



**Minutes**  
**September 20-21, 2006**  
**Vancouver, WA**

**September 20, 2006**

<b>Members Present:</b>	Terry Bergeson Carol Coar Shannon Espinoza Kathryn Nelson Grant Pelesky Stephen Rushing Dennis Sterner Stacey Valentin Donna Zickuhr	June Canty Gary Cohn Vicki Frei Sharon Okamoto Martha Rice Ron Scutt Yvonne Ullas Jill Van Glubt
<b>Members Absent:</b>	Rebecca Bowers Roger Erskine	Dora Noble
<b>Staff Present:</b>	Jennifer Wallace Esther Baker Nasue Nishida	Gina Hobbs Lin Douglas

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Kay Nelson, Acting Chair, called the meeting to order at 8:30am and announced this was her last meeting as Acting Chair. New PESB member, Jill Van Glubt, has been appointed to the post by Governor Gregoire. Ms. Van Glubt will assume her new responsibilities tomorrow.

Ms. Nelson announced there are five newly appointed members of the PESB and asked them to introduce themselves.

- **Jill Van Glubt**, of Fall City, is Chair of the PESB. Representing public school teachers, she is a teacher at Eastlake High School in the Lake Washington School District.
- **June Canty**, of Battle Ground, representing public higher education, is a Professor and the Director of Education Programs at Washington State University, Vancouver.
- **Shannon Espinoza**, of Spokane, representing public school teachers, is a teacher in the Cheney School District.
- **Stephen Rushing**, of Puyallup, representing public school principals, is the principal at Pioneer Valley Elementary School.
- **Donna Zickuhr**, of Anacortes, representing public school principals, is the principal at Anacortes High School.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

- Antioch University Request to Rescind Approval of Secondary Education Endorsements for English/Language Arts, Math and Social Studies
- Annual Approval of Providers of Clock Hours for Continuing Education Requirements

- Continuance of September 20<sup>th</sup> Deaf Education Endorsement and Endorsement Competencies to September 21st
- Agenda
- Approval of Minutes from PESB July 20-21 Meeting

**MOTION:** *To approve the consent agenda with noted corrections to the July minutes.*  
***Motion carried.***

**DRAFT REPORT WITH RECOMMENDATIONS FROM GOVERNOR GREGOIRE'S WASHINGTON LEANS INITIATIVE**

Judy Hartmann, Governor's Executive Policy Advisor for K-12 Education

The steering committee of Governor Gregoire's Washington Learns initiative has released its draft report for public comment. Ms. Hartmann presented the key recommendations contained in the report, with particular emphasis on those areas in which the Governor is requesting the PESB take action.

The report includes strategies so students are prepared for the world; very young students through college students, and learners returning to pursue a degree. The report is a draft and the Governor's Office is in the process of conducting public hearings. There are three advisory committees; early learning education, K20 advisory and higher education advisory. The Governor's perspective is clear; capacity building will take some time and the reader shouldn't take this as being something that will be implemented immediately. Ideas are being brought forth and community members are asking us to think more broadly about how to make change in WA to support students. Ms. Hartmann would encourage the PESB to think about how they could best bring forward ideas.

Policy considerations for PESB:

1. If WA Learns recommendation is adopted - Institutions individually determine program completion, but assessments from all candidates across all institutions "scored" in order to determine standard met. [similar to relationship of K-12 schools and WASL passage]
2. Implications for the current requirements related to the "culminating seminar"?
3. If state administers a performance assessment, could an experienced teacher opt to prepare their evidence on their own / with selected assistance rather than complete a program?
4. Descriptions of Practice – the higher education professional certification programs have accomplished a great deal in developing common rubrics for assessing the pro cert standards. How will whatever model of administration build upon / utilize this work/consensus?
5. Inter-rater reliability – This has been an area of difficulty in implementing the pedagogy assessment at each institution. It is essential for licensure decisions. How will this be ensured?
6. Validity – How will this be established?
7. Cost to candidate? Will state fund both development and administration? Vendor assumes cost of development in exchange for fee to candidate? Some combination of state, vendor and candidate?

The Acting Chair opened the floor to PESB members for clarifying questions and/or comments. PESB members expressed concern over the commingling of professional certification and

salary, this needs to be addressed gingerly as there are high stakes involved. Also of concern is the cost of such programs and how the bar can be kept high.

Dr. Arlene Hett, Director, Professional Education and Certification, OSPI  
Mary Jo Larsen, Program Specialist, Professional Education and Certification, OSPI

Dr. Hett welcomed new board members and thanked the PESB for the invitation to speak on this issue. She and her staff have gone through four years of implementation with many changes, including responses from the community, and they've worked to be responsive to stakeholder claims. They've received increased guidance to work towards common assessment of professional certification and to broaden the assessment committee; to move forward and get more input.

Ms. Larsen introduced committee members and spoke about the work of the Professional Certification Assessment Committee. There is a history in increased guidance and collaboration and elements are coming into alignment. In developing recommendations for the plan, the committee has met three times, reviewed other state models, developed guiding principles, discussed various levels of assessment, and discussed next steps. Delaware has a four cycle induction system; two assessments at the state level, and two at the local level.

Dr. Terry Bergeson, State Superintendent, made clear that this is ultimately the work of the PESB. Staff at OSPI are getting people together to see if the plan makes sense; it's a proposal at this point.

Ms. Larsen outlined potential outcomes; transparency, consistency, rigor, relevance, time involved, establishing professional certifications as the touchstone of educator preparation and development. She also outlined potential implications; increased rigidity, less flexibility within programs, logistics including cost and program approval.

The Acting Chair opened the floor to board discussion and questions/comments. Jennifer Wallace emphasized the policy shift; currently professional certificates are issued based solely on the program. Board members addressed the need to end with a consistent program; it's important to remember uniform accountability.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Lucinda Young, Washington Education Association (WEA):  
I was a teacher for 14 years. We'll either stay on top of the crust or drown. I'd like to preface my remarks with how we (WEA) perceive the PESB. You are the experts at getting the most qualified people in the classrooms and it's a critical job. The education community looks to the PESB to see what is needed around licensure. There is a funding issue; how will we fund the concepts? We exist with the authority we have because we're rushed without funding to meet new challenges of professional certification system. A certificate is a property right; once a teacher goes through the steps, it becomes a piece of paper with a property right to them. How do you tie the certificate to pay? There is a local control issue in our state; strong school boards; difficulties looking at a broad spectrum while dealing with unique local needs of every community. A prime example is a one-room school house where you have to meet every need; please keep these in mind. The whole assessment piece is worth looking at; it's an additional hoop, more paper, more time, more money; it may send them over the edge. Our teachers will get to the end and know they are a good teacher because they did the additional work. The third caution is the cost; I left Colorado as they were instituting a process to review portfolios. It costs

to pay people to determine whether they meet requirements. If the state doesn't fund it, ultimately the student does. Look at all of the factors; it's a well thought out pilot. I'm concerned about salary; merit pay; and a performance based pay system. WEA is working very hard and having spicy conversations about this issue; we need an objective system of determining whether a teacher has reached a level to receive recognition pay. Professional development is frightening and exciting at the same time; schools don't have the money to pay for this; it must be funded at the state level. Think about the number of teachers and reimbursement pay.

Margaret Lawson, Washington State University, Vancouver:

I am happy to have a program specialist at OSPI assigned to WSU. I totally agree that this much of what we have could be avoided if we had program alignment, a clear picture/rubric with the end in mind. We have criteria and descriptors; we need to fix this and to provide opportunity for all students to learn. Professional Certification is not jumping through hoops; I'm concerned that if we involve WA educators and external evaluators, we will lose the colorful context of WA educational reform and informal programs; we must help continue to refine them. I have concerns about wide scale external scoring; caution when you look at options; remember we're not always in good times, please don't put a system in place we can't support during the bad times. Continue to work collaboratively; please continue to support this.

## **PESB LEGISLATIVE BUDGET AND POLICY PROPOSALS**

Jennifer Wallace, Executive Director, PESB

Dr. Lin Douglas, Alternative Routes Program Director, PESB

Nasue Nishida, Policy and Research Analyst, PESB

Staff presented proposals at the July meeting and the PESB held afternoon work sessions to discuss these proposals. They then directed staff to pursue them for the 2006-2007 legislative session. The proposals include: Workforce Diversity, Alternative Routes, Cross-sector Collaboration, and the PESB Operating Budget.

Why these proposals? The PESB published a Comprehensive Analysis which yielded recommendations and a work plan; these topics were included. These are goals that require additional resources, changes in RCW, or additional funding. The requests go to the Legislature on October 2, 2006.

- Nasue Nishida: Workforce Diversity  
This goal of this proposal is to better reflect diversity in the teacher population so it mirrors the student population. The intent is to pilot a program focused on targeted recruitment of diverse high school students into shortage teaching areas. There are four components to this plan; targeted recruitment, school and community support; future teacher camps; and evaluation of existing teacher recruitment efforts in the state.
- Dr. Douglas: Cross-sector Collaboration  
The goal of this proposal is to create a state facilitated model partnership between one or two public/private higher education institutions and school districts where their candidates are placed for field experiences/internships and that employ significant numbers of program completers from those institutions.
- Dr. Douglas: Alternative Routes  
The goal of this proposal is to add a content component based on the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), piloting a competency based baccalaureate degree. Alternative Routes for principal certification; money set aside for small rural districts; exploring developing alternative routes for school psychologists.

- Jennifer Wallace: PESB Operating Budget  
The PESB non-salary, non-earmarked allotment has decreased over time. We have been given money for specific charges, such as the Comprehensive Analysis and adding Nasue's position. We've review our budget needs, reviewed a comparison of costs over time, and considered the fact that PESB has gone from being an advisory to a policy making board, which costs more to administer. Based on our findings, we're asking the Legislature for an increase in our 2008-2009 biennial budget allotment.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Sheila Fox, Western Washington University (WWU), Teacher Preparation Program: Speaking on cross sector collaboration proposal; concerns around language. WWU was one of the Universities having initial conversations with staff about this project. We too have concerns around the language. WWU was invited to suggest alternate language and I invite other higher education institutions to do the same. The heart and soul of it is one that we really support; institutions working as partners with ESDs and public school districts to focus on strategies that make a difference in student learning so we can go back to the institutions and say this is what's right and this is where we might need to do some fine tuning. It's another way for us to zero in on high quality student performance and to figure out how to get there using the best strategies. I really support this proposal and welcome the opportunity to influence the language of instruction.

**MOTION** to approve the presented budget proposals with language revisions in progress.  
**Motion carried.**

## **REPORT FROM THE WEST-E PROPOSAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE**

Esther Baker, Assessment Program Manager, PESB  
Steve Siera, St. Martin's University, Director of Masters of Education and Professional Certification  
Dana Edward, Western Washington University, Director of Certification and Accreditation

The Acting Chair reminded the PESB that action will be taken on this item tomorrow morning so members can have a chance to review the recommendation more thoroughly before voting.

Ms. Baker provided a brief overview of the evaluation process. She received two proposals; one from Educational Testing Systems (ETS) and one from National Education Systems, Inc. (NES). A committee of nine members evaluated the proposals and reviewed sizable amounts of documents from both vendors. The committee was very well prepared and worked hard to provide a complete evaluation of the proposals. The committee had concerns over the cost proposals and asked both vendors to submit revised cost proposals so they could compare apples to apples. Throughout the process, the unanimous recommendation was the same.

Ms. Edward was pleased to announce the unanimous recommendation of the committee to accept NES as the vendor for the WEST-E. The evaluation report provides a summary of the scores; key reasons; confidential overview and fee schedule of other services. Ms. Edward reviewed the technical scores and reasons why they gave those scores.

Mr. Siera and Ms. Edward continued to review the scores for each evaluation category. Ultimately, the committee recommends the PESB enter into contract negotiations with NES for the WEST-E test.

Ms. Baker introduced NES representatives to the PESB; Bill Gorth, Les McCallum, Phil Dolly, and Janet Bell.

The Acting Chair opened the floor to board discussion and questions/comments. Several members recognized the work of the evaluation committee and thanked them for their thorough review and recommendation.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

### **MEMBER WORK SESSION: PESB CONTINUED DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF POLICY GOVERNANCE**

Sherry Jennings, Sound Governance

Ms. Jennings introduced herself to members and gave a brief presentation on what the board has done so far with respect to policy governance. Policy Governance (PG) is a framework of best practices and a comprehensive approach to how boards conduct their business.

After a brief PowerPoint presentation, Ms. Jennings split members up into groups of three to discuss various questions. The groups reported back and continued discussions centered on the PESB's new policy making responsibilities and what implications that has to current board policies and guidelines.

Next steps to implementing PG at the PESB are:

1. Using practical examples so members can see the work they're doing and how implementing PG would impact and improve what they're currently doing...**practice**;
2. Go back and revisit who the board serves and who they represent;
3. Review Ends policies;
4. Simplify the board's policies as they are currently written

Ms. Jennings will continue to work with the Executive Committee to review and revise current policies so they align with the PG principles.

The Acting Chair adjourned the meeting at 4pm.

**September 21, 2006**

<b>Members Present:</b>	June Canty Gary Cohn Vicki Frei Sharon Okamoto Martha Rice Dennis Sterner Stacey Valentin Donna Zickuhr	Carol Coar Cathy Davidson Kathryn Nelson Grant Pelesky Stephen Rushing Ron Scutt Yvonne Ullas Jill Van Glubt
<b>Members Absent:</b>	Terry Bergeson Roger Erskine Dora Noble	Rebecca Bowers Shannon Espinoza
<b>Staff Present:</b>	Jennifer Wallace Esther Baker Nasue Nishida	Gina Hobbs Lin Douglas

### **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

New PESB Chair, Jill Van Glubt, called the meeting to order at 8:30am and reviewed the agenda for the day. She thanked Ms. Nelson for her leadership to the PESB. Several members recognized Ms. Nelson for her service as Chair and also thanked her for her leadership.

Jennifer Wallace spoke briefly about the previous afternoon's Policy Governance session. She said she would continue to work with the consultant on a more one-to-one basis and through the Executive Committee.

### **DISCUSSION AND ACTION: SELECTION OF WEST-E VENDOR**

***MOTION*** to accept recommendation of RFP evaluation committee to choose National Evaluation System, Inc. as the consultant with whom the PESB will negotiate the WEST-E contract. ***Motion carried.***

The Chair opened the floor to PESB members for discussion and clarifying questions and/or comments. Several members spoke in favor of the motion. The PESB thanked ETS and staff for their work on the current Praxis II test. There was some discussion about how a transition would take place and if a work plan would be created. It was suggested that a transition committee be formed because changes will need to be made for the new test, as they were when the Praxis II was released. It was also suggested the PESB issue a public statement when the time comes.

### **UPDATE AND STATUS REPORT: FIRST PEOPLE'S LANGUAGE AND CULTURE CERTIFICATE**

Karen Condon, Colville Tribes  
Marsha Wynecoop, Spokane Tribe  
Toby Langen, Tulalip Tribe  
Carrie Acker, Suquamish Tribe

PESB Executive Director, Jennifer Wallace, and PESB members Kay Nelson, Gary Cohn and Carol Coar joined the presenters in delivering a status report to the board. Ms. Wallace began by giving the PESB some background on the committee's purpose and the status of the First People's Language and Culture (FPLC) Certificate.

This program allows individuals who have been certified by a participating tribe as proficient in that tribe's native language to become state-certified to teach that language in Washington public schools. The program is administered by PESB. Candidates for this certificate must meet the background check and "issues of abuse" coursework required of all certified teachers. Eleven tribes currently participate in the program: Colville; Kalispel, Nooksack, Suquamish, Cowlitz, Lower Elwha Klallam, Skokomish, Tulalip, Jamestown S'Klallam, Makah, and Spokane.

Recommendations from the committee include conducting a program review and completing a status report every five years, similar to the end of program analysis. Another recommendation is for a PESB member to attend the annual FPLC meeting to strengthen the relationship between FPLC and PESB.

The Chair opened the floor to PESB members for discussion and clarifying questions and/or comments. Members of the committee spoke about the importance of this program and thanked the PESB for their work to further the FPLC certificate and for making the smooth transition from the State Board of Education to the PESB.

The PESB will determine if the end of analysis report will be submitted for their review in November 2006 or January 2007.

### **PESB/STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION JOINT REPORT**

Sheila Fox, SBE Liaison to the PESB  
Jennifer Wallace, PESB Executive Director

The 2005 legislation that transferred certain areas of rulemaking authority from the State Board of Education (SBE) to the PESB also requires that by October 15th of even numbered years, the State Board and PESB submit a joint report describing how they are working together and individually to promote the goals of basic education. In July, the PESB approved a staff-prepared outline for the report. Last week, the State Board of Education reviewed and approved the report.

The Chair opened the floor to PESB members for discussion and clarifying questions and/or comments. PESB members commented on the report and said page nine is especially helpful in explaining the transition of duties from the SBE to the PESB. Members are thrilled to see the two boards working together.

***MOTION*** to approve joint report, with noted correction in membership role. ***Motion carried.***

### **REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS: PESB EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAM REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE**

Dr. Lin Douglas, Director of Alternative Routes, PESB  
Carol Coar, PESB and Program Review Subcommittee member

Dr. Douglas provided an overview of the program review process presented to the board at previous meetings. She presented the recommendations from the Program Review Subcommittee to move forward with proposed changes to WAC 181-78A-100, 181-78A-105, and 181-78A-110. Some changes remain procedural, some need to be codified. Close attention should be paid to one item in particular: 181-78A-100(7)c regarding site visits. The process of site visits is simply referenced and the process will be adopted and published by the PESB, rather than describing the process in WAC.

The Chair opened the floor to PESB members for discussion and clarifying questions and/or comments. Members expressed the need for clarity relating to members who participate on site visits; whether they are voting or just observing. Other topics of discussion included the composition of teams conducting site visits and the need for more specific language relating to team substitutes. Dr. Douglas asked PESB members to make suggestions for updated language. She also said new forms will be posted on the PESB web site to make the process transparent.

A couple of PESB members expressed concern over the fact that an institution could have their programs pulled if they receive two “unmet” findings during a site visit. Discussion followed regarding this topic and it was also mentioned that institutions have lots of time to prepare for the site visits and they know what’s expected; they should be prepared. The PESB must make sure these programs meet the standards and if they don’t, they cannot be allowed to operate.

***MOTION*** to move forward in filing WAC amendments for PESB adoption of committee recommendations in November. ***Motion carried.***

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Lucinda Young, Washington Education Association (WEA):

WEA appreciates the work of the committee and likes the transparency in the process, it’s very important to have due process. WEA is happy to provide names of teachers who might be interested in being part of the site visit team. WEA likes the pre-proposal; its tough looking at the state saying where there’s enough programs; that’s the responsibility of the PESB; to keep the education programs within our state at the top level. WEA also supports the “unmet” standards piece; two “unmet” standards seem tough, but its critical people understand how important a program is that a college student or existing teacher has to go through. I also believe the six month time period to correct the problem seems reasonable. I don’t think anything will be accomplished if the PEC teams going in are so worried about stopping the program that they don’t want to look at every aspect of the program, so having the due process piece up front would work. Thank you for your time and good luck.

Dr. Arlene Hett, Director of Professional Education and Certification, OSPI

I’ve been invited to the last two meetings of this review committee, but I’m not a member of the committee. I’ve shared some of the same concerns at the meeting that were brought up today. When we’ve done the site visits, we’ve approached them from both aspects; compliance & accountability and program approval & improvement. The a-b-c seems harsh to me, almost punitive. Let me give you an example of an institution this last year that had several of the five basic standards unmet; they were given six months to respond; to show us a plan and to show us how they were going to correct those situations. Becoming very specific really ties our hands; we (PEC) would appreciate a little more flexibility in our ability to bring forward a report to you and to make a recommendation to you, rather than being so tied. For example, if an institution (under Standard 1) does not hold a required meeting during the year, we give them an unmet.

Then they have a problem with governance, maybe new leadership, that decides they're not going to budget the same way and the site visit team finds there is no money allocated to the library and the amount allocated for teacher preparation is not sufficient, they get an unmet. What has happened is we put them on probation for six months, they respond and move forward and we see the program really grow. On the other hand, if we have a program that missed one standard and that happens to be Standard 5, that program has major concerns and perhaps deserves more to be shut down than the program described in the other situation. I'm glad you're taking this back to the committee and I would encourage discussion in that area. Also under the a-b-c there are implications for the Title II report and what that means for the institutions that were pointed out. It's my understanding that a practitioner meant someone who is involved in education, either at the K12 level, ESA, Principal or Teacher or a higher education practitioner. The vast majority of people signed up for PEC's site visit training are higher education folks. We will be talking to Lucinda to see if we can get more WEA folks.

Jerry Deluca, Educational Testing Service (ETS):

I would like to make a general comment since I have to leave the meeting. ETS will continue to do everything it can to make this program (WEST-E/Praxis II) the absolute best it can be up to and throughout the transition in terms of cooperating with NES. Some people have sought me out to say thank you and I want you to know I appreciate that. I want to say thank you very much to the PESB.

### **EDUCATIONAL STAFF ASSOCIATE (ESA) PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATION**

Dr. Arlene Hett, Director of Professional Education and Certification, OSPI  
Connie Reichel, Program Specialist, Professional Education and Certification, OSPI  
Dr. Christine Jensen, Seattle University  
Dr. Keith Mars, Central WA University School Psychology PEAB

Dr. Hett announced that Connie Reichel is retiring and this is her last act in office. Her duties have been reassigned to Judy Smith.

Ms. Reichel gave brief background information and asked for questions about the information contained in the packet.

PESB member Carol Coar is the ESA representative on the PESB. Ms. Coar commented that ESAs can be isolated and in this proposal they have the opportunity to be part of a cohort.

Although the PESB is not voting on this today, an included section of WAC outlines language to delay implementation of the program from August 2007 to August 2008. This will give staff plenty of time to put this program together in the best possible way.

PEC has been issuing ESA residency certificates for counselors, psychologists and social workers since September 1, 2005. As of September 11, 2006, 274 ESA residency certificates have been issued; 198 counselors, 51 psychologists, 25 school social workers. From those 274, 247 of them have no expiration date. That's based upon the fact its their residency certificate and they have not yet completed two years of service in that particular ESA role. The earliest expiration date will be June 30, 2011. The one year implementation delay would allow more time for the process to come together as smoothly as possible.

The Chair opened the floor to PESB members for discussion and clarifying questions and/or comments. We are striving for collaboration between all programs. Board members expressed concern over salary and think that should be a factor is this as well; similar to teachers.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

**MOTION** to approve *ESA Professional Certificate benchmarks. Motion carried.*

### **PESB PROCESS FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF DISTRICT REQUESTS FOR OUT-OF-ENDORSEMENT WAIVERS**

Jennifer Wallace, Executive Director, PESB

One of the new responsibilities the PESB gained this past January is to grant or deny out-of-endorsement assignment waivers submitted by local school districts. In lieu of any established criteria, and in order to respond to incoming district requests given the start of the '06-'07 school year, PESB staff developed a waiver request form that reflects the criteria required for local school district boards to grant waivers.

The purpose of this session is to discuss potential criteria by which the PESB staff may sign-off on waiver requests from school districts. This is more or less a stop gap measure; the ultimate goal is having an educator workforce data system.

**MOTION** to approve *criteria presented, motion seconded. Motion withdrawn.*

Ms. Wallace began to review eight (8) criteria for members to consider adopting so staff can approve waiver requests. The review process garnered many questions on the clarity of the agenda item. It was further explained that the PESB is approving the criteria of the request, not the actual form. The intent of attaching criteria to the waiver request is not so it becomes a process for rejection, but more to gather information and to ensure districts have plans for filling their hard to fill positions and plans for the development of the assigned teachers.

Members still appeared unclear as to whether they were being asked to approve a form, which seems more an administrative process. Ms. Wallace continued to explain that what they are being asked to approve are criteria for granting waiver requests. Given the approved criteria, staff would be responsible for creating the form and granting the requests.

As the review progressed, it was determined the group would resurrect the discussion after lunch.

**MOTION** to recess for lunch and continue discussion later this afternoon. **Motion carried.**

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

## **DEAF EDUCATION ENDORSEMENT AND ENDORSEMENT COMPETENCIES**

Nasue Nishida, Policy & Research Analyst, PESB  
Lori Dunsmore, Principal, Washington School for the Deaf  
Carol Carrothers, State Coordinator for Washington Sensory Disabilities Services  
Judy Smith, Program Specialist, Professional Education and Certification, OSPI

Ms. Nishida provided a brief history and timeline on the work completed to this point. At the July meeting, the PESB directed staff to move forward on a specialty endorsement. Ms. Nishida reviewed the proposed WAC language.

***MOTION*** to approve WAC language. ***Motion carried.***

Ms. Nishida reviewed the competencies for the Deaf Education specialty endorsement.

Ms. Smith reviewed the process used in establishing specialty endorsement. The draft deaf education endorsement competencies were sent out to stakeholders. Not many comments were received regarding the proposed changes.

Ms. Dunsmore and Ms. Carrothers thanked the PESB for inviting them to attend. They commented that this was a great experience and it turned out well.

***MOTION*** to approve the endorsement competencies for the Deaf Education specialty endorsement. ***Motion carried.***

Ms. Nishida has contacted Educational Testing Systems (ETS) about how this new endorsement will fit into the endorsements currently included in the WEST-E Praxis II Series. It was also suggested this be added to National Evaluation Systems, Inc. (NES) list for inclusion in the new WEST-E test.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

None.

## **PESB PROCESS FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF DISTRICT REQUESTS FOR OUT-OF-ENDORSEMENT WAIVERS (continued from before the lunch break)**

Jennifer Wallace, Executive Director, PESB

Ms. Wallace began by stating why the PESB needs to be involved in this process. It's not an administrative issue, it's a policy issue. The PESB has the authority to determine criteria for approval of out-of-endorsement assignment waivers.

Before lunch, discussion of the eight (8) criteria ended at number five (5). Discussion continued on the remaining criteria, and ended with Ms. Wallace recommending removal of criteria numbers four (4) and six (6) for now. Criteria approved for granting waiver requests include:

1. Time limit – one year
2. Annual request [if time limitation beyond one year]
3. Rationale for request

- ~~4. Position recruitment efforts described, including where posted [e.g. Free state-sponsored sites such as wateach]~~
5. Plan of support for teacher during assignment described
- ~~6. Plan for either teacher to meet assignment requirements or for district to recruit and hire appropriately endorsed teacher~~
7. Complete specified number of clock hours in endorsement area by a specified time
8. Does teacher meet highly-qualified requirements under NCLB?

The question of tracking this information was brought up and Ms. Wallace stated her intent to have this information included in the educator workforce data system.

***MOTION*** to approve adoption of criteria; School districts requesting out-of-endorsement assignment waivers must complete the approved PESB request form annually. Districts must report progress made on the plan of support annually for requests made after the initial year.

**ROLL CALL VOTE (requested):**

Yes = 13 (June Canty, Carol Coar, Cathy Davidson, Vicki Frei, Kathryn Nelson, Sharon Okamoto, Martha Rice, Stephen Rushing, Dennis Sterner, Stacey Valentin, Yvonne Ullas, Donna Zickuhr, Jill Van Glubt)

No = 2 (Gary Cohn, Grant Pelesky)

Abstain = 1 (Ron Scutt)

***Motion carried***

Chair adjourned the meeting at 2:10pm.