CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION Hartford

Legislation and Policy Development Committee Meeting November 2, 2016

Draft Minutes

Pursuant to notice filed with the Secretary of the State, the Board of Education Legislation and Policy Development Committee met in Room 2600, Legislative Office Building, Hartford, Connecticut, on November 2, 2016.

I. Call to Order

Committee Chairperson Theresa Hopkins-Staten called the meeting to order at 8:38 a.m. Also present were Committee members Erin Benham, Joseph Vrabely, Robert Trefry, *Maria Mojica and *Terry Jones.

Also present for all or part of the meeting were the following Department of Education staff members: Assistant to the Commissioner for Board Matters, Pamela Charland; Chief Operating Officer Charlene Russell-Tucker; Chief Talent Officer Sarah Barzee; Division Director Shannon Marimón; Legal Director Peter Haberlandt, and Recorder, Lisa Carta Corriveau.

*Ms. Mojica arrived at 8:52 a.m. Mr. Jones arrived at 9:10 a.m.

II. Approval of Meeting Minutes

On a motion made and seconded, the Committee unanimously approved the minutes of the October 5, 2016, Legislation and Policy Development Committee meeting.

III. Overview re: Recommendations of the Educator Preparation Advisory Council (EPAC) for Educator Preparation Transformation

Committee Chair Hopkins-Staten introduced Chief Talent Officer Sarah Barzee, who provided the Committee with an overview of recommendations for transforming CT's system of educator preparation. The recommendations will be presented to the State Board of Education (SBE) at its December 7, 2016, meeting. Dr. Barzee provided background on the formation and charge to EPAC. On March 7, 2012, the SBE approved a resolution to establish EPAC, assigning it the task of recommending principles to guide the design of a system for the approval, development of regulations and oversight of Connecticut's education preparation programs (EPPs). Membership includes Connecticut professional organizations, representatives from Higher Education, legislative representatives, PK-12 districts, and Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) staff.

Recommendations from the EPAC, who worked with advisory committees as well as state and national experts, include the following six principles adopted by the State Board of Education in April of 2013: Program Entry Standards; Staffing and Support of Clinical Experiences; Clinical

Experience Requirements; District-Program Partnerships and Shared Responsibility; Program Completion and Candidate Assessment Standards; and Program Effectiveness and Accountability.

Dr. Barzee explained that, pursuant to Special Act 16-22, and EPAC's recommendation, the CSDE will establish a partnership with the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) for the purpose of accrediting and establishing standards for higher education programs of educator preparation leading to professional certification. Dr. Barzee summarized the program approval process, including the site visit component, and noted EPAC's recommendation to transition from the current five-year approval to the seven-year approval used by CAEP.

Committee Chair Hopkins-Staten indicated that she would like more information on the process for the site visits themselves.

EPAC is recommending less variation in clinical experiences across CT EPPs. The American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE) is currently finalizing a white paper that will guide Connecticut's work in this area. Some changes expected include increasing the amount of time candidates spend in clinical experiences and ensuring candidates spend time in various, diverse settings.

EPAC is recommending adoption of the edTPA, a pre-service performance assessment designed to assess a candidate's competency in the practice of teaching, including planning, instruction, assessment and classroom management. edTPA was piloted in seven EPPs in 2015-16. A second pilot is occurring in several EPPs during the 2016-17 academic year.

In September 2017, a new Educator Preparation Quality Data Dashboard will go "live." The dashboard will provide data on the quality of CT's EPPs through a variety of metrics.

Lastly, Dr. Barzee reported that a new teacher/employer survey has been created for teachers and their principals/direct supervisors to assess the effectiveness of CT EPPs in preparing candidates to be "learner ready" on day one in the classroom. The survey was piloted in eight districts during the 2015-16 academic year. Discussion ensued.

IV. Consideration of Approval of Praxis Core Guidance under Public Act 16-41

Passed in 2016, Public Act 16-41 amends the competency examination requirement originally in place, now requiring candidates to take Praxis Core upon enrollment in a Connecticut EPP. The change removes achievement of a passing score on Praxis Core as a certification and EPP entry requirement. Moving forward, EPPs will have more flexibility in admitting candidates on a variety of indicators as demonstration of competency. The Praxis Core will be used to identify areas of basic skills (reading, writing and math) in which candidates may require additional support.

Candidates will now apply directly to the EPP, as opposed to the CSDE, for waivers based on achieving a passing score on the SAT, ACT, or GRE.

Chairperson Hopkins-Staten expressed some concern about the language of Public Act 16-41 in regard to the Praxis Core and noted that, when possible, Committee members should be given some opportunity to comment on non-State Board education bills that come to the Department's attention during the legislative session. She further noted that the "messaging" in how a piece of proposed legislation is packaged is extremely important. For example, now that the dashboard will be transparent to the public, candidates needing "remediation of basic skills" may yield to a perception of lowering standards on the state's part, which was not the intent of the bill.

Chairperson Hopkins-Staten has requested a revision of the language in the guidance that goes forward to the Board in December. Praxis Core will highlight deficiencies but does not necessarily address a candidate's ability to teach the content, in addition to their understanding and knowledge of the content. Focus must also be directed toward ensuring that the teacher is able to clearly convey the information.

V. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 a.m.
Respectfully submitted,
Lisa Carta Corriveau, Recorder