	4/26	5/30	6/20	7/25	9/11	9/25
Emily Dow Secretary	Maryland Higher Education Commission	X	X	X	Absent	X J. Enriquez	X	X	X	X	X
Marietta English President	Baltimore Teachers Union (BTU)	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	X L. Cornish-Harris	X C. McCoy	Absent	Absent
Linda Gronberg-Quinn Chair	Maryland Association of Directors of Teacher Education at Community Colleges (MADTECC)	X	Absent	X	X	X	X	X	X	X A. Butler	X
Deborah Kraft Dean, Stevenson University	Maryland Independent College and University Association (MICUA)	X	X	X	X	X	X J. Frank	X C. Abrams	X J. Frank	X	X
Tess Blumenthal President	Maryland Association of Elementary School Principals	Absent	X	X	X	X	X	Absent	Absent	Absent	X
Nancy Shapiro, Associate Vice-Chancellor	University of Maryland System	X	X	X	X	X K. Angeletti	X	X	X	X J. Rice	X
Jack Smith Superintendent	Public School Superintendents Association of Maryland (PSSAM)	X	X	X	X	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent
Sarah Spross, Chair Assistant State Superintendent	Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Annette Wallace Principal, Pocomoke High	Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals (MASSP)	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent
Rowena Shurn President	Maryland State Education Association (MSEA)	X Justin Heid	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Laura Weeldryer Member	Maryland State Board of Education	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	NA	NA	NA	NA
Jin Schrattenecker	Prince Georges County Public Schools (MAAPP)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	X	X	X	X	X

National and Local Perspectives on Teacher Recruitment and Retention

The nation is experiencing a clear and worsening teacher shortage. Many concerning trends in education have converged to warrant critical scrutiny and deliberation for the implementation of much needed reforms at the local and state levels. Schools are experiencing an increase in the annual enrollment levels of elementary and secondary students (NCES, 2017) with projections trending upward for the next ten years. Naturally, as LEAs are presented with more students, a larger teacher workforce is necessary (Ingersoll, Merrill, Stuckey, 2014). To further complicate matters, educator preparation programs across the country have collectively experienced a sharp reduction in candidates for teaching (Sutcher, Darling-Hammond, Carver-Thomas, 2016). Despite effort on the part of policy makers and local school districts to reduce or reverse teacher turnover, it remains unchanged. As a result, a greater percentage of the workforce is comprised of inexperienced teachers (Ingersoll, 2012), and those inexperienced teachers are concentrated in schools with higher poverty levels (Rice, 2013). Teacher turnover compromises teacher quality, school stability, and student achievement, and there is a substantial financial cost to school districts (Carver-Thomas, Learning Policy Institute, 2017).

Specifically, national K-12 enrollment experienced a 19.4% increase from 1987 to 2012 (Ingersoll, Merrill, Stuckey, 2014). Between 2009 and 2014, teacher education enrollments dropped from 725,518 to 455,328, a startling 37.2% reduction (Title II Report). During the same time period (2009-2014), the total number of program completers in teacher education dropped from 241,401 to 172,139, a 28.6% reduction (Title II Report). In the next few years, the number of teacher education program completers is expected to decline due to the preceding years of low enrollment in these programs. Alternative certification programs have not been immune to the recruitment downturn, with the high-profile Teach For America facing a 35% drop in applications over three consecutive years, resulting in fewer teachers placed in classrooms around the country (Brown, 2016).

While national teacher education enrollment has plunged, some states have started to respond by lowering or adjusting entrance standards to keep pace with recruitment needs. Currently, there are approximately 100,000 underqualified individuals staffing classrooms across the nation (Carver-Thomas, Darling-Hammond, 2017). If the trends continue with regard to teacher staffing, more states will adopt reactive and emergency policies that could further dilute and diminish professional credentials and fail to address the annual revolving door of teacher turnover.

All of these national trends are present in Maryland. Student enrollment increased by 25,572 students to K-12 classrooms from 2010-2015, with an average increase of 5,114 students added per year (Maryland Department of Planning, 2015). The student enrollment projections for 2015-2020 surpass prior levels of growth, with 34,664 new students being added currently, and with an average of 6,993 students per year (Maryland Department of Planning, 2015). In

twenty-one (21) of the twenty-four (24) counties, school enrollment levels will record a new high in the next ten year cycle.

Rural districts will feel acute pressures with rising student enrollment and teacher staffing need, and almost all LEAs will be educating a greater number of free-or-reduced price meals (FARM) students. Much of the expected enrollment growth will occur in counties surrounding Washington D.C. and Baltimore. However, smaller and rural school systems such as Dorchester, Somerset, Wicomico, Worcester, Charles, St. Mary’s, Washington, and Queen Anne’s school systems will experience steady annual enrollment growth. In particular, Dorchester (12.1%), St. Mary’s (11.0%), and Charles (9.7%) all have to anticipate significant teaching staffing challenges without a large presence of educator preparation providers in their backyard.

Another layer to add to the projected increases in Maryland student enrollment, and its subsequent teacher needs, is that the percentage of Maryland public schools with 50% or greater concentration in poverty (defined by FARM) jumped from 14.2% to 43.4% from 1990 to 2010 (Sunderman & Dayhoff, 2014). In that same time period, every LEA experienced an increase of students in poverty with Prince George’s County having the greatest rise by 34.1%. Overall, twenty-three (23) of the twenty-four (24) Maryland school systems experienced more than 10% increase in the number of students in poverty (Sunderman & Dayhoff, 2014).

The Maryland teacher workforce has expanded by 2.9%, from 58,351 teachers to 60,053 teachers, over the past five years (Maryland P-12 Dashboard). As the need for Maryland teachers has grown, the state’s 34 educator preparation programs collectively (23 MAPs and 11 MAAPPs) have had fewer enrollees and completers over the past four years. Maryland is not unique to the recent recruitment downturn since neighboring states, like Pennsylvania and Delaware, have also experienced steeper declines in the number of their program completers (see Table A).

Table A. Program Completers from Educator Preparation Programs

State	2010-2011	2014-2015	change
Maryland	3,072	2,618	-14.7%
Pennsylvania	12,297	6,979	-43.2%
Delaware	766	615	-19.7%

Title II Report, 2016

Since Maryland is known as an “import state”, hiring over 59% of new teachers from outside of Maryland, the new hiring landscape will require more discussion, resources, and collaboration to increase the number of certification-eligible program completers from both traditional and non-traditional programs, while also reducing the rate of teacher attrition through multiple research-based interventions.

Maryland must begin to actively and definitively address the teacher shortage issue. Attention to the preparation of teacher candidates, in both colleges and universities and alternative

preparation programs, induction of new teachers, and differentiated professional development, is vital to addressing the issue of attrition from the profession. Redesigning teacher training through enhanced clinical experiences, performance-based assessments, and other reforms is necessary to equip beginning teachers to make the professional transition more smoothly and to be effective educators that remain in the profession. Each of these factors contributes to the reduction in available teachers in the State.

Educator preparation programs must be responsible and accountable for training teacher candidates to apply best-practice instructional strategies in the classroom in order to educate students of all races, zip codes, socio-economic statuses, and ability levels. In September 2017, the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) released *Transforming Education Preparation: Lessons Learned from Leading States*. In this “playbook”, CCSSO encourages states to increase the rigor of teacher preparation by elevating the expectations of state program approval, for both initial and reauthorizations (CCSSO, 2017). This includes having strong standards for program approval that are relevant to the state and using program reviews to guide teacher preparation programs towards continued improvement.

Once teachers are in the classroom, it is essential to provide induction and mentoring. [The Education Commission of the States](#), an organization that tracks education policy, wrote that to help ensure high-quality mentorship and induction, program standards may include mentor selection and training criteria. The advised criteria for selecting high-quality mentors include minimum years of experience, proven effectiveness in the classroom, demonstrated leadership qualities, and a strong understanding of adult learning. Program standards may also require mentors to teach in a common content area or grade as their mentee (Education Commission of the States, 2016).

The LEAs in Maryland have institutionalized mentoring and induction programs to assist and support new teachers as required in COMAR 13A.07.01. Currently, induction programs feature new teacher orientations, allocation of mentors to first-year teachers, and targeted professional development opportunities. An evidence-based approach to increase teacher planning time and reduce class workload is being piloted in three counties this academic year as a result of the Pilot Program included in this Senate Bill. The LEAs will report findings to the MSDE who will make recommendations regarding the pilot program’s feasibility to implement this initiative on a larger scale.

Next is the issue of attrition. The profession has a national attrition rate of about 8%, annually, and research shows that the number of teachers leaving each year accounts for close to 90% of annual teacher demand. Furthermore, less than a third of national teacher attrition is due to retirement. In other words, each year schools nationwide must hire tens of thousands of teachers as a result of beginning- and mid-career teachers leaving the profession (Carver-Thomas, Darling-Hammond, 2017).

In Maryland, the teacher workforce has shifted to a greater percentage of beginning teachers with fewer than five years of experience at 29.3%, compared to 16.5% of teachers with more than twenty years of experience (Maryland State Department of Education, 2016). Teacher attrition also has significant financial ramifications for LEAs, with a calculated annual cost of \$1 billion to \$2 billion nationwide (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2014). Prince George's County Public Schools calculated a financial hit of \$25 million with the need to replace 1197 teachers this past year ([Eubanks, LPI Panel, 2017](#) and [LPI Cost of Teacher Turnover Calculator](#)). To combat the growing costs of teacher staffing, induction programs have proven to not only bolster mentoring and professional development but also have been economically advantageous with a return of \$1.66 for every \$1 invested, when factoring in student achievement, teacher effectiveness, and teacher retention in the field (Villar & Strong, 2007).

To address the reasons why teachers are leaving the profession, it is imperative that there be an increase in the effectiveness and accountability of Maryland's teacher preparation programs, assurance that certification requirements are aligned to these programs, and a diverse nature of today's classroom. To do this, policies must be written that support new teachers with strong induction and mentoring, and incentives must be provided for teachers, not only to stay in the profession, but for strong successful teachers to take on the challenge of working in the lowest performing schools. Lastly, differentiated professional development, that fosters reflective practitioners and continuous learning, is needed to give teachers the skills and knowledge to address what educators feel they need to learn.

This is the backdrop for why education professionals from across Maryland were contacted and consulted to examine a path forward. Maryland has the opportunity to be a leader when addressing its teacher recruitment needs and teacher attrition with collaborative and research-based approaches among all interested stakeholders.

Committee Reports

Committee 1: Restructuring Certification (Recruitment)

Background

Committee 1 held meetings in 2016 and 2017 on the following dates: July 19, 2016; August 8, 2016; January 31, 2017; February 21, 2017; April 26, 2017; May 30, 2017; June 20, 2017; July 25, 2017; and September 11, 2017. Discussions centered on Maryland certification regulations, as well as recruitment opportunities. Initial meetings developed a more thorough charge to guide the committee, including:

1. Examining the degree to which Maryland can incorporate and interweave the principals of National Board Certification with Maryland certification;
2. Identifying current Maryland programs that support National Board Certification;
3. Determining how to link loan forgiveness to teaching in high needs schools;
4. Examining the routes to certification for specialized and professional technical areas;
5. Reviewing the certification requirements surrounding the basic skills assessment; and
6. Determining if an adjunct certification is an appropriate alternative pathway for Maryland LEAs.

In January 2017, the committees were restructured by the workgroup and this committee was charged with focusing solely on certification issues. All incentives, including loan forgiveness, became the responsibility of committee #2. With the inception of the new incentive committee, committee #1 shifted its focus to exploring how Maryland certification regulations may be amended to break down perceived barriers while preserving high standards.

Problems to Solve:

- **Recruitment and Retention of PTE Teachers:**

Local education agencies are not only having difficulty recruiting, but losing specialized and PTE teachers due to their inability to achieve full certification. It has been reported that these PTE teacher candidates often have difficulty passing basic skills assessments within the two year time frame allotted under the conditional certificate.

Given the critical shortages in many of these areas, it is in the best interest of Maryland students to examine if there are alternative measures of basic skills for those who do not test well but have demonstrated success in the classroom as conditionally certified teachers. Specific data regarding teacher shortage areas may be found in the Maryland Teacher Staffing Report 2016-2018 (Appendix XXXV)

Furthermore, the committee was provided with letters (Appendix XXXVI) from Montgomery County Public Schools, Carroll County Public Schools, Charles County

Public Schools, and The Maryland House of Delegates Legislative District 35B, Cecil and Harford Counties, that address the challenges of staffing PTE teachers.

- **Certification Structure:**
Current Maryland certification regulations are sometimes arduous and confusing to an applicant. In some instances, the regulations appear unnecessarily prohibitive and difficult to interpret. If Maryland is going to attract out of state educators and retain the educators prepared in-state, the regulations must be unambiguous, consistent, and sensible, while preserving high standards.
- **Conditional Certificate:**
Conditionally certified teachers need access to flexible professional development opportunities while working toward professional certification.
- **Inability to Staff Specialized Programs with Highly Skilled Individuals:**
Local education agencies are not able to offer specialized STEM and arts programs to their students due to the lack of professionally certified educators who have a background in these fields. During the 2016 legislative session, House Bill 617, Adjunct Instructor Program, was introduced. This bill would allow an LEA to issue adjunct certificates for this purpose. The bill did not pass; however, many LEAs in Maryland expressed interest in an adjunct certificate option for individuals who do not wish to become full time teachers but have knowledge in a specialized area and are willing to teach a course at a public high school.

Discussion Topics

- **National Board Certification as a Pathway to Maryland Certification**
Committee #1 examined the eligibility requirements associated with becoming Nationally Board Certified and found that, in order to participate in the program, a candidate must possess a bachelor's degree from an accredited institution, have completed three years of successful teaching, and hold a valid state teaching license. In Maryland, an individual who presents a bachelor's degree, three years of successful teaching experience in the past seven years, and a valid out of state teaching certificate, qualifies for Maryland certification. The committee felt strongly that developing a direct pathway to initial certification for those who achieve National Board Certification made sense.
- **Adjunct Certification**
During the 2016 Maryland legislative session, Anne Arundel County Public Schools (AACPS) sponsored House Bill 617, Adjunct Instructor Program, allowing AACPS to issue an adjunct certificate to an individual who is employed to teach part time in an area identified by AACPS as requiring a content expert. This bill did not pass; however, many LEAs expressed interest in the idea of an adjunct certificate.

Given the recently proposed legislation, committee #1 was charged with exploring the concept of an adjunct certificate. Several states have developed an adjunct certification to allow content experts the opportunity to share their expertise in the classroom. For example:

- South Carolina currently offers an adjunct certificate to individuals who hold a bachelor's degree and either have a major in, or pass the Praxis subject assessment in a South Carolina certificate area, as well as provides verification of five years of occupational experience in the content field of the certification area; and
- Georgia offers an adjunct certificate in all trades and industry fields, as well as healthcare science, to individuals with an associate's degree and two years of occupational experience who hold an applicable industry license. Additionally, Georgia allows an individual with a bachelor's degree in any major, and two years of applicable occupational experience, to qualify for an adjunct certificate in one of several identified shortage areas.

Committee #1 recognizes that Maryland LEAs are not currently able to offer specialty and professional technical programs due to critical staffing shortages. Current regulations do not allow an LEA the flexibility to place individuals with highly specialized content expertise, whom are interested in teaching on a part time basis, in the classroom as a teacher of record unless they are issued a conditional certificate. Conditional certificates are designed for an individual who is working toward full time employment and professional certification. The committee agreed that an adjunct certificate should be developed, but be limited in scope and designed to meet the needs of the LEA in which the individual is employed.

In order to assure high quality instruction, the committee is recommending that LEAs provide mentoring, co-teaching opportunities, and professional development to individuals who receive an adjunct certification. At a minimum, the committee is recommending candidates hold a bachelor's degree in a related content area, provide five years of successful occupational experience, and hold an industry credential, if applicable.

It is important to note that not all committee members were in favor of the creation of an adjunct certificate as some felt that all teachers, regardless of employment status, should be held to the same standard of pedagogical coursework requirements. Despite the dissent, all committee members did participate in formulating the recommended adjunct certificate parameters.

- **Basic Skills Assessment Requirement/Conditional Certification Renewal**

The committee was tasked with determining if the current renewal requirements for the conditional certificate remain appropriate. The committee reviewed the current regulatory language:

C. Conditional Teacher Certificate.

(1) An applicant may hold only one Conditional Teacher Certificate which may be renewed in accordance with this regulation.

(2) A Conditional Teacher Certificate may be renewed for 2 years, only one time, upon the recommendation of the local superintendent of schools, if the applicant has:

(a) Completed a minimum of 12 semester hours of course work toward the professional certificate during the 2-year period; and

(b) Achieved a qualifying score on the basic skills teacher certification test if required under Regulation .05A(3) of this chapter.

Members agreed that submitting twelve (12) semester hours toward the plan for professional certification remains appropriate. This allows conditionally certified educators two years to complete twelve (12) semester hours toward a plan that may take as little as three (3) semester hours, to as many as sixty-five (65) semester hours, to achieve professional certification. The committee felt that this “check point” helps to keep an individual on pace to achieve professional certification.

Further discussion focused on the basic skills test requirements in Maryland. Currently, all educators who apply for professional certification in Maryland must submit passing scores on one of the following approved basic skills teacher certification tests: Praxis Core Academic Skills for Educators (CORE), Scholastic Assessment Test (SAT), American College Test (ACT), or Graduate Records Examination (GRE).

The committee reviewed literature from College Board, publisher of the SAT, as well as literature from Educational Testing Services, publisher of the Praxis CORE and GRE, and determined that each of these measures is specially designed to assess whether an individual will be successful in completing college coursework. Given that all of the basic skills certification tests currently approved in Maryland are designed to measure skills and content knowledge of those entering a college program, the committee felt strongly that requiring those who have a conferred bachelor’s or higher degree from an accredited university or college, with a minimum Grade Point Average (GPA) of 2.75, should not be required to submit scores on a basic skills certification test. According to the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, ten (10) states (Arizona, Colorado, Iowa, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina, and Wyoming) do not currently require a basic skills assessment to qualify for teacher certification.

It is important to note that committee #1 considered the basic skills assessment requirement only as it pertains to teacher certification, not as it pertains to entry into a teacher education preparation program.

- **Specialized and Professional Technical Areas**

Public comment provided during several meetings focused on PTE teachers, specifically, the need for “career” based certification.

Currently, Maryland has a pathway to initial certification for professional and technical education for those individuals with occupational experience and a minimum of a high school degree. Current regulations require all teacher applicants, including PTE candidates, to submit passing scores on the teacher certification tests approved by the State Board of Education. Prior to 2006, individuals who were eligible for PTE certification were exempt from submitting certification assessment scores; however, on September 1, 2006, the regulations, driven by the request of the PTE community, were amended to include this requirement.

Since this time, the MSDE has heard anecdotally, from across the state, that LEAs are not able to staff Career and Technology Education (CTE) programs because PTE teachers who are conditionally certified are not able to meet the basic skills testing requirement within the two-year time frame allowed under current regulations. Anecdotal reports indicate that this is due to the length of time spent in their respective career industry and; therefore, although able to utilize basic skills in the career area, the individual struggles to show mastery on skills mastered in high school when presented in an assessment format. It has also been reported that, in many instances, these same individuals are receiving effective or higher ratings on their teaching evaluations.

Committee #1 discussed the requirements associated with the PTE certification at length on several occasions. The committee agreed that the current twelve (12) semester hours of professional coursework required for certification remains relevant, although the committee acknowledges that the courses are difficult to find given the specificity of the topics listed in the regulations. The committee discussed whether these courses could be delivered at the community college level or fulfilled through Maryland approved Continuing Professional Development credits (CPDs), which all members agreed were viable options.

Additionally, the committee discussed the basic skills assessment requirement as it pertains to PTE teachers. Public comment was delivered on three occasions, and in each instance, the speakers reported that PTE teachers who are conditionally certified are not able to present passing scores on the basic skills exam within the two year time frame that is required by current regulation. Much discussion took place regarding whether the extension of the requirement from two years to three or four years would

allow struggling individuals to pass the test, and those members representing LEAs were not confident that an extension would make a difference.

Local education agency representatives shared that currently, there are supports in place, such as test preparation resources and coursework and mentoring, to assist PTE teachers in passing the assessment. Unfortunately, even with these supports, some individuals who receive effective teacher evaluations are not able to achieve a passing score on the assessment.

The committee explored the idea of using multiple measures to assess basic skills mastery. Discussion focused on using coursework in lieu of an assessment. The committee concurred that those individuals who are required to submit demonstration of basic skills knowledge and who do not test well, should have the opportunity to demonstrate mastery by submitting an alternative measure, such as a grade of C or better in credit bearing courses, identified by the MSDE, that cover content in math, reading, and writing.

- **Use of a Rubric Assessment to fulfill the Principles of Learning and Teaching Assessment Requirement**

Educator preparation programs across the country require candidates pass a standards based performance assessment (e.g., PPAT, edTPA) as a requirement for program completion. Currently, Maryland requires passing scores on several assessment measures, including, the Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) Praxis for an applicant to qualify for certification in a teaching area. Those applicants who have already passed a standards based performance assessment through an educator preparation program must pay to take the Praxis PLT, although both types of measures assess a new teacher's knowledge and understanding of educational practices. Pearson, publisher of the edTPA, and Educational Testing Services, publisher of the PPAT, presented to the workgroup and committee, which included information regarding the design of each assessment.

Committee #1 discussed the current requirements and agreed that individuals applying for certification should have the option of presenting either a traditional assessment or a standards based performance assessment to fulfill the pedagogical certification test requirement.

Recommendations

National Board Certification

- **Finding 1:** Individuals who achieve National Board Certification in a teaching area should meet all of the current requirements for Maryland teacher certification. To be eligible for National Board Certification, a candidate must possess a bachelor's degree from an accredited institution, complete three years of successful teaching, and hold a valid state teaching license.

- **Related Research 1:** Students of teachers that hold National Board Certification make greater academic gains than their peers, and National Board Certification is a signal of teacher effectiveness (e.g. Cavalluzzo, 2004; Vandervoort and Berliner, 2004; Goldhaber and Anthony, 2005).
- **Recommendation 1:** The MSDE should develop a direct pathway for initial certification for those individuals who have achieved National Board Certification.
 - To be eligible for National Board Certification, a candidate must possess a bachelor’s degree from an accredited institution, complete three years of successful teaching, and hold a valid state teaching license.
- **Implementation 1:** A regulation should be promulgated by the SBOE and the PSTEB.

Adjunct Certificate

- **Finding 2:** Local educational agencies are not able to offer specialty and professional technical coursework/programs due to critical staffing shortages. Additionally, LEAs are currently unable to place individuals with highly specialized content expertise, whom are interested in teaching on a part time basis, in the classroom as a teacher of record unless they are issued a conditional certificate which is designed for an individual who is working toward professional certification.
- **Related Research 2:** No related research because programs are new. From a policy standpoint, National Research Center for Career and Technical Education (NRCCTE) has called for alternative pathways for CTE teachers and may states have begun to identify alternative credentialing or passed some sort of legislation for part-time CTE and STEM certification. Further, the National Council for Teacher Quality (2015) recommends the expansion of the teaching pool by offering part-time teaching licenses for content experts.
- **Recommendation 2:** Support regulation allowing local education agencies (LEAs) the ability to request adjunct certification from the MSDE for those individuals who meet the following eligibility criteria:
 - Hold a minimum of a Bachelor’s Degree from an accredited university/college
 - Hold industry licensure when applicable for that profession
 - Have five years of successful experience in the field

Local education agencies would be required to provide the following to those individuals who hold an adjunct certificate:

- Mentoring
- Full time, side by side coaching with a professionally certified educator (for a minimum amount of time). Note that language choice here was not agreed upon by the committee as a whole; the MSEA representative(s) prefer “co-teacher”.

- Professional development, both prior to entry into the classroom and throughout the school year
- Regular evaluations

The certificate should be limited to the following:

- Non-transferable
 - Part-time
 - One-year validity period
 - Renewable, upon the request of a LEA
 - Issued by the MSDE
 - Limited to certification areas identified by the MSDE
- **Implementation 2:** A regulation should be promulgated by the SBOE and the PSTEB. Local education agencies should work collaboratively with IHEs and community businesses to maximize partnership opportunities. When determining what specialty areas are included in the adjunct certificate, the MSDE will survey LEAs to determine the specific fields that LEAs need to fill within their counties. The MSDE should share the identified areas with Maryland IHEs and the Maryland Higher Education Commission.

Rubric Assessment to fulfill the Principle of Learning and Teaching Assessment Requirement

- **Finding 3:** Educator preparation programs across the country require candidates pass a standards based performance assessment (e.g., PPAT, edTPA) as a requirement for program completion. Currently, Maryland requires applicants to submit passing scores on several assessment measures, including the PLT Praxis. Those applicants who have already passed a standards based performance assessment must pay to take the Praxis PLT, even though both types of measures assess a new teacher’s knowledge and understanding of educational practices.
- **Related Research 3:** The limited research on standards-based performance measures supports its use. Studies find a positive relationship between teacher effectiveness and the pre-service Performance Assessment of California Teachers (PACT) which is a predecessor to EdTPA (Wilson, Hallam, Pecheone, and Moss, 2010; Newton, 2010; Darling-Hammond, Newton, & Wei, 2013).
- **Recommendation 3:** Support the acceptance of either a traditional measure (e.g., Praxis PLT) or standards based performance measure (e.g., EdTPA, PPAT) to fulfill the pedagogy assessment requirement for certification.
- **Implementation 3:** The MSDE should explore the adoption of standards based performance measures, including recommended passing scores for each assessment adopted.

Basic Skills Assessment Requirement

- **Finding 4:** Basic skills assessments such as the SAT and Praxis CORE, are designed to measure academic readiness of candidates entering college. Currently, Maryland requires applicants to submit passing scores on an approved basic skills assessment (SAT, GRE, ACT, or Praxis CORE) and the conferral of a bachelor's degree.
- **Related Research 4:** Researchers caution that traditional pre-service assessments are useful for efficient "screening" of a large number of candidates, but that these assessments can "shut out" individuals who might otherwise be effective after only two or three years' of experience, are not generally predictive of later teacher effectiveness, and can disproportionately screen out aspiring teachers of color (see, e.g., Angrist and Guryan, 2004; Goldhaber, 2007; Kane, Rockoff, and Staiger, 2008; Goldhaber and Hansen, 2010; Tyler, 2011). This is especially important because of the demonstrated positive academic, social-emotional, and long-term effects when struggling students of color have a teacher who is demographically similar to themselves (see, e.g, Dee 2001, 2004, and 2005).

Research also finds a high degree of correlation between final college GPA and Praxis scores, and that performance in a teacher preparation program is a significantly better predictor of teaching skill than test scores (Blue, O'Grady, Toro, and Newell, 2002; D'Angostino and Powers, 2009). Taken together, research supports the use of additional criteria besides traditional pre-service assessments.

- **Recommendation 4:** Amend current regulation to allow those individuals seeking certification who have a conferred bachelor's degree or higher from an accredited university/college and a minimum grade point average of 2.75 be exempt from submitting passing scores on a basic skills assessment.
- **Implementation 4:** Current regulation should be amended by the SBOE and the PSTEB to allow those who have a conferred bachelor's degree or higher from an accredited institution and a minimum grade point average of 2.75 be exempt from submitting passing scores on a basic skills assessment.

Conditional Certification Renewal

- **Finding 5:** Current certification regulations do not allow for multiple measures of assessing basic skill knowledge. Those individuals who do not test well do not currently have an alternative means of demonstrating competency in basic reading, writing, and mathematics.
- **Related Research 5:** Students see both short- and long-term benefits of career and technical education, such as increased likelihood of high school graduation,

postsecondary enrollment, and employment, and higher wages (see, e.g., Kemple and Willner, 2008; Castellano et al., 2011; Dougherty, 2015, 2016; Bozick and Dalton, 2013). Many Maryland LSSs report acute difficulties in recruiting for Professional Technical Education areas of instruction, such as culinary arts, nursing, cosmetology, TV production, carpentry, Homeland Security, engineering, masonry, and auto mechanics. (Maryland Teacher Staffing Report 2016-2018)

- **Recommendation 5:** Amend current regulation to allow those individuals seeking certification who do not hold a bachelor's degree (i.e., specialized and professional technical area candidates) to have the ability to present credit bearing coursework to fulfill the basic skills requirement in lieu of an assessment.
- **Implementation 5:** A regulation should be promulgated by the SBOE and the PSTEB that allows those who submit the coursework (credit bearing with a grade of C or better) identified by the MSDE to meet the basic skills requirement.

Certification Regulations – Content and Structure:

- **Finding 6:** The current certification regulations are often cumbersome, and in some places, contradictory. It is difficult for potential educators to understand the regulations in place. If Maryland is going to attract out of state educators, and retain the educators prepared in-state, the regulations must be unambiguous, consistent and sensible, while preserving high standards.
- **Recommendation 6:** The MSDE, with input from stakeholder groups, should explore the current structure and content of the certification regulations to determine if they remain appropriate.
- **Implementation 6:** The MSDE should establish a workgroup that explores the current certification regulations in order to determine what regulations will require amending, as well as considering whether the current regulations remain relevant. The workgroup should consider both the structure and the content of the regulations.

Committee 2: Incentives (Recruitment and Retention)

Background

The Teacher Incentives committee held six meetings in 2017 on the following dates: January 31, 2017; February 21, 2017; April 26, 2017; June 20, 2017; July 25, 2017; and September 11, 2017. Discussions were focused on incentives, both monetary and non-monetary, to attract candidates to become teachers and to maintain quality teachers in the classroom. Initial discussions included a review of current incentives available to teachers in Maryland and other states, a review of data collected by the Maryland Longitudinal Data System at the request of

the Maryland State Department of Education, and an examination of current practices across the country. Beginning on January 20, 2017, the workgroup decided to alter the focus of committee #2. The newly developed committee #2 was tasked with looking at ways to incentivize and retain teachers in Maryland and make recommendations to the QTIA stipend program.

Problem(s) to Solve:

Loan Forgiveness

Across the country, teacher salaries do not compete with other, similarly educated professionals, making it difficult for educators to repay their student loan debts. The need for high quality teachers is noted in states and school districts all over, and proposals to ensure the best and the brightest are recruited into the teaching profession have been prevalent in the last few years; however, salary scales simply do not provide adequate incentive to draw unlikely candidates into the field (Aragon, 2016).

In Maryland, given that one of the state's largest financial incentive programs, the QTIA stipend program, in its current format, is noted as a being disincentive for continual improvement in Maryland schools, the committee discussed loan forgiveness, tuition reimbursement, and housing stipends at length. The committee discussed ways to utilize loan forgiveness to increase the length of time a teacher commits to teaching in a Maryland public school. The committee was eager to offer incentives to as many educators as possible, without special regard for those teachers working in hard to staff schools or in hard to staff content areas. In addition, the committee suggested extending financial incentives, such as loan forgiveness, to teachers already working in Maryland schools, not just those initially entering the field. While there is federal loan forgiveness available to educators such as the Perkins and Stafford Loans, certain restrictions make accessing this loan difficult. As stated on the US Department of Education website:

“The Teacher Loan Forgiveness Program is intended to encourage individuals to enter and continue in the teaching profession. Under this program, if you teach full-time for five complete and consecutive academic years in certain elementary and secondary schools and educational service agencies that serve low-income families, and meet other qualifications, you may be eligible for forgiveness of up to a combined total of \$17,500 on some loans. More specifically, the educators who qualify for federal loan forgiveness must work in a Title I schools.” (USDOE, 2017)

Data provided by Dr. Dara Shaw, Executive Director, Research and Accountability, Maryland State Department of Education, indicates that students in teacher preparation programs accrue greater debt (approximately \$3,000 more) than their classmates in other majors, potentially due to the length of time in school. Therefore, greater loan repayment must be considered as an incentive as a means to employ, and retain individuals in the teaching profession.

Partnerships with IHEs

Initially, discussion centered on the burden of teacher recruitment being borne by the IHEs. In an effort to re-brand the profession, teacher preparation programs must work more aggressively to reshape the image of becoming a teacher. While discussion initially focused on incentivizing interns, discussions moved to the role of internships and early exposure to classrooms and schools as a possibility for incentivizing graduates to become teachers. The need for strong mentoring programs has been the topic of conversations throughout the state, through ESSA, the MSDE's Listening Tours, and in each of the committees working to respond to this bill. The topic of strong mentoring programs, requirements for mentors, and the link between strong teachers and those who mentored them, remains a popular topic of conversation. The discussion has been robust. Over fifty-four percent of respondents to the MSDE online Survey in preparation for the State's ESSA Plan indicated that having a mentor would have a large impact on educator effectiveness. Workgroup members expressed interest concerning qualifications required of mentors and whether or not the MSDE and LEAs have collaborated with IHE's for professional development. Committees #3 and #5 are tasked with making recommendations surrounding mentors and mentor programs. Recommendations for mentoring can be found on page 65.

The committee explored the current Teacher Academy of Maryland program and agreed uniformly, that integrating these opportunities into all LEAs will be a recommendation for increasing the pipeline of teachers. Considering the outcomes of the recent Maryland Commission on Innovation and Excellence in Education, known as the Kirwan Commission, Dr. Kirwan recommended to the commission, with respect to teacher preparation, the following: "A tuition forgiveness/other incentive programs should be developed to encourage top tier high school graduates to pursue the teaching profession; and alternative pathways into the teaching profession should not be eliminated, they should be modified and strengthened." (Kinnally, 2017)

Quality Teacher Incentive Act

The QTIA stipend program, in its current format, is noted as a being disincentive for continual improvement in Maryland schools. The statute provides incentive grants to classroom teachers under three scenarios:

- 1) A "classroom teacher or other non-administrative school-based employee in a public school identified by the State Board as having comprehensive needs who holds a standard professional certificate or an advanced professional certificate, who is employed by a county board and who holds a certificate issued by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards shall receive a stipend from the State in an amount equal to the county grant for national certification, up to a maximum of \$4,000 per qualified individual." ED §6-306(b)(2) (please note that the Budget reconciliation and Financing Act (BRFA) of 2017 reduced this amount to \$2,000.00 for Fiscal Year 2017).
- 2) A "classroom teacher or other non-administrative school-based employee in a school not identified by the State Board as having comprehensive needs who holds a standard professional certificate or an advanced professional certificate, who is employed by a

county board and who holds a certificate issued by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standard shall receive a stipend from the State in an amount equal to the county grant for national certification, up to a maximum of \$1,000 per qualified individuals." [Md. Code Ann., §6-306(b)(3)].

The QTIA has created a disincentive for improving school performance, as once a school is no longer designated as a “comprehensive needs” school, its teachers are no longer eligible for the stipend.

Teacher Academies of Maryland

The Teacher Academy of Maryland (TAM) program prepares students for further education and careers in the education profession. The program focuses on human growth and development through adolescence, teaching as a profession, curriculum and instruction and an education academy internship. Upon completion of the program and passing the ParaPro test or Praxis Core, high school graduates are ready to enter the teaching profession. This program is based on the outcomes of the Maryland Associate of Arts in Teaching (AAT) degree, which aligns with the National Council for the Accreditation for Teacher Education standards. Many students enter two-year degree programs in the field of education before enrolling in a teacher preparation program at a 4-year institution. This grow your own model has been very successful in Maryland.

The TAM was developed by the MSDE in 2005-2006 with representatives LEAs, community colleges, baccalaureate degree granting institutions, the Maryland Higher Education Commission, and the University of Maryland System. In 2015, there were 2,105 students enrolled in this program and over 90% of the TAM students passed the industry recognized credential. The ParaPro was 11% higher than the state average for all industry credentials for all CTE programs. Currently, six universities have articulated agreements to accept TAM credits and 20 out of 24 LEAs offer TAM as a state approved career and technology program of study.

Committee Discussion

The committee reviewed compensation systems utilized by other states to determine their value and success in the retention of teachers. The committee explored housing considerations, whether or not incentives related to housing would boost recruitment in geographically hard to staff areas, and explored a differentiated pay scale for teachers assigned to teach in low performing schools. The committee discussed, at length and over multiple meetings, the establishment of a loan-forgiveness system that would require a particular number of years of service and would become incrementally more robust the longer a teacher served in a public school. Throughout all discussions, the committee paid particular attention to maintaining equity and “fairness” in its recommendations and as a result, made only a few recommendations for financial incentives as the committee agreed that incentivizing teachers in only low performing schools, or in areas of geographical shortages, would be inequitable.

At the conclusion of the January 31, 2017 meeting, the committee had preliminarily discussed and concluded that student loan differences for educators are higher because of the length of time they remain in school; tuition reimbursement must be higher if it is going to be used as an incentive; \$15,000 is more desirable and will make an impact on an educator's debt out of school; the Quality Teacher Incentive Act is, in fact, a disincentive and must be revised; bargaining agreements of each LEA should be reviewed; recruitment remains an issue that impact retention; Teacher Academies of Maryland strengthens the linkage and partnership between LEAs and IHEs; and exposing teachers to a classroom is expected to have an impact on recruitment and retention. At the February and April meetings, the committee's discussions centered on loan forgiveness and housing stipends. Early recommendations included (1) loan forgiveness; (2) housing incentives/stipends; (3) differentiated pay for work in priority schools; and (4) paid internships.

Loan forgiveness and recruitment became the committee's priorities. In order to recruit and retain, the committee decided that loans, scholarships, and "free college" (to pay back a year for each year of education) would guarantee four years of teaching in Maryland schools. The committee was concerned with the cost of loan forgiveness and tuition reimbursement. Differentiated pay was suggested by some committee members to have a more positive impact and provided at a nominal cost. The committee also considered the possibility that having inexperienced teachers in challenging positions might be linked to loan forgiveness. As a result, the committee decided they did not want to limit loan forgiveness to teachers new to the profession, but instead to open the incentive to all teachers.

On February 21, 2017, Ms. Donna Thomas from the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC), provided an overview to the committee on the Workforce Shortage Student Assistant Grant Program. The Workforce Shortage Student Assistance Grant (WSSAG) program is for students who plan on working in specific career/occupational programs upon graduation. Eligible fields include: child care, human services, teaching, nursing, physical and occupational therapy, social work, and public service. All current high school seniors, full-time and part-time, degree seeking undergraduate, and graduate students enrolled in an eligible accredited Maryland postsecondary institution, may apply for the grant. Students must be Maryland residents and plan to attend a two-year or four-year Maryland college or university as a full-time or part-time degree seeking undergraduate student, and/or full-time or part-time degree seeking graduate student. The award amounts are set at the statutory minimum and are based on the type of institution and the student's enrollment status. The service obligation for teachers requires the recipient to attend an approved teacher education program leading to certification in a critical shortage field. Ms. Thomas stated that MHEC also offers scholarships. She indicated that less than 100 applicants have applied for the scholarship. The committee identified the need to increase awareness of the program. The main requirement of the program is for the applicant to teach in Maryland and complete the service obligation which is one year of service for each year of scholarship awarded.

During the April 26, 2017 meeting, the committee reviewed information that had been provided to them, and restated their focus. Loan forgiveness and recruitment into the field should be the basis of priority recommendations, housing stipend(s) should be next, differentiated pay for those working in “priority schools” should be third, and paid internships should be last.

Members of the committee employed in Frederick County explained that there are not strictly financial incentives in their county, but instead, in February of each year a teacher can elect to go to a “Star” school. In March, the county interviews employees at the Star schools. When a position opens, such as an administrative position or a leadership position, teachers have already interviewed and are available to be promoted or re-placed. More teacher leader positions open up to teachers working and excelling in Star schools. Aspiring administrators are encouraged to take these positions. Since experienced teachers are electing to be placed in a “Star” school, it is believed to benefit students enrolled because they are receiving instruction from an experienced teacher. Currently, the program does not offer a financial incentive for electing to work in a “Star” school; however, this is a program that appears to work to increase the number of experienced teachers in low performing schools. In addition, Frederick County representatives also described an incentive for taking coursework and a program in which school-based mentors use the co-teaching model for the first year.

At the May 30, 2017 meeting of the Workgroup, committees reported their preliminary recommendations to the group for feedback and approval. The workgroup members provided the following feedback to the committee for their consideration:

- Consider discount rates for continuing education.
- Strengthen LEA partnership for cost-sharing.
- All negotiated agreements should be reviewed.
- Look for commonalities; regional trends.
- Look for non-monetary incentives too.
- Consider Quality Teacher Incentive Act (QTIA) – how to further?

At the May 30, 2017 meeting, the committee focused its discussion on the previously identified topics and attempted to streamline its recommendations. The committee agreed, at this time, that student loan repayments must be higher, due to length of time for repayment, and the fact that reimbursement must match this higher amount in order to be viewed as an incentive. Tuition reimbursement should be \$15,000 or more in order to be considered an incentive. The committee once again reviewed the QTIA and briefly discussed ways to alter the program to prevent it from becoming a disincentive. Two new ideas were brought to the group by the MSDE for the committee’s consideration: (1) development of a Statewide Recruitment Database and (2) consideration for funding of the already existing Maryland Alternative Teaching Opportunity Program.

The idea of a Statewide Recruitment Database was presented as a way for Maryland to support the employment needs of all LEAs and to streamline data and potentially cut time and cost to the educator. The committee agreed that this would be a way for the State to support recruitment efforts.

The committee only supports the recommendation for funding Education Article §6-120, Maryland Alternative Teaching Opportunity Program as long as the funding does not affect the other recommendations made by this committee or workgroup.

Recommendations

Loan Forgiveness:

- **Related Research 1:** Loans and loan forgiveness are not well-studied, but limited research suggests that teacher candidates do respond to these programs (Hare and Heap, 2001; Liou and Lawrenz, 2010). Maryland data reveals that graduates of Maryland four-year public teacher preparation programs have an average aggregate loan amount of approximately \$24,000 (2014-15).
- **Recommendation 1:** Recommend that loan forgiveness, the committee's number one recommendation, be open to all teachers, in all certificate areas, in all public schools. Educators should have their loan repaid at a rate of \$25,000 for those prepared in Maryland Approved Programs, and at a rate of \$17,500 for those prepared in approved, out of state programs. Repayment should begin on day one of the 6th year of teaching, after five years teaching in a Maryland public school.

Quality Teacher Incentive

- **Related Research 2:** Students of teachers that hold National Board Certification make greater academic gains than their peers, and National Board Certification is a signal of teacher effectiveness (e.g. Cavalluzzo, 2004; Vandervoort and Berliner, 2004; Goldhaber and Anthony, 2005). (2)

A study of a \$5,000 retention bonus in Tennessee's Priority schools showed that the bonus had a consistently positive effect for teachers in tested subjects and grades, and that the teachers who stay because of the bonus have much greater estimated effectiveness than the teachers who would otherwise replace them (Springer, Swain, and Rodriguez, 2015).

Clotfelter, Ladd, Vigdor, and Wheeler (2006) find that a short-lived incentive policy in North Carolina that provided \$1,800 salary increases to math, science, and special

education teachers who taught in low-performing public schools was successful at reducing turnover rates by an average of 12%.

Work by Steele, Murnane, and Willett (2010) finds that a California state incentive policy providing \$5,000 per year for 4 years to attract academically talented new teachers to the state's lowest performing schools increased the likelihood that those teachers would work in hard-to-staff schools by 28%.

Research shows numerous benefits of mentoring to new teachers, including increased educator effectiveness, greater job satisfaction and efficacy, and reduced turnover (see, e.g., Ingersoll and Strong, 2011; Villar and Strong, 2007; New Teacher Center, 2007 and 2016; U.S. Department of Education, 2010; DeCesare and Randel, 2017).

Research shows that bonuses can increase teacher retention, thus motivating the use of the stipend to retain NBCT and APC teachers (see Imazeki, 2004). Further, stipends are identified as a critical component to mentoring programs (see Waterman and He, 2011).

Goldhaber (2006) also reported that there is no relationship between Master's degree and teacher effectiveness.

- **Recommendation 2:** Expand the Quality Teacher Incentive Act (QTIA) as follows:
 - All Nationally Board Certified Teachers (NBCT) and Advanced Professional Certificated (APC) teachers who qualify to be mentors, based on revised Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) language, will be eligible for the \$1000 stipend for serving as mentors to early-career educators.
 - If the early-career educator works in a comprehensive needs school (CNS), the mentor is eligible for an additional \$1000 stipend.
 - No extension of time is recommended but there is now eligibility in more than one area.
 - See the recommended awards summary below:
 - NBCT: \$2,000 in CNS or \$1,000 non-CNS
 - If APC and/or NBCT and a mentor, awarded an additional \$1,000
 - If a mentor in a CNS, an additional \$1,000

Recruitment Database

- **Recommendation 3:** Recommend the creation of a statewide recruitment database that acts as a central hub for information on eligible candidates for educator positions. Local education agencies would pay a fee to access the candidate database, with the option to create individualized addenda, relevant for each locality.

Teacher Intern Stipends

- **Related Research 4:** Research has demonstrated that alternative certification programs have a positive impact on student achievement in some tested subjects and grades

(especially math), and have the same impact as traditionally-certified teachers in all other tested subjects and grades with no demonstrated negative impact (e.g. Glazerman, Mayer, and Decker, 2006; Henry et al., 2014). At the same time, alternative certification programs have been found to reduce teacher shortages (Shaw, 2008), and many programs recruit minority candidates (Putman et al., 2016). Further, classroom performance during the first two years of teaching is a much stronger predictor of future effectiveness than a teacher's initial certification status (Kane, Rockoff, and Staiger, 2008).

- **Recommendation 4:** Fund the Maryland Alternative Teaching Opportunity Program, a previously unfunded statute, created in order to encourage the use of alternative preparation programs to meet the demand for qualified teachers in science, mathematics, and special education. Funding could be used to support participation in the pre-residency internship required for between four to eight weeks. Committee members agree that this is a low priority recommendation and only make the recommend this if there is adequate funding that does not pull funding from other recommended incentives.

Teacher Academies

- **Related Research 5:** In 2015, there were 2,105 students enrolled in this program and over 90% of the TAM students passed the industry recognized credential, the ParaPro, which was 11% higher than the state average for all industry credentials for all CTE programs.
- **Recommendation 5:** Recommend that all LEAs implement the Career Technology Education TAM programs of study. Encourage all institutes of higher education in Maryland with teacher preparation programs to enter into statewide agreements with TAM. Recommend each county ensure their TAMs are located strategically across each county and not geographically misrepresented.

Committee 3 and 5: Professional Development and Mentoring (Retention and Induction)

Introduction

In June 2016, committee #3 was charged with determining how to induct quality teachers at all levels of education in the [State](#). The group submitted recommendations to strengthen the qualifications of mentor teachers, including tenure, evaluation outcomes, and commitment to serve as a mentor. Following the workgroup meeting in January 2017, committee #3 was broken out into two separate committees; committee #3 and committee #5. The new committee #3 took on the responsibility of looking at professional development for teachers and administrators, while the new committee #5 focused on mentoring. The committees worked independently until June 2017 when they joined together to align their overlapping

recommendations. Specifically, these committees worked to develop recommendations that would address:

1. Professional development provided to all educators;
2. The need for IHEs and LEAs to collaborate when developing trainings, induction programs, and professional development;
3. Development of state-wide mentor training programs to support the development of teacher preparation and teacher leadership; and
4. Being cognizant of the need for funding and infrastructure to support the recommendations.

Problem(s) to Address:

The overall goal of committees #3 and #5 was to Increase Educator Retention in the First Five Years. The committee addressed issues that result in new teacher’s [leaving](#) the profession within their first five years and considered solutions through mentoring and professional development. In a 2013 paper by [Ronfeldt, Loeb, & Wycoff](#), the authors note that, “Teacher turnover rates can be high, particularly in schools serving low income, non-White, and low-achieving student populations. Nationally, about 30% of new teachers leave the profession within 5 years, and the turnover rate is about 50% higher in high-poverty schools as compared to more affluent ones” (Darling-Hammond & Sykes, 2003; Ingersoll, 2001, 2003). Teacher turnover rates also tend to be higher in urban and lower-performing schools (Hanushek, Kain, & Rivkin, 1999).

Maryland is a diverse state, serving low income, non-White, and low achieving students. In addition, Maryland also serves students in rural areas that are equally affected by the teacher staffing shortage. It would be easy to think that the concerns an urban school district, such as Baltimore City, would be vastly different from the rural counties in Western Maryland or on the Eastern Shore; however, as part of the ESSA plan, the MSDE conducted five Listening Tours in various regions of Maryland. Teachers, parents, students, and community member feedback regarding, teacher preparation, regardless of region, indicated new teachers were not prepared to teach students who do not look like them or have similar backgrounds. Additionally, internship placements were not representative of a newly hired teacher’s first teaching assignment. The latter will be addressed by committee #4.

As early as 2006, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities published a [paper](#) on the importance of state-level policy support for teacher induction programs, including the additional importance of IHEs and LEAs working together to ensure that what is taught in teacher preparation programs reflects what happens in the classroom. More recently, the Council of Chief State Officers (CCSSO) released [Transforming Educator Preparation: Lessons Learned from Leading States](#), offering guidance to state leaders to increase rigor, and hold accountable, teacher preparation programs. The “play book” also advised teacher preparation programs to ensure that their programs are graduating teacher candidates who are prepared to teach in the varying local school districts. For new teachers who are faced with the challenge of

teaching in low-performing schools or to students who do not look like them or have similar backgrounds, their access to a supportive induction program, a qualified mentor teacher, and quality professional development becomes even more important.

Discussion- Mentors

Committees #3 and #5 both determined that the quality and qualifications of mentor teachers, and the current implementation of induction programs, needed to be examined. [Code of Maryland Regulations 13A.07.01](#), Comprehensive Teacher Induction Program, specifically addresses both induction programs and mentor qualifications. As reported in the interim report, committee #3 recommended language be added to this COMAR regulation. Committees #3 and #5 reviewed the interim report and made some adjustments that better reflect the committees' intention to strengthen the implementation of COMAR 13A.07.01, [Comprehensive Teacher Induction Program](#) and to raise the standards of mentor teachers in Maryland schools.

The MSEA submitted to the workgroup suggestions for the revision of COMAR 13A.07.01 that were not agreed upon in committee. While the committees did not vet each recommendation from the MSEA, a few stood out. Specifically, the MSEA proposed a mentor should be a "teacher that has been released full or part time from the classroom or is a retired teacher or principal". Some members of the committee had concerns that smaller school districts would not have the resources or staff to provide release time to their mentors. The committee did agree that release time would be ideal; however there was hesitation to include recommendations that could lead to some districts immediately being out of compliance.

Another recommendation that the committee did not have consensus on was the percentage of extra time, or reduction of workload, a new teacher should be afforded for non-instructional professional development. This would include regularly scheduled opportunities for new teachers to observe or co-teach with skilled teachers, engage in follow-up discussions with his or her mentor to develop lesson plans, review observations, and participate in relevant professional development. The MSEA recommended 20% more time be allocated to new teachers. This 20% came directly from the language regarding the "Pilot Program" initiated by SB 493. Three counties are currently participating in this pilot and a study regarding its effectiveness will be reported on December 1, 2021. While all committee members agreed there should be more time for new teachers to have professional development and less time doing bus duty, some committee members felt 20% was an arbitrary number and there was no research to support that amount of time. Instead, the committee recommends resources and accountability measures for induction that include release time to participate in evidence-based best practices.

Committee #3 focused on reviewing current trends in professional development, the feedback received from the ESSA listening tours and survey, and what approaches will best serve the educators and administrators in Maryland.

In consideration of the key components of a good induction program, committee #5 noted that Maryland needs to be sure that its LEAs' policies and procedures include a multi-year investment of support, quality mentors, and time designated for evidence-based best practices of professional development for new teachers.

[Learning Forward's website provides](#) the following definition for professional development; "means activities that are an integral part of school and LEA strategies for providing educators with the knowledge and skills necessary to enable students to succeed in a well-rounded education and to meet the challenging State academic standards; and are not stand-alone, 1 day, or short term workshops but instead sustained, intensive, collaborative, job-embedded, data-driven and classroom focused". The committee agreed that there should be multiple ways to gain professional development and acquire knowledge, specifically differentiating professional development to reflect what the educator or administrator has identified as what he or she needs to grow. In addition, both committees' recommendations and Maryland's ESSA plan address the need for IHEs and LEAs to increase collaboration by creating regional teacher learning centers and provide professional development that focuses on cultural competencies.

Most teachers do not have access to professional development opportunities that equip them to adapt, deepen, and enhance their professional practices in the classroom (Darling-Hammond, Wei, Andree, Richardson, & Orphanos, 2009). Micro-credentials are touted as a potential solution to modernize traditional methods of delivering and receiving teacher professional development. Micro-credentials "shift teacher [professional development] to a competency-based system with personalized development opportunities that match teachers' and schools' specific needs. Such a system could allow teachers to drive their own development, signal their true areas of expertise to school and district administrators, and advance in their careers according to their skills" (Horn & Arnett, 2017).

Notable concerns include, if micro-credentials are adopted across the state, then accountability measures may have to be enacted in order to preserve consistency and quality issues with the core competencies. Research and monitoring will have to continue to ensure micro-credentials are improving teaching and student learning outcomes. The potential of micro-credentials is that they allow the teacher to pursue learning relevant to his or her practice. This pursuit of learning is desired in the profession and, combined with the requirements to apply newfound knowledge in the classroom, could be added to lengthen the impact of induction programs or paired to address teachers' professional development plans. Advantages to micro-credentials include their emphasis on competency-based learning, specialization of topic, and self-paced or cohort-based instruction.

The committees looked to review relevant research and expertise that would support their recommendations. This research review included Richard Ingersoll and Michael Strong's 2011 academic journal article, *The Impact of Induction and Mentoring Programs for Beginning Teachers: A Critical Review of the Research*. In addition to scholarly work, both committees #3 and #5 invited Mr. Liam Goldrick to present on the work done by the New Teacher Center

focusing on induction and mentoring programs. Mr. Goldrick suggested examining the past analyses by New Teacher Center for the states of [Colorado](#) and [Minnesota](#). These reports also distilled the research to demonstrate benefits afforded from specific aspects of induction and mentoring. The committee also suggested the use of The National Commission on Teaching & America's Future (NCTAF) Teacher Turnover Cost Calculator to estimate a financial price tag of teacher turnover and estimate potential savings from strong induction, mentoring, and professional development.

Recommendations:

Statewide Pathways:

- **Related Research 1:** The few rigorous empirical studies on teacher professional development indicate that, if delivered with fidelity and with sufficient dosage, certain models can improve student achievement (Johnson, Kahle, and Fargo, 2015; Yoon et al, 2007).
- **Recommendation 1:** Create statewide and equitable professional development pathways, with career-wide learning opportunities, for educators across the state.
 - Leverage state, LEA, union, and two- and four-year higher educational expertise and resources to increase quality, transparency, and portability of professional learning.
 - Leverage new knowledge, promising practices, and advanced technologies to increase access and success, including an online repository for professional development, mentor training, and induction programs.
 - Leverage statewide and regional partnerships, resources, and delivery structures to ensure equitable access across the state.

Micro-Credentials

- **Related Research 2:** Although there is not yet research on the impact of micro-credentials, since they are a new development, there is a demonstrated need for this competency-based, personalized approach. Many teachers nationwide report dissatisfaction or lack of engagement with current professional development, or that “seat-time” based programs do not support their particular areas of need (see Berry, 2016).
- **Recommendation 2:** Build capacities and establish protocols for development and implementation of innovative educational approaches, such as micro-credentials and micro-degrees, to strengthen teaching effectiveness and career advancement.

- Create contexts and conditions for research and development of micro-credentials and micro-degrees with high-tech, high-touch, and hi-impact approaches to increase equitable access and improve teacher effectiveness and career advancement.
- Establish state-wide quality assurance policies and procedures for validating and awarding micro-credentials and micro-degrees among stakeholders such as MSDE, MHEC, USM, LEAs, IHEs, and industry leaders.
- Establish an innovation and improvement collaborative on micro-credentials and micro-degrees that leverages expertise and resources among stakeholders to build capacity and linkages for sustainable advancement.

Cultural Competencies and Ethics

- **Related Research 3:** Educators and scholars have long called for direct instruction of teachers to increase cultural competency, cross-cultural learning, and culturally-relevant pedagogy (e.g. Ladson-Billings, 2001; McAllister and Irvine, 2000) and emphasized that such instruction take place not only in pre-service training but as in-service professional development as well (Ladson-Billings, 1995, 2000).
- **Recommendation 3:** Establish LEA-IHE partnerships in developing, delivering, and ensuring high quality professional development programs that link, but are not limited to, certification regulations for renewal.
 - Establish shared vision, responsibilities, and resources for professional development, mentor training, and induction programs that meet LEA and school priorities and address individualized needs for teachers.
 - Establish professional development, mentor training, and induction programs that incorporate evidence-based practices with context, content and pedagogical currency, such as cultural proficiency and technology integration, to increase teacher effectiveness and student achievement.
 - Establish a quality assurance framework that meets state and national guidelines such as National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, Standards for Professional Learning, and Model Code of Ethics for Educators.

Mentor Requirements

- **Recommendation 4:** Application of COMAR 13A.07.01.06.F Mentoring Component of the Comprehensive Induction Program shall include the following:
 - Mentors shall:
 - Have received tenure;

- Have a minimum of three years of “satisfactory” experience teaching (five years teaching experience preferred);
- Be in good standing with a rating of "highly effective" or the equivalent, depending upon the rating scale used by the LEA;
- Receive a recommendation from a principal or administrator that includes evaluation of content, pedagogical, and interpersonal skills;
- Express a willingness to participate in professional development specific to mentoring;
- Receive training in best practices related to mentoring; and
- Agree with the administrators to the mentorship position.

Mentor Networks

- **Recommendation 5:** Create state-wide and equitable mentoring training pathways among IHEs, LEAs and regulatory agencies to support teacher preparation and teacher leadership development.
 - Co-develop and implement high-impact mentorship training programs which embed innovative evidence-based strategies and practices, such as adult learning theories, cultural competencies, and peer coaching, to support teacher development.
 - Provide appropriate time and resources to address professional needs and support individualized learning for mentors and mentees.
 - Establish mentoring networks and provide theme-based (such as English Learners and special education), role-based (such as department chair and resource teacher), and or/context-based (urban and rural schools) opportunities to improve effectiveness mentorship in diverse school settings.
 - Match mentees with mentors who have similar experiences serving specific student populations, such as student with disabilities, English Learners, and socio-economic background and content area.

Funding

- **Recommendation 6:** Provide appropriate funding and infrastructure to ensure equitable and accountable implementation of the above recommendations in compliance with statewide policies (e.g. COMAR 13A.07.01 and local operations).
 - Strengthen COMAR implementation with resources and accountability measures for teacher induction and mentor training, including sufficient release time to engage in non-instructional evidence-based professional development opportunities and documentation of evidence-based practices that are consistent with the recommendation of SB 493.

- Strengthen LEA infrastructures and capacities to ensure equitable and accountable implementation leading to full compliance of COMAR 13A.07.01 and the above recommendations no later than 2023.

Committee 4: Revision of the Institution Performance Criteria (Retention and Recruitment)

Introduction

The IPC forms the standards by which the MSDE holds EPPs accountable for quality. The IPC was developed in the years between 2002 and 2015, during which time a legislative mandate also required all IHEs to be nationally accredited as well as state approved. Until the spring of 2016, when the general assembly enacted new legislation no longer requiring national accreditation, the MSDE held joint state and national program approval/national accreditation visits. With the end of the state/national partnership, state accreditation and use of the IPC as the sole basis for standards-based review of programs that prepare teachers, counselors and administrators, the MSDE and its IHE and community partners were charged by the Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016 (SB 493) Workgroup with revision of those standards to assure enhanced rigor and increased quality in the state's EPPs.

Meetings

Committee #4 met eight times between January 21, 2017 and September 25, 2017. Alternates representing the various stakeholders included Dr. Deborah Kraft, MICUA; Dr. Jonathon Singer, USM; and Eugene Schaffer, USM.

Materials

The committee reviewed the current IPC, the reports of the P-20 Committee; the MSDE publication *Preparing Educators for High Poverty/Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Schools: A Manual for Teacher Educators, Teachers and Principals*; The Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium Standards (InTASC); and general principles of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) Standards.

Findings

Committee findings focused on revising the IPC to:

1. Assure rigor in the implementation and assessment of EPPs;
2. Require outcome documentation of rigor rather than course titles or college origin, including for mathematics and science in an elementary program;
3. Redesign elementary programs to align with the common core requirements;

4. Assure candidate competency in designing instruction for and teaching of students with exceptionalities at both ends of the cognitive spectrum, and with students for whom English is not the primary language;
5. Eliminate the outdated Maryland Teacher Technology Standards (MTTS) as a requirement in favor of the **International Standards for Educational Technology (ISTE) Standards**.
6. Re-conceptualize the Professional Development Schools (PDS) requirements:
 - a) Broaden the definition of PDS to include a system that identifies the opportunity for candidates to master certain InTASC-related competencies that the school offers, leveling the schools ranging from Level 1 to Level 4, with Level 4 PDS able to offer the full range of PDS experiences;
 - b) Eliminate the arbitrary 100 days required for all undergraduate candidates and replace with a series of field placements and extended field experiences, each of which requires candidates to meet a set of competencies framed by the InTASC Standards;
 - c) Assure that all candidates in all programs have direct experiences with a diverse PreK-12 student population;
 - d) Require that PDS mentors meet certain standards of competency in assuming this important link in the education of a teacher.
7. Require direct instruction designed to assure candidate competency in meeting the challenges of diverse classrooms that include the demonstration of application skills in restorative practices, classroom management, Universal Design for Learning (UDL), and cultural competency.
8. Educator preparation programs will provide direct instruction on Professional Learning and Ethical Practice, and consider use of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification's *Model Code of Ethics*.
9. Combine Current Components 1 and 4 (*Strong Academic Content and Linkage with PreK-12 Priorities*) into a revised Component 1, *Strong Instructional Preparation*, to assure that content instruction is aligned with current Maryland content requirements in a seamless model, rather than utilizing a separate accountability model.

Recommendations:

- **Recommendation 1:** With unanimous agreement, the committee recommends to the Work Group that it seek the adoption of the *Maryland Educator Preparation Standards* to replace the *Institutional Performance Criteria* as the framework for all state-approved educator preparation programs. (Appendix II)

- **Recommendation 2:** The committee further recommends that a representative stakeholder group revise the *Professional Development School Standards*, the *PDS Implementation Manual*, and the *PDS Framework for Assessment* between November 1, 2017 and November 1, 2018.
- **Recommendation 3:** The committee recommends that a concurrent work group of representative stakeholders focus on the alignment of the *Maryland Approved Alternative Preparation Program Standards*, currently aligned with the *Institutional Performance Criteria*, with the *Maryland Educator Preparation Standards*.
- **Recommendation 4:** The committee recommends that the MSDE, with its EPP, LEA and other partners, develop a “Glossary of Terms” that incorporates commonly used terms that do not always lend themselves to a common definitive understanding. Such terms as “rubrics,” “performance assessment,” and others require a clear, common understanding of meaning to maintain the critical balance between EPP performance and State Program Approval and assure program excellence.
- **Notes:**
 - The word “mastery” is used in the document to replace commonly used, but ill-defined and often meaningless, words such as “rigorous” and “proficient.” In the context of this document, EPPs will be required to provide evidence that teacher candidates demonstrate mastery of certain instructional elements and competencies. An EPP will be required to define the measurement of mastery in its assessment system, defend that measurement with a rationale, collect and use resulting data to validate the rationale, and systematically engage in ongoing program improvement as a result of data analysis.
 - Significant changes to the IPC are found in Standard II, in relation to the Professional Development Schools implementation, and in Standards I and III with increased requirements for program completion/certification eligibility.

Workgroup and Committee Recommendations

Recommendations

Committee 1 Recommendations: Certification

- **Recommendation 1:** The MSDE should develop a direct pathway for initial certification for those individuals who have achieved National Board Certification.
 - To be eligible for National Board Certification, a candidate must possess a bachelor's degree from an accredited institution, complete three years of successful teaching, and hold a valid state teaching license.

- **Recommendation 2:** Support regulation allowing local education agencies (LEAs) the ability to request, from the MSDE, adjunct certification for those individuals who meet the following eligibility criteria:
 - Hold a minimum of a Bachelor's Degree from an accredited university/college
 - Hold industry licensure, when applicable, for that profession
 - Have five years of successful experience in the fieldLocal education agencies would be required to provide the following to those individuals who hold an adjunct certificate:
 - Mentoring
 - Full time, side by side coaching with a professionally certified educator (for a minimum amount of time). Note that language choice here was not agreed upon by the committee as a whole; MSEA representative(s) prefer "co-teacher".
 - Professional development, both prior to entry into the classroom and throughout the school year
 - Regular evaluationsThe certificate should be limited to the following:
 - Non-transferable
 - Part-time
 - One-year validity period
 - Renewable, upon the request of a LEA
 - Issued by the MSDE
 - Limited to certification areas identified by the MSDE

- **Recommendation 3:** Support the acceptance of either a traditional measure or standards based performance measure (e.g., EdTPA, PPAT) to fulfill the pedagogy assessment requirement for certification.

- **Recommendation 4:** Amend current regulation to allow those individuals seeking certification, who have a conferred bachelor's degree or higher from an accredited university/college and a minimum GPA of 2.75, to be exempt from submitting passing scores on a basic skills assessment.

- **Recommendation 5:** Amend current regulation to allow those individuals seeking certification, who do not hold a bachelor’s degree (i.e., specialized and professional technical area candidates), the ability to present coursework to fulfill the basic skills requirement in lieu of an assessment.
- **Recommendation 6:** The MSDE, with input from stakeholder groups, should explore the current structure and content of the certification regulations to determine if they remain appropriate.

Workgroup Recommendations: Certification

The workgroup concurred with all committee #1 recommendation with the following clarifying language:

- **Recommendation 2:**
 - Mentoring should target pedagogy and professional development; and
 - Issuance of the certificate should be closely monitored as not to circumvent traditional and nontraditional teacher preparation programs.
- **Recommendation 4:**
 - Clarify that the recommendation to all a bachelor’s degree in lieu of Praxis Core is solely for certification requirements and does not impact entrance and exit for teacher preparation programs
- **Recommendation 5**
 - Clarify that this option is only available to PTE and specialized teachers;
 - The MSDE will evaluate the impact and conduct research on student learning outcomes as a result of implementation; and
 - The MSDE will study the number of teachers impacted by this recommendation.

Committee 2: Incentives

- **Recommendation 1:** Recommend that loan forgiveness, the committee’s number one recommendation, be open to all teachers, in all certificate areas, in all public schools. Educators should have loans repaid at a rate of \$25,000 for those prepared in Maryland Approved Programs, and at a rate of \$17,500 for those prepared in approved, out-of-state programs. Repayment should begin on day one of the 6th year of teaching, after five years teaching in a Maryland public school.
- **Recommendation 2:** Expand the Quality Teacher Incentive Act (QTIA) as follows:
 - All Nationally Board Certified Teachers (NBCT) and Advanced Professional Certificated (APC) teachers who qualify to be mentors, based on revised Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) language, will be eligible for the \$1000 stipend for serving as mentors to early-career educators.
 - If the early-career educator works in a comprehensive needs school (CNS), the mentor is eligible for an additional \$1000 stipend.

- No extension of time is recommended but there is now eligibility in more than one area.
- See the recommended awards summary below:
 - NBCT: \$2,000 in CNS or \$1,000 non-CNS
 - If APC and/or NBCT and a mentor, awarded an additional \$1,000
 - If a mentor in a CNS, an additional \$1,000
- **Recommendation 3:** Recommend the creation of a statewide recruitment database that acts as a central hub for information on eligible candidates for educator positions. Local education agencies would pay a fee to access the candidate data base, with the option to create individualized addenda, relevant for each locality.
- **Recommendation 4:** Fund the Maryland Alternative Teaching Opportunity Program, a previously unfunded statute, created in order to encourage the use of alternative preparation programs to meet the demand for qualified teachers in science, mathematics, and special education. Funding could be used to support participation in the pre-residency internship required for between four to eight weeks. Committee members agree that this is a low-priority recommendation and only make the recommendation if there is adequate funding that does not pull funding from other recommended incentives.
- **Recommendation 5:** Recommend that all LEAs implement the Career Technology Education Teacher Academies of Maryland (TAM) programs of study. Encourage all IHEs in Maryland with teacher preparation programs to enter into statewide articulation agreements with TAM. Recommend each county ensure their TAMs are located strategically across each county and not geographically misrepresented.

Workgroup Recommendations: Incentives

The workgroup concurred with all committee #2 recommendations with the following clarifying language:

- **Recommendation 1:**
 - Clarify that loan forgiveness should include those individuals that already are employed;
 - Align with Kirwan Commission recommendations; and
 - Support loan forgiveness, but with no consensus on details of deferment, amount, years in service, type of school, and retroactive model.
- **Recommendation 2:**
 - Include APC teachers in Quality teacher Incentive Act;
 - Create new levels of incentives for recognizing mentors in both comprehensive and non-comprehensive needs schools; and

- Consider increased monetary incentive amounts as present amounts do not appear to be enough to fulfill the program’s objectives.
- **Recommendation 3:**
 - Database to be developed by the MSDE; and
 - Costs of database are not passed on to LEAs.
- **Recommendation 4:**
 - Amend language to include funding teacher internships in traditional and nontraditional teacher preparation programs.

Committees 3 and 5: Induction and Mentoring

- **Recommendation 1:** Create statewide and equitable professional development pathways, with career-wide learning opportunities, for educators across the state.
 - Leverage state, LEA, Union, and two- and four-year higher educational expertise and resources to increase quality, transparency, and portability of professional learning.
 - Leverage new knowledge, promising practices, and advanced technologies to increase access and success, including an online repository for professional development, mentor training, and induction programs.
 - Leverage statewide and regional partnerships, resources, and delivery structures to ensure equitable access across the state.
- **Recommendation 2:** Build capacities and establish protocols for development and implementation of innovative educational approaches, such as micro-credentials and micro-degrees, to strengthen teaching effectiveness and career advancement.
 - Create contexts and conditions for research and development of micro-credentials and micro-degrees with high-tech, high-touch, and hi-impact approaches to increase equitable access and improve teacher effectiveness and career advancement.
 - Establish state-wide quality assurance policies and procedures for validating and awarding micro-credentials and micro-degrees among stakeholders such as the MSDE, MHEC, USM, LEAs, IHEs, and industry leaders.
 - Establish an innovation and improvement collaborative on micro-credentials and micro- degrees that leverages expertise and resources among stakeholders to build capacity and linkages for sustainable advancement.

- **Recommendation 3:** Establish LEA-IHE partnerships to develop, deliver, and ensure high-quality professional development programs that link, but are not limited to, certification regulations for renewal.
 - Establish shared vision, responsibilities, and resources for professional development, mentor training, and induction programs that meet LEA and school priorities and address individualized needs for teachers.
 - Establish professional development, mentor training, and induction programs that incorporate evidence-based practices with context, content and pedagogical currency, such as cultural proficiency and technology integration, to increase teacher effectiveness and student achievement.
 - Establish a quality assurance framework that meets state and national guidelines such as National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, Standards for Professional Learning, and Model Code of Ethics for Educators.

- **Recommendation 4:** COMAR 13A.07.01.06.F Mentoring Component of the Comprehensive Induction Program shall include the following:
 - Mentors shall:
 - Have received tenure;
 - Have a minimum of three years of “satisfactory” experience teaching (five years teaching experience preferred);
 - Be in good standing with a rating of "highly effective" or the equivalent, depending upon the rating scale used by the LEA;
 - Receive a recommendation from a principal or administrator that includes evaluation of content, pedagogical, and interpersonal skills;
 - Express a willingness to participate in professional development specific to mentoring;
 - Receive training in best practices related to mentoring; and
 - Agree with the administrators to the mentorship position.

- **Recommendation 5:** Create state-wide and equitable mentoring training pathways among IHEs, LEAs and regulatory agencies to support teacher preparation and teacher leadership development.
 - Co-develop and implement high-impact mentorship training programs which embed innovative evidence-based strategies and practices, such as adult learning theories, cultural competencies, and peer coaching, to support teacher development.
 - Provide appropriate time and resources to address professional needs and support individualized learning for mentors and mentees.

- Establish mentoring networks and provide theme-based (such as English Learners and special education), role-based (such as department chair and resource teacher), and or/context-based (urban and rural schools) opportunities to improve effectiveness mentorship in diverse school settings.
- Match mentees with mentors who have similar experiences serving specific student populations, such as students with disabilities, English Learners, and socio-economic backgrounds and content areas.
- **Recommendation 6:** Provide appropriate funding and infrastructure to ensure equitable and accountable implementation of the above recommendations in compliance with statewide policies (e.g. COMAR 13A.07.01 and local operations).
 - Strengthen COMAR implementation with resources and accountability measures for teacher induction and mentor training, including sufficient release time to engage in non-instructional, evidence-based professional development opportunities, and documentation of evidence-based practices, that are consistent with the recommendation of SB 493.
 - Strengthen LEA infrastructures and capacities to ensure equitable and accountable implementation, leading to full compliance with COMAR 13A.07.01 and the above recommendations, no later than 2023.

Workgroup Recommendations: Induction and Mentoring

The workgroup concurred with all committees #3 and 5 recommendations with the following clarifying language:

- **Recommendation 1:**
 - Clarify language to assure greater communication and dialogue within the education community i.e. pre-K -12 and Higher Education;
 - Emphasized the need to allocate financial resources; and
 - Identified recommendation #3 supports recommendation #1.
- **Recommendation 2:**
 - The MSDE should assure micro-credentials can be converted to CPDs for certification renewal;
 - The MSDE should create a teacher leadership pathway through micro-credentialing; and
 - The MSDE consider requiring mentoring endorsement for certification purposes.
- **Recommendation 5:**
 - Identified that bullets 2, 3, and 4, should be moved under recommendation 4.
- **Recommendation 6:**
 - LEAs identify and share best practices used for professional development.

Committee 4: Institutional Performance Criteria Revision

- **Recommendation 1:** With unanimous agreement, the committee recommends to the Work Group that it seek the adoption of the *Maryland Educator Preparation Standards* to replace the *Institutional Performance Criteria* (IPC) as the framework for all state-approved educator preparation programs. (Appendix II)
- **Recommendation 2:** The committee further recommends that a representative stakeholder group revise the *Professional Development School (PDS) Standards*, the *PDS Implementation Manual*, and the *PDS Framework for Assessment* between November 1, 2017 and November 1, 2018.
- **Recommendation 3:** The committee recommends that a concurrent work group of representative stakeholders focus on the alignment of the *Maryland Approved Alternative Preparation Program Standards*, currently aligned with the *Institutional Performance Criteria*, with the *Maryland Educator Preparation Standards*.
- **Recommendation 4:** The committee recommends that the MSDE, with its educator preparation programs (EPP), LEA and other partners, develop a “Glossary of Terms” that incorporates commonly used terms that do not always lend themselves to a common definitive understanding. Such terms as “rubrics,” “performance assessment,” and others require a clear, common understanding of meaning to maintain the critical balance between EPP performance and State Program Approval and assure program excellence.
- **Notes:**
 - The word “mastery” is used in the document to replace commonly used, but ill-defined and often meaningless, words such as “rigorous” and “proficient”. In the context of this document, EPPs will be required to provide evidence that teacher candidates demonstrate mastery of certain instructional elements and competencies. An EPP will be required to define the measurement of mastery in its assessment system, defend that measurement with a rationale, collect and use resulting data to validate the rationale, and systematically engage in ongoing program improvement as a result of data analysis.
 - Significant changes to the IPC are found in Standard II, in relation to the Professional Development Schools implementation, and in Standards I and III with increased requirements for program completion/certification eligibility.

Workgroup Recommendations: Institutional Performance Criteria Revision

While workgroup members recognized the considerable improvements made to IPC, members were split on its adoption. Four (4) individuals abstained from voting: Dr. Dow, MHEC; Dr. Kraft,

MICUA; Dr. Shapiro, USM, and Ms. Shurn, MSEA. One abstaining member asked for more time for deliberation on the IPC. All other members present; Ms. Blumenthal, MESP, Ms. Gronberg-Quinn, MADTECC; Dr. Lawson, MSDE; Mr. Jin Shrattenecker, Alternative Preparation Community; and Ms. Spross, MSDE, support the committee's recommendations.

- **Recommendation 1:**
 - Remove the word unanimous.

- **Recommendations 2, 3, and 4:**
 - Abstaining members expressed concern about the timelines associated with the implementation of the IPC, the membership of the workgroups identified in recommendations 2, 3, and 4, and the specifics regarding the IPC oversight.

Bibliography

- Advance CTE (2017). State Policies Impacting CTE: 2016 Year in Review. Retrieved from https://cte.careertech.org/sites/default/files/files/resources/2016_State_Policy_Year_in_Review.pdf
- Alliance for Excellent Education (2014). *On The Path To Equity: Improving the Effectiveness of Beginning Teachers*. Retrieved from <http://all4ed.org/wpcontent/uploads/2014/07/PathToEquity.pdf>
- Angrist, J. D., & Guryan, J. (2004). Teacher Testing, Teacher Education, and Teacher Characteristics. *The American Economic Review*, 94(2), 241-246. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3592890>
- Aragon, Stephanie. "Mitigating Teacher Shortages: Financial Incentives." *Education Commission of the States*, May 2016. Retrieved from www.ecs.org/ec-content/uploads/Mitigating-Teacher-Shortages-Financial-incentives.pdf
- Barnum, M. "Certification rules and tests are keeping would-be teachers of color out of America's classrooms. Here's how." *Chalkbeat*, 12 September 2017.
- Blue, T.W., O'Grady, R.J., Toro, J.A., & Newell, E.A. (2002). *How do we find the best teachers? A study of the relationships among SAT, GPA, Praxis Series test scores, and teacher ratings*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Denver, CO. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED467764).
- Brown, Emma. "Teach for America applications fall again, diving 35 percent in three years." *Washington Post*, 12 April 2016.
- Brown-Jeffy S., Cooper J. E. (2011). Toward a conceptual framework of culturally relevant pedagogy: An overview of the conceptual and theoretical literature. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 38, 65–84. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23479642>
- Cavalluzzo, Linda C. (2004). *Is National Board Certification An Effective Signal of Teacher Quality?* Alexandria, Virginia: The CAN Corporation.
- Clotfelter, C., Ladd, H.F., Vigdor, J., & Wheeler, J. (2007). High-poverty schools and the distribution of teachers and principals. CALDER Working Paper 1. Washington, DC. The Urban Institute.

- Council of Chief State School Officers (2017). Transforming Educator Preparation: Lessons Learned from Leading States. Retrieved from [file:///C:/Users/reccles/Downloads/CCSSOEducatorPreparationPlaybook%2009132017%20\(1\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/reccles/Downloads/CCSSOEducatorPreparationPlaybook%2009132017%20(1).pdf)
- D'Agostino, J.V., & Powers, D.J. (2009). Predicting teacher performance with test scores and grade point average: A meta-analysis. *American Education Research Journal*, 46(1), 146-182.
- Darling-Hammond L., Newton S.P., & Wei R.C. (2012). Developing and assessing beginning teacher effectiveness: The potential of performance assessments. Stanford, CA: Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Wei, R.C., Andree, A., Richardson, N., & Orphanos, S. (2009). Professional Learning in the Learning Profession: A Status Report on Teacher Development in the United States and Abroad. National Staff Development Council, 1-36. Retrieved from <https://learningforward.org/docs/pdf/nsdcstudy2009.pdf>
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Sykes, G. (2003). Wanted: A national teacher supply policy for education: The right way to meet the “Highly Qualified Teacher” challenge. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 11(33). Retrieved from <http://epaa.asu/epaa/v11n33/>
- Department of Planning, Maryland State Data Center (2016). Public School Enrollment, Historical 2015 and Projections 2016 to 2025. Retrieved from http://www.mdp.state.md.us/msdc/School_Enrollment/SchoolEnrollmentProjecti on.shtml
- Education Commission of the States (2016). Teacher Certification CTE and STEM Request. Retrieved from <https://www.ecs.org/ec-content/uploads/Teacher-certification-CTE-and-STEM-request-June-2016.pdf>
- Glazerman, S., Mayer, D., & Decker, P. (2005). Alternative routes to teaching: The impacts of Teach for America on student achievement and other outcomes. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 25(1), 75-96.
- Goldhaber, D., & Anthony, E. (2007). Can Teacher Quality Be Effectively Assessed? National Board Certification as a Signal of Effective Teaching. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 89(1), 134-150.
- Goldhaber, D., & Hansen, M. (2010). Race, gender, and teacher testing: How informative a tool is teacher licensure testing? *American Educational Research Journal*, 47(1), 218-251.

- Hale, D., & Heap, J.L. (2001). Effective Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies in the Midwest: Who is Making Use of Them? North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED477648.pdf>
- Hanushek, E., Kain, J., & Rivkin, S. (2004). Why public schools lose teachers. *Journal of Human Resources*, 39(2), 326–354.
- Horn, M., & Arnett, T. (2017) Competency-Based Learning for Teachers: Can micro-credentials reboot professional development? *EducationNext*, 17(2). Retrieved from <http://educationnext.org/competency-based-learning-teachers-micro-credentials-professional-development/>
- Ingersoll, R. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38, 499–534.
- Ingersoll, R. (2003). Is there really a teacher shortage? Washington, DC: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.
- Ingersoll, R., & Strong, M. (2011). The Impact of Induction and Mentoring Programs for Beginning Teachers: A Critical Review of the Research. Retrieved from http://repository.upenn.edu/gse_pubs/127.
- Ingersoll, R. (2012). Beginning Teacher Induction: What the Data Tell Us. Retrieved from http://repository.upenn.edu/gse_pubs/234
- Ingersoll, R., Merrill, L., & Stuckey, D. (2014). Seven trends: the transformation of the teaching force, updated April 2014. CPRE Report (#RR-80). Philadelphia: Consortium for Policy Research in Education, University of Pennsylvania.
- Kinnally, Kevin. “Dr. Kirwan To Education Commission: ‘We’ve Reached The Beginning Of The End.’” *Conduit Street, Maryland Association of Counties*, 14 Sept. 2017, <https://conduitstreet.mdcountries.org/2017/09/14/dr-kirwan-to-education-commission-weve-reached-the-beginning-of-the-end/>
- Maryland State Department of Education (2016). Maryland Teacher Staffing Report 2016-2018. Retrieved from <http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/about/Documents/DEE/ProgramApproval/MarylandTeacherStaffingReport20162018.pdf>
- National Center for Education Statistics (May 2017). *Elementary and Secondary Enrollment*. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cga.asp

- National Center for Education Statistics (April 2015). *Public School Teacher Attrition and Mobility in the First Five Years*. Retrieved from <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2015/2015337.pdf>
- Newton, S. (2010). Preservice performance assessment and teacher early career effectiveness: Preliminary findings on the performance assessment for California teachers. Stanford, CA: Stanford University, Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity.
- Pey-Yan, L., & Lawrenz, F. (2010). Optimizing teacher preparation loan forgiveness programs: Variables related to perceived influence. *Science Education Policy*, 95(1), 121-144.
- Putnam, H., Hansen, M., Walsh, K., & Quintero, D., (2016). High hopes and harsh realities: The real challenges to building a diverse workforce. The Brown Center on Education Policy at Brookings. Retrieved from https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/browncenter_20160818_teacherdiversityreportpr_hansen.pdf
- Rice, J.K. (2013). Learning from experience: Evidence on the impact and distribution of teacher experience and the implications for teacher policy. *Education Finance and Policy*, 8(3), 332-348.
- Steele, J.L., Murane, R.J., & Willet, J.B. (2009). *Do financial incentives help low-performing schools attract and keep academically talented teachers? Evidence from California*. Working Paper 14780. Cambridge, MA. National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Sunderman, G. L., & Dayhoff, J. (2014). Creating opportunities or settling for inequities: Two decades of change in Maryland's public schools. College Park, MD: Maryland Equity Project, The University of Maryland.
- Sutcher, L., Darling-Hammond, L., & Carver-Thomas, D. (2016). A coming crisis in teaching? Teacher supply, demand, and shortages in the U.S.. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.
- Tyler, L., Whiting, B., Ebranks, S. et al (2011). *Toward Increasing Teacher Diversity: Targeting Support and Intervention for Teacher Licensure Candidates*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service (ED517750).
- Vandevoort, L. G., Amrein-Beardsley, A., Berliner, D.C. (2004). National Board certified teachers and their students' achievement. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 12(46), 1-117. Retrieved from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v12n46/v12n46.pdf>

- Villar, A. & Strong, M. (2007). Is Mentoring Worth the Money? A Benefit-Cost Analysis and Five-Year Rate of Return of a Comprehensive Mentoring Program for Beginning Teachers. *ERS Spectrum*, 25 (3), 1-17.
- Wilson, M., Hallam, P.J., Pecheone, R., & Moss, P., (2010). Using Student Achievement Test Scores as Evidence of External Validity for Indicators of Teacher Quality: Connecticut's Beginning Educator Support and Training Program. Retrieved from <http://edtpa.aacte.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/Using-Student-Achievement-Test-Scores.pdf>
- Yoon, K.S., Duncan, T., Lee, S. W.-Y., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K. (2007). Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects student achievement (Issues & Answers Report, REL 2007-No. 033). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southwest. Retrieved from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs>

Appendix Summary

Appendix I:	Chapter 740 (SB 493) Teacher Induction, Retention, and Advancement Act of 2016
Appendix II:	Maryland Educator Preparation Standards
Appendix III:	Interim Report (November 1, 2016)
Appendix IV:	June 22, 2016 Meeting Minutes
Appendix V:	June 22, 2016 Materials of Interest
Appendix VI:	July 7, 2016 Meeting Minutes
Appendix VII:	July 7, 2016 Materials of Interest
Appendix VIII:	July 19, 2016 Meeting Minutes
Appendix IX:	July 19, 2016 Materials of Interest
Appendix X:	August 2, 2016 Meeting Minutes
Appendix XI:	August 2, 2016 Materials of Interest
Appendix XII:	August 16, 2016 Meeting Minutes
Appendix XIII:	August 16, 2016 Materials of Interest
Appendix XIV:	October 4, 2016 Meeting Minutes
Appendix XV:	October 4, 2016 Materials of Interest
Appendix XVI:	November 14, 2016 Meeting Minutes
Appendix XVII:	November 14, 2016 Materials of Interest
Appendix XVIII:	January 20, 2017 Meeting Minutes
Appendix XIX:	January 31, 2017 Meeting Minutes
Appendix XX:	January 31, 2017 Materials of Interest

Appendix XXI:	February 21, 2017 Meeting Minutes
Appendix XXII:	February 21, 2017 Materials of Interest
Appendix XXIII:	March 29, 2017 Meeting Minutes
Appendix XXIV:	April 26, 2017 Meeting Minutes
Appendix XXV:	April 26, 2017 Materials of Interest
Appendix XXVI:	May 30, 2017 Meeting Minutes
Appendix XXVII:	May 30, 2017 Materials of Interest
Appendix XXVIII:	June 20, 2017 Meeting Minutes
Appendix XXIX:	June 20, 2017 Materials of Interest
Appendix XXX:	July 25, 2017 Meeting Minutes
Appendix XXXI:	July 25, 2017 Materials of Interest
Appendix XXXII:	September 11, 2017 Meeting Minutes
Appendix XXXIII:	September 11, 2017 Materials of Interest
Appendix XXXIV:	September 20, 2017 Meeting Minutes
Appendix XXXV:	September 25, 2017 Meeting Minutes
Appendix XXXVI:	2016-2018 Staffing Report
Appendix XXXVII:	Letters