

MINUTES
January 16-17, 2008
Tumwater, WA

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Lori Blanchard	Shannon Lawson	Stephen Rushing
June Canty	Corinne McGuigan	Stephanie Salzman
Gary Cohn	(representing Terry Bergeson)	Yvonne Ullas
Roger Erskine	Kay Nelson	Jill Van Glubt
Vicki Frei	Sharon Okamoto	Joyce Westgard (16)
Myra Johnson	Grant Pelesky	

MEMBERS ABSENT: Terry Bergeson (represented by Corrine McGuigan), Keith Hunziker, Dora Noble (2)

STAFF PRESENT: Esther Baker, Pamela Cook, Lin Douglas, Nasue Nishida, Jennifer Wallace (5)

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Van Glubt called the meeting to order at 8:30 AM.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Chair Van Glubt stated that Roger Erskine is meeting with Secretary of Education, Margaret Spellings, and will be delayed this morning.
- Chair Van Glubt announced that The Washington Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (WACTE) is hosting a reception for members this evening from 5:00-6:00 PM. Following the reception, the board will have a work session and dinner from 6:15 until 8:00 PM.
- Members were reminded about using the green half sheets as a guide to the process related to discussion and action on tab items. Additionally, the evaluation forms continue to provide useful information for the executive committee as it plans and adjusts for future meetings.
- Members pointed out a few corrections to the November draft minutes and it was noted that in approving the consent agenda, members understood those corrections would subsequently be made.

MOTION was made by June Canty and seconded by Myra Johnson to accept the consent agenda.

MOTION carried.

PRESENTATION: REVISIONS/CLARIFICATION OF LANGUAGE FOR MUSIC ENDORSEMENT COMPETENCIES

Ms. Arlene Hett, Director, Professional Education and Certification, OSPI

Ms. Hett stated that in response to concerns expressed by the Washington University Music Association (WUMA), a meeting of music educators was convened by the Professional Education and Certification (PEC) office on November 29, 2007 to study and address their concerns. Editorial changes were made which provided resolution of the issues WUMA had identified as concerns. Ms. Hett introduced Keith Ward, Director, School of Music, University of Puget Sound, and David Robbins, Pacific Lutheran University, who were present in support of the revisions.

Mr. Ward stated that he and Mr. Robbins were representing WUMA and in attendance to express support for the proposed changes. There were three issues they believe are addressed in the revisions and clarifications. First, they respond to the current issues faced by principals and superintendents in hiring music teachers; second, they preserve the uniqueness of each emphasis; and third, they reflect the need and presence of all constituencies in the review process.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment.

MOTION was made by Grant Pelesky and seconded by Joyce Westgard to adopt the revisions/clarification of language for music endorsement competencies.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

Members expressed appreciation to all parties involved in this process for their diligence in resolving some difficult issues.

MOTION carried.

PRESENTATION: THE EVERGREEN STATE COLLEGE SITE VISIT REPORT

Ms. Arlene Hett, Director, Professional Education and Certification, OSPI

Chair Van Glubt advised members they would make two separate motions on this item, one for each of the programs requesting approval. Ms. Hett announced that Colleen Putaansuu who serves as the liaison for The Evergreen State College (TESC) and Ms. Sherry Walton, Dean of the program at TESC, were present. The site visit occurred October 27-31, 2007.

Ms. Walton expressed appreciation for the thorough and thoughtful review of the TESC program by the review team. She briefly described the Professional Certificate Preparation Program and the Teacher Preparation Program. TESC enrolls approximately 45 students a year into these programs.

Ms. Hett asked members to consider the Teacher Preparation Program first. She pointed out that all standards were met and they also received six exemplary marks in several categories. She requested five year approval of this program.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment.

MOTION was made by Gary Cohn and seconded by June Canty to grant five year approval for The Evergreen State College Teacher Preparation Program.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

Members expressed appreciation for the excellent work TESC has done in developing this program.

MOTION carried.

Ms. Hett stated that while the review team was at TESC, they also reviewed the Teacher Professional Certificate Program. She noted that all standards were met and requested five year approval.

MOTION was made by June Canty and seconded by Yvonne Ullas to grant five year approval for The Evergreen State College Professional Certificate Preparation Program.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

Members stated the report is thorough and it's a fine program.

MOTION carried.

Ms. Hett acknowledged the collaborative effort involved in the Masters in Teaching Program at TESC and stated that Ms. Walton would like to introduce some of the team members in attendance. Ms. Walton introduced Loren Petty, Field Placement Officer, Maggie Foran, Associate Director-Certification Officer, Sonja Wiedenhaupt, MIT Faculty, and Don Bantz, Provost, as well as other members who were teaching and couldn't attend.

PRESENTATION: REQUEST FROM OSPI PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION AND CERTIFICATION DIVISION FOR EXTENSION OF TIMELINE FOR APPROVAL OF CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY ROUTE APPROVAL SCHEDULE

Ms. Arlene Hett, Director, Professional Education & Certification, OSPI

Ms. Hett stated that there are five institutions that offer business and industry programs that were approved by the State Board of Education in 2002-2003. They were extended in 2005 through 2008. Due to the many categories involved in the Business and Industry Route, a typical site visit is not appropriate. Therefore, the Professional Education & Certification

Division of OSPI is requesting an extension of up to one year approval for Central Washington University, Eastern Washington University, Southwest Washington Consortium, Bates Technical College, and South Seattle Community College. This will provide PEC staff an opportunity to meet with folks across the state to develop and establish more appropriate procedures for program review and re-approval.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

- Q:** What are the similarities and differences between how traditional teacher certification programs and career and technical education (CTE) programs are reviewed?
- A:** CTE program that are a part of a university's teacher residency preparation program are reviewed in the site visit process the same way as other programs. For Business and Industry Route programs the review is based on 6000 hours of work experience.
- Q:** Why hasn't the annual report which is a criterion for approval, been enforced and how will it be in the future?
- A:** The year extension will help the PEC ensure this is incorporated into the process.
- Q:** Is this a request for an extension of program approval or for not having to do any reporting at all?
- A:** Since the criterion for an annual report is embedded within the criteria for approval, PEC is requesting an extension of program approval so they have time to meet with people to help them understand what this requirement is.
- Q:** Is one year enough time to take care of this?
- A:** The PEC staff believes it is enough time.
- Q:** Why would the annual report be delayed?
- A:** The extension of the timeline doesn't impact any reports they need to file.
- Q:** Have you gotten any reports?
- A:** There are no reports as of yet in the Business and Industry Route.

MOTION was made by Gary Cohn and seconded by Kay Nelson to approve the request from OSPI Professional Education and Certification Division for a one year extension for approval of career and technical education Business and Industry Route programs.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

Members expressed support of the motion, but urged PEC to be more diligent in collecting reports from the institutions.

MOTION carried.

PRESENTATION: PROPOSAL TO COMBINE BUSINESS AND MARKETING EDUCATION ENDORSEMENTS

Ms. Arlene Hett, Director, Professional Education & Certification, OSPI

Ms. Hett explained that in reviewing the competencies for endorsements in Business Education and Marketing, it became evident that it would be desirable to combine the separate endorsements into a single combined endorsement. This would require one WEST-E test and eliminate redundancy in the two endorsements. It would increase program efficiency across the state and provide greater flexibility for districts. This would also assist in the process of eliminating out-of-endorsement assignments.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

- Q:** Would people have to have both sets of experiences in order to get this certification?
- A:** Completion of this endorsement would include work in both areas. The review committee felt that due to the redundancy between the two, they could easily complete the work for both areas.
- Q:** How do we ensure we're not setting up a higher barrier to entry due to more experience required for two areas?
- A:** For folks who now have either a business or marketing endorsement, they could still teach business or marketing. In the future people coming out of a pre-service program could teach business or marketing or both with this endorsement.
- Q:** Does a person now need 12,000 hours?
- A:** This item is for an endorsement on a residency certificate and the hour requirements are different. The 6,000 hours for the CTE Business and Industry Route certificate is different than the residency certification.
- Q:** Is there evidence that business and marketing educators support this proposal to combine the two endorsements?
- A:** The PEC did receive feedback from the program folks at higher education institutions and according to the business and marketing pathways supervisor at OSPI, this represents a national trend within business education.
- Q:** Was the review committee looking at this as if they would be combined?
- A:** The committee considered the fact that these endorsements are in Phase III and there are test development deadlines, and with strong feedback from the field, support from OSPI contacts and the program directors,

combining was the appropriate way to go. Approval is needed first to combine them and then the combined competencies are on the agenda for this afternoon.

Q: Did the Washington Association of Marketing Educators and the Business Education Association endorse this?

A: The PEC sent requests to several professional organizations, but struggled to get participation. We've received positive feedback from school districts and the Business Education Association supports this combination.

Q: Would it be possible for an instructor to only have business education credentials but will now be qualified to teach marketing?

A: Both the universities that offer both endorsements have capacity in terms of qualified faculty for both business education and marketing. The assignments and how the program is packaged might look different, but it will be the same faculty.

MOTION was made by Gary Cohn and seconded by Grant Pelesky to table this item with no time frame.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

Members said they would like to hear from Larry Lashway, Program Specialist at OSPI before considering this item. Mr. Lashway chaired the committee and had not arrived yet.

MOTION carried.

Chair Van Glubt asked Mr. Lashway to respond to the lack of letters of support from Washington Association of Marketing Educators and the Business Education Association. Mr. Lashway provided a recap of the process used to develop the rationale for this proposal. He stated there are three main reasons for this recommendation. First, there is considerable overlap in the content between business education and marketing. Second, having separate endorsements limits flexibility for school districts when assigning teachers to classes. Third, at present, only two universities, Eastern and Central, maintain business and marketing programs and in both cases recent enrollments have been low enough to threaten program viability. The PEC spoke with the Deans of those two institutions and they did not object to combining the two programs. Lee Goeke, Washington School Personnel Association, also assisted the PEC with an informal survey of their membership and received 24 responses from district folks with nearly unanimous support. Ms. Larsen stated that they had received verbal support from the Business Education Association and would get it in writing and that they would be contacting the Washington Association of Marketing Educators to obtain support in writing from them as well.

Members expressed concern for why marketing folks hadn't responded to PEC's requests and wondered what the downside would be to waiting. It was pointed out that test development would be impacted and there would be implications to the endorsement competencies in Tab 11. Mary Jo Larsen, Program Specialist at OSPI, stated that Diane Heath, President of the Washington Association of Marketing Educators (WAME) would be in attendance in the afternoon and would provide the requested support.

Ms. Hett asked Diane Heath, President of WAME to tell the board about her conversation with Doug Aubert, President Elect of WAME. She stated that Mr. Aubert is supportive of the combination as long as the word marketing was contained within the endorsement. She read a statement from Mr. Aubert endorsing this proposal.

MOTION was made by Grant Pelesky and seconded by Gary Cohn to take Tab 10 off the table.

MOTION carried.

MOTION was made by Grant Pelesky and seconded by Kay Nelson to combine the Business Education and Marketing endorsements.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

Members felt that the information provided was adequate for the board to act on this item.

MOTION carried.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Jim Meadows, Learning and Education Policy Center, Washington Education Association (WEA)

Mr. Meadows provided comments on the technical fix on the professional certification assessment. He stated that WEA is on record with concerns about the external assessment, specifically that it not be additional work for members or create additional cost in a professional certification program. He said WEA does support the notion of quality with programs and

recognizes there needs to be more consistency in programs. On behalf of WEA and its members, Mr. Meadows expressed appreciation for the thoughtful work in making dramatic improvements to professional certification that the PESB has done. He discussed the dead halt effect from the lack of provision to be able to collect a fee. He asks the board to consider the opportunity that lies in that dead halt and use the opportunity to improve communication with educators about professional certification. More information could turn around the recent surge in frustration and concern about professional certification. He believes they can continue to work on program quality by identifying effective programs or components of effective programs and determining how to replicate those best ideas. He believes there needs to be alignment between the residency certification process and the national board process. Washington State is one of the top states with national board and we certify at the highest rate in the country and members are resoundingly positive about the experience. Yet, the professional certification pales in comparison and there is a surge in dissatisfaction in the process. He said WEA will be surveying teachers to see what the issues are including the ramifications of recommending a system that adds an additional fee to teachers already overburdened with assessment costs. If the PESB does seek a technical fix, he believes they should ask for funding from the state to pay the fee rather than place it on the back of teachers who are already burdened.

PRESENTATION: LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Nasue Nishida, Policy and Research Analyst, PESB

Ms. Nishida explained that this is a short legislative session and shared good news that the Governor's proposed supplemental budget includes funding for the PESB's Standard V Pilot. The amount is \$214,000 for fiscal year 2008-09. She provided information on the gubernatorial confirmation of four new members earlier in the morning, Lori Blanchard, Myra Johnson, Stephanie Salzman, and Joyce Westgard. Ms. Nishida discussed the priorities of this session and provided information and issues surrounding the priorities. In addition to Standard V, other priorities include English Language Learner populations, the P-20 Council, which Chair Van Glubt is a member of, and the Basic Education Finance Taskforce.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Q: Do the legislators understand our state's ranking in terms of expenditures?

A: The legislators on the taskforce understand the issue behind the funding. In this supplemental year it will be difficult to get funding to make changes. Next budget year, you'll see more legislators working on the K-12 funding issue.

Q: When will we know when the Standard V Pilot is coming?

A: We'll know by March. Ms. Nishida will send weekly legislative updates to members.

PRESENTATION: APPROVAL OF GRANT RECIPIENTS – RECRUITING WASHINGTON TEACHERS PROGRAM

Nasue Nishida, Policy and Research Analyst, PESB

Mea Moore, Coordinator of Educator Programs and Standards, PESB

Ms. Nishida provided information about this new program, which the legislature passed in the 2007 session. The goal of this program is to recruit underrepresented populations in grades 9 through 12 into the teaching profession. There are several key components of this legislation. First, the legislation requires that the proposals must include partnerships between Colleges of Education, including Community Colleges, school districts and community based organizations. Second, an advisory board of different community organizations and associations with representation of educators must be established. Third, an evaluation of existing teacher recruitment efforts must be set up. A contract is underway with The Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession (CSTP) to perform the evaluation piece of the legislation.

Ms. Moore discussed the community organizations that will partner with schools to ensure recruitment is community based and serves local students. Ten proposals were received and reviewed by a screening committee selected by the advisory board, and three grantees, ESD 105, North Seattle Community College and the Renton School District were selected for approval by the board. Ms. Moore described the process used to select the grantees, which will each be awarded \$128,000 over two years. It is projected that each grantee will recruit 20-25 students. She briefly explained why each grantee warranted selection. These programs are looking at the needs of residents and the community rather than using an institutional model approach. Each grantee has strong incentive programs for students to be in the program which will help them plan for careers in education. There will be an update by the grantees to the advisory board this spring as well as an evaluation report next year which will provide information on the program's overall effectiveness, including lessons learned. Before the end of the biennium, we should know if there will be continued funding.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Q: Do the students recruited for this program begin at the 9th grade level?

- A:** The core group is primarily 10th and 11th graders.
- Q:** Is there any significant difference between where there are multiple partners versus a school district type of program, such as in Renton?
- A:** The community and schools of Renton are an umbrella organization which contain a diverse group of community partnerships and organizations.
- Q:** Are you talking to counselors in the school districts in recruiting students?
- A:** Each grant proposal indicates who their key personnel are and I don't recall specifically the role of counselors. The RFP went to all the groups who have a role in providing this type of program.
- Q:** Are any of the projects paying students to be involved?
- A:** No, the legislature was clear that no financial incentives be given to students.
- Q:** What about recruitment from community colleges, which is an area that could benefit from this?
- A:** There are other avenues for those folks to explore, such as the Higher Education Coordinating Board's conditional scholarship program, the parapipline, and alternative route programs.
- Q:** Recruitment at the middle level seems as if it would be more effective. Is there an effort in that area?
- A:** The legislation was clear about the grade levels at which students would be eligible.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment

MOTION was made by Myra Johnson and seconded by Sharon Okamoto to approve the three finalists, North Seattle Community College, ESD 105, and Renton School District as grant recipients for the Recruiting Washington Teachers Program.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

The outcome of this program is that it has provided opportunities to form partnerships that will carry us into the future.

MOTION carried with two abstentions.

PRESENTATION: ANTIOCH UNIVERSITY SITE VISIT REPORT

Ms. Arlene Hett, Director, Professional Education and Certification, OSPI

Ms. Hett introduced Bob Delisle, Director, Center for Programs in Education, and asked him to introduce other Antioch folks present. He proceeded to introduce Cassandra Manuelito-Kerkvliet, President, Ormond Smythe, Academic Dean, and Lila Henderson, Director of Field Placement and Experiences.

Ms. Hett explained that Antioch had a site visit in 2006 and based on that site visit was granted one year approval for their teacher preparation program. At that time, Antioch had unmet standards in three areas, Professional Education Advisory Board, Accountability, and Unit Governance and Resources. The November 2007 focused site visit revealed that Antioch had improved these three standards and had now earned "mets" in all three areas. She described the steps Antioch had taken to meet the recommendations of the site visit team. Ms. Hett requested five year approval for the Teacher Preparation Program.

Mr. Delisle stated he felt they had learned a great deal in the process and described what Antioch had done to improve their standards, including hiring a consultant to help them collect data on the student teaching experience. Ms. Manuelito-Kerkvliet expressed her appreciation for the opportunity to bring this back to the board.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Q: Is the five year approval from now or from a year ago?

A: It is five year approval from the date when they would have been approved which was November 2006.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment.

MOTION was made by June Canty and seconded by Kay Nelson to grant five year approval from November 2006 to Antioch's Teacher Residency Program.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

Members said they were pleased with the effort Antioch had made to improve their program.

MOTION carried.

PRESENTATION: REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF NORTHEAST WASHINGTON CONSORTIUM'S PRINCIPAL/PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR'S PROGRAM

Ms. Arlene Hett, Director, Professional Education & Certification, OSPI

Ms. Hett explained the consortium was developed as a collaborative venture to offer a Professional Certificate Program for Administrators in the northeast portion of the state. The consortium consists of Eastern Washington University (EWU), Gonzaga, Washington State University (WSU), Spokane, Whitworth University, and Educational Service District (ESD) 101. Larry Lashway described the advantages of this program, particularly to folks on the eastern side of the state. He introduced Jim Howard, Clinical Associate Professor of Educational Leadership, WSU, Spokane who introduced Sharon Mowry, Associate Professor, Whitworth University and Helene Paroff, Assistant Superintendent, ESD 101.

Mr. Howard provided a historical perspective on why the consortium was developed. Ms. Mowry discussed the program design and stated that while the model of delivery may look different from other programs, the heart of what they deliver to their candidates will be exactly in line with all the designs that came forward from the collaboration work in the state. Ms. Paroff discussed the role the ESD's will play, including serving as the fiscal agent for the consortium. They will develop, implement and monitor the on-going activities of the consortium.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Q: What happens if someone in this program doesn't meet the standards?

A: The model is designed so that the candidate pays a flat fee for one year of support with a mentor. If they aren't ready, there would be another fee to get on-going support and specific mentoring around those areas identified as lacking. They may get tired of paying, but we would probably continue to offer that support.

Q: Who determines if a candidate needs additional work?

A: The University support person would help them prepare and not send them to the panel until they feel they are ready. There will be a system in place to help those candidates.

Q: Does it open the door for the ESD to be the agency recommending students?

A: All five partners understand the concern and the ESD recognizes they don't want to be involved in recommending certification. They are still working out who will be the recommending body.

Q: Would a candidate go to one of the colleges to request assistance?

A: The consortium will recommend certification and as an approved program they would have that right.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment.

MOTION was made by Roger Erskine and seconded by Stephen Rushing to approve for two years Northeast Washington Consortium's Principal/Program Administrator's Program.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

Members expressed appreciation for the collaboration in getting capacity on the east side of the state, where access for the few candidates who need it is very limited.

MOTION carried with one abstention.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment.

PRESENTATION: REVISION OF ENDORSEMENT COMPETENCIES FOR PHASE III ENDORSEMENTS: EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION, SPECIAL EDUCATION, EARLY CHILDHOOD SPECIAL EDUCATION, WORLD LANGUAGES, TRAFFIC SAFETY EDUCATION, LIBRARY MEDIA, AND CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Ms. Arlene Hett, Director, Professional Education & Certification, OSPI

Ms. Hett acknowledged the considerable effort involved in ensuring that the competencies reflect state standards for P-12 and are aligned with the Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALR's) and Grade Level Expectations (GLE's). She said that people from OSPI and the field would participate with the board in small work groups to review each of the

competencies. After reviewing and discussing each of the endorsement competencies of the Phase III endorsements, the group facilitators each provided their recommendation for the endorsements they had reviewed.

Early Childhood Education and World Languages endorsement competencies – Joyce Westgard reported that her group determined the competencies met each criterion.

Special Education and Traffic Safety endorsement competencies – Gary Cohn reported that his group determined the competencies met each criterion.

Early Childhood Special Education and Library Media endorsement competencies – Roger Erskine reported that his group determined the competencies met each criterion.

Agricultural Education and Family and Consumer Sciences endorsement competencies – Stephanie Salzman reported that her group determined the competencies met each criterion.

Business and Marketing and Technical Education endorsement competencies – Kay Nelson reported that her group determined the competencies met each criterion.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment.

MOTION was made by June Canty and seconded by Myra Johnson to approve the Phase III endorsement competencies.

MOTION carried.

PRESENTATION: OUT-OF-ENDORSEMENT WAIVER PROVISIO

Nasue Nishida, Policy and Research Analyst, PESB

Ms. Nishida reminded members that she had been tasked by the board in November to prepare WAC language creating the waiver proviso and related forms. Modeled after OSPI's special education pre-endorsement waiver, the waiver proviso is geared toward the 2009 goal for ending out-of-endorsement assignments and allows flexibility for districts. She noted several components that differentiate the out-of-endorsement waiver proviso including a time limit to obtain a full endorsement and criteria the board could adopt related to eligible teachers for this type of waiver. Like the pre-endorsement waiver, there could be verification from a higher education institution that the teacher is enrolled in an endorsement program for which they are assigned to teach, or some kind of mechanism that they intend to seek that endorsement. This would be a collaborative effort between the teacher and the institution.

Ms. Nishida discussed what OSPI had learned from their pre-endorsement waiver and provided statistics that indicate districts are utilizing this waiver and teachers are attaining full endorsement. This is a fairly new process for OSPI and completers are still to be determined. Ms. Nishida contacted four districts and the primary feedback was that they appreciated the goal the board has set and that their feedback was sought. For the most part, the districts support a waiver proviso, but they have some concerns related to eligible teachers, emergency waivers and turnover. They provided suggestions related to the 24 credit minimum feeling that this would limit the pool of eligible candidates. However, if the credit minimum is lowered, the time limit to seek an endorsement would be longer. The districts would like to keep the existing waiver or some form of it as a fallback for when they have mid-year emergencies. They also expressed concerns about the timing a teacher would need to verify program enrollment.

Ms. Nishida identified three areas necessary for the board to determine in order to enact the waiver proviso: 1) eligibility credit minimums, including what kind of program enrollment verification and if there is a time limitation; 2) length of time to complete endorsements; and 3) will there be an emergency fallback waiver.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Q: How will this affect the shortage areas?

A: This will provide flexibility for districts to find people to fill those hard to fill subject areas, but also being intentional that this is a commitment.

Q: What are the consequences if out-of-endorsed educators continue to teach children?

A: This proviso is for folks committed to getting that endorsement and the mechanisms for accountability, such as reviewing annual reports, will be utilized.

- Q:** Is there a geographic pattern to out-of-endorsement assignments in special education?
A: There is no pattern. The out-of-endorsement assignments in special education are all over the state.
Q: Can we ask the school districts to include a plan of support?
A: Yes, we can add that.
Q: What do the 24 credits relate to?
A: The 24 credits are applicable to the endorsement, which allows for the option of doing a minimum credit level.
Q: Which waiver would be appropriate in a situation where the initial position the teacher is hired for won't be available in the long term?
A: If it's determined the person will be put in an out-of-endorsement assignment long term, you could negotiate with them to commit to obtaining endorsement in that assignment.
Q: Is it possible for the board to address WAC language without approving a specific form related to it?
A: Yes, it's up to the board if they want to do that.
Q: Who verifies how many credits someone has?
A: It's the responsibility of the human resource department or hiring district to know their assignment policy and appropriately assign people.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment.

Chair Van Glubt summarized the issues that need to be addressed and stated that motions should be made on each of these issues in order to provide clarification to staff as they further develop the WAC language and forms for the out-of-endorsement waiver proviso:

1. Credit minimums
2. Enrollment verification and time frame
3. Time limitation to complete the endorsement
4. Emergency waiver
5. Name

MOTION was made by June Canty and seconded by Kay Nelson to create WAC language for 18 quarter credit minimum.

Chair Van Glubt stated that this item won't be final and voted on until Ms. Nishida clearly understands what the board is requesting. This motion is intended to provide clarity to staff in further studying this issue.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

Members discussed the need for districts to develop a plan for supporting candidates. The need to track data electronically was raised. Concern was expressed related to the burden on the teachers to complete 24 credit hours applicable to an endorsement they do not currently hold. Ms. Nishida pointed out the retooling dollars that allow existing teachers to gain endorsements in shortage areas, but within 2 years. Members spoke against the motion and discussed the impact of lowering the credit limit and the effect this would have on remote districts.

Ayes – 9

Nays – 6

MOTION carried.

MOTION was made by June Canty and seconded by Kay Nelson that within 6 months of assignment the college or university will verify enrollment in an endorsement program.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

Members stated that it is possible for a student to take the appropriate coursework and not be enrolled in a program. In such an instance they would be a non-matriculated student. Members discussed the proposed language in the WAC and the various methods of adding endorsements, such as Pathways I, II, and III. They clarified that the term "enrolled in a program" means an added endorsement program, not a graduate or certification program. Members expressed concern for some of the other language and Ms. Nishida stated she could address that language in a renewal form, which she could bring back to the board in March.

Ms. Nishida stated that she had just learned from Lou Colwell, who administers OSPI's special education pre-endorsement waiver, that if the board changes the minimum credit limit, there would be severe implications to the special education waiver. Chair Van Glubt suggested this issue be returned to staff for further study.

MOTION was made by June Canty to withdraw the motion that within 6 months of assignment the college or university will verify enrollment in an endorsement program.

Chair Van Glubt acknowledged that the motion was withdrawn and stated that staff needs more time to study this issue. She asked Ms. Nishida to determine the pros and cons and options of the five items previously identified and bring this item back to the board at the March meeting.

PRESENTATION: AWARD FOR EXCELLENCE IN TEACHER PREPARATION – MS. DAWN SHINEW, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY

Jill Van Glubt, Chair, PESB

Chair Van Glubt stated that annually, the Professional Education Advisory Board at each approved higher education teacher preparation program has the opportunity to nominate a faculty member from their institution for the Excellence in Teacher Preparation award. The required nomination applications are fairly lengthy and must address:

- role in implementing innovations in the nominee's preparation programs;
- demonstrated leadership; contributions to the field;
- demonstrated excellence in teaching;
- communication with policymakers, stakeholders and practitioners; and
- contribution to preparing teachers to implement state learning goals.

The recipient is awarded a certificate and \$2,500 for the professional education advisory board for their institution.

This year three nominees were submitted and reviewed by the selection committee. All nominees clearly exhibit excellence. The PESB is pleased to award Ms. Dawn Shinew from Washington State University with this year's award. Honorable mention goes to Mr. Cap Peck and Mr. Bill McDiarmid, University of Washington, Seattle and Ms. Margo Long, Associate Professor, School of Education, Whitworth University.

Chair Van Glubt read the following:

In her nine years with WSU, Ms. Shinew has significantly impacted teacher preparation. She has brought about an increased focus on the importance of connections between teacher educators and educators in the field and between educators and the communities in which their students reside. Of particular note is her focus on teacher professional dispositions. She's been a leader in helping to ensure that teacher preparation programs reflect the understanding that teacher effectiveness in diverse communities requires respect for, knowledge of and relationship with the home communities of students. Under Ms. Shinew's leadership, WSU's elementary education program won the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education Best Practice Award in Professional Ethics.

Among her many publications Ms. Shinew co-authored an article entitled "Partnerships at a Distance: Redesigning a Teacher Education Program to Prepare Educators for Diverse, High-Need Classrooms."

Ms. Shinew served as co-principal investigator on WSU's CO-TEACH Grant from the U.S. Department of Education. The success of this partnership between WSU and over two dozen high-need schools throughout Washington bears out in the retention rates of its graduates and serves as a model for preparation of teachers to serve in high-need schools.

Ms. Shinew is an excellent teacher at both the undergraduate and graduate level, consistently receiving outstanding evaluations from her students and fellow faculty. She is described as bringing "contagious energy, enthusiasm and passion" to her classroom and that she has "the highest respect from pre-service teachers and faculty alike."

Chair Van Glubt introduced Senator Rosemary McAuliffe, Chair of the Senate Early Learning and K-12 Education Committee and Representative Dave Quall, Chair of the House Education Committee, who were in attendance to join the board in presenting the award to Ms. Shinew. Senator McAuliffe and Representative Quall congratulated Ms. Shinew and expressed their gratitude to her for her outstanding contributions.

Chair Van Glubt recessed the meeting at 3:11 pm.

January 17, 2008

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Lori Blanchard	Shannon Lawson	Stephanie Salzman
June Canty	Kay Nelson	Yvonne Ullas
Gary Cohn	Dora Noble	Jill Van Glubt
Roger Erskine	Sharon Okamoto	Joyce Westgard (16)
Vicki Frei	Grant Pelesky	
Myra Johnson	Stephen Rushing	

MEMBERS ABSENT: Terry Bergeson (represented by Corrine McGuigan), Corinne McGuigan (representing Terry Bergeson) Keith Hunziker (1)

STAFF PRESENT: Esther Baker, Pamela Cook, Lin Douglas, Mea Moore, Nasue Nishida, Jennifer Wallace (6)

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Roger Erskine attended the recent State Board of Education meeting and briefly discussed highlights from the meeting. He pointed out the synopsis of the meeting that Sheila Fox had provided to members.
- Chair Van Glubt announced that the PESB Executive Committee will meet the State Board of Education Executive Committee on February 15.
- Members were reminded to ask questions in the form of a question during the question and answer portion of the proceedings.

PRESENTATION: ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Esther Baker, Program Director – Teacher Assessments, PESB

Ms. Baker introduced Phil Gullion, Associate Director of Assessment Services and Project Director for the WEST-E, Evaluation Systems group of Pearson, who was in attendance to discuss issues directly related to the five year WEST-B cut score and associated data needs. Ms. Baker informed members that she would provide a report on the annual assessment data on the WEST-B and WEST-E/Praxis II, from the years 2002-2006. She shared with members that this is the fifth year of the administration of the WEST-B and that passage is an admission requirement for candidates entering Washington Teacher Preparation Programs and for applicants for the residency certificate who are prepared and/or certified out-of-state. Ms. Baker discussed the various results of the WEST-B assessment and provided interpretive information on the results. She pointed out highlights of the findings, reporting that there has been an overall decrease in the number of candidates admitted to teacher preparation programs, while the number admitted among the members of the underrepresented groups has increased slightly or held steady. She discussed initial versus cumulative statistics related to the three subtests. The trend of the cumulative retake pass rates indicates that the most significant improvement occurs between the first and second attempts. The data show that multiple attempts of a subtest provided a person with a level of learning that allows them to be successful. She stated the challenge is to discover how to adequately prepare the candidate so they successfully pass on the first attempt.

Ms. Baker provided annual assessment data on the WEST-E/Praxis II, informing members that there were eight programs with pass rates at 80% or higher. Seven programs had pass rates lower than 80% and one program had seven pass rates lower than 80%. Ms. Baker advised members that last year, in the first year of the WEST-E/Praxis II data, staff sent out letters to the programs with pass rates lower than 80% requesting they submit a plan of review. That process will be repeated again this year. She proceeded to share data on the statewide range of pass rates for the 31 tests which is 72% to 100% passing. There were 17 tests with pass rates at 90% or higher and interestingly enough, the same four tests as last year received the lowest pass rates.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Q: Regarding the pass rates leveling off after multiple tests, does this indicate that people just stop taking the test?

A: Typically, no. Most people are very determined to pass and they address the issues that are essential to their success.

Q: Are there intervention or remediation programs that provide resources for support to candidates?

A: We have studied that issue and findings indicate if a candidate is admitted and hasn't passed the WEST-B, it is a significant issue if the program does lend support. Some programs are catering to admitting candidates who will have difficulty in their first quarter or semester.

Q: Where is NCATE standard relative to the WEST-B in setting acceptable pass rates on the content exams?

A: It's 80%.

Q: What do universities see as a reason for the decline in the number of candidates admitted?

A: It's speculative, but it could be related to the current economy in Washington. There is a notion that when the economy is good, people tend not to gravitate toward teaching as they have more choices in other career areas.

PRESENTATION: WEST-B FIVE YEAR DATA: IMPLICATIONS FOR WEST-B CUT SCORES

Esther Baker, Program Director – Teacher Assessments, PESB

Phil Gullion, Associate Director of Assessment Services, Evaluation Systems group of Pearson

At the March 2005 PESB meeting, Mr. Gullion presented three years of examinee performance information on the WEST-B. At that time, the board passed a motion to review the WEST-B passing score in three years. The PESB will take possible action related to the cut score at the March 2008 meeting.

Establishing passing scores for the WEST-B involves both a technical decision and a policy decision. Mr. Gullion discussed the technical aspect and reviewed the basics and overview of the WEST-B test development process. He spoke about the rigor and validation involved in the development of this test and pointed out two key components, the test objectives and development of test items. He discussed the recommendations made during the "Passing Score Review Conference." During this conference, a panel of Washington educators and teacher educators recommended passing scores through the modified-Angoff method. This method is a well researched method for providing a passing score recommendation. This method was also endorsed by the WEST-B Technical Advisory Committee, which was the independent review of the technical soundness of the WEST-B development process. Mr. Gullion discussed the policy decision made by the PESB in 2002 to lower the passing score below the panel recommendation to reduce the possibility of false negatives. A false negative test score would indicate a candidate doesn't have the required knowledge and skills, when in fact, they do. Mr. Gullion stated that this is a common practice when a test is first implemented. He displayed a chart depicting the 2002-2007 program years pass rate analysis by group for the WEST-B and explained the findings of this data.

Ms. Baker discussed staff recommendations regarding adjustments to WEST-B passing scores which include adjusting the reading & math scores to the standard setting panel's score with 0.0 Standard Error of Measurement (SEM) and adjusting the writing score to the standard setting panel's score with a -0.5 SEM.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Sheila Fox, Western Washington University

Ms. Fox discussed the problematic issues related to getting good data from the WEST-B annual report. She stated that institutions pay close attention to these reports and want to be assured that the candidates attributed to an institution are actually with that institution. In order to verify this information, they need someone at their institution to go through each list and pull the names of people who aren't affiliated with their institution. It is an arduous process and they often don't have the personnel to perform this function. The institutions send report to ETS that indicate who is affiliated with each institution, but they would like to know if the numbers reflected in the reports are from the reports the institutions send, or from candidate reports that indicate they may attend their institution. Ms. Fox also discussed the need to track people who take the WEST-B once, do not pass, and don't return to take it again. Of that group, she questioned whether or not there is a disproportionate representation of people of color. She stressed the importance of tracking that information and believes it is critical in the PESB's goal to increase diversity in the teaching population.

Ms. Baker stated that page 23 of the report provides information on people who have taken the test, not passed it and did not come back to take the test again. That number is 6%.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Q: Would be possible to track the data indicating that a candidate attributed to an institution is actually from that institution?

A: Educational Testing Service has been working on this issue. They communicated with institutions and alerted them of the opportunity to match candidates to their institution. They were able to sort out the candidates who had taken a Praxis exam and were not in a teacher preparation program.

Q: What happens to people who fail the test and don't come back to take it again?

A: The testing company does not have that type of information, but the institutions may.

Q: How are we ensuring the WEST-E scores reported for candidates match the program in which they are enrolled?

A: There are opportunities for the programs to perform that type of matching.

PRESENTATION: CONTINUED STUDY/DISCUSSION: BALANCE ACROSS BORDERS: DO WE HAVE EQUITY/QUALITY ASSURANCE RELATIVE TO IN-STATE AND OUT-OF-STATE REQUIREMENTS FOR TEACHERS AND PREPARATION PROGRAMS

Nasue Nishida, Policy and Research Analyst, PESB
Jennifer Wallace, Executive Director, PESB

Chair Van Glubt stated that this will not be an action item today, but rather the board will provide guidance to staff on where to focus and further develop policy issues related to this item. Ms. Wallace advised members that this is a preliminary discussion that will provide staff with guidance on what information they need to gather next. She told members this item is rooted in three goals: Goal 1 – A state-level system for assessing educator preparation program quality, Goal 6 – Realistic strategies for ending out-of-field assignment and Goal 8 – Enhanced access and expanded program delivery options for pre-service educator preparation. She discussed the challenges of defining and requiring appropriate credentials balanced with the challenge of access and opportunity to acquire them. The PESB also has several responsibilities defined by Washington Administrative Code (WAC). These responsibilities are addressed through two main processes – program approval of institutions within Washington State and interstate reciprocity/reliance on other state’s program approval. Interstate reciprocity is important because it not only recognizes the realities of mobility, but removes unnecessary barriers for teachers prepared in other states. However, the question is does the reciprocity agreement anticipate distance learning/programs that straddle the borders? Ms. Wallace discussed how other states handle adding endorsements through out-of-state. She discussed the intent of the WAC related to out-of-state programs and candidates. She informed members that staff has been collecting data related to the number of individuals adding endorsements to their Washington teaching certificate through an online/out-of-state institution. Unfortunately, the system of certification data we have is very outdated and there’s no current way to know how many candidates were prepared by an out-of-state institution while residing here in Washington. Despite this fact, the consensus is to assume a future increase, especially for a first certificate.

Ms. Nishida displayed charts depicting the Institutions reporting geographic areas that have been/are being served for Pathway II and shortage areas/roles by ESD, and a map of teacher preparation program locations and shortage areas/roles by ESD.

Ms. Wallace shared information she had learned regarding why people use on-line programs. Findings thus far indicate that this isn’t necessarily an access issue. Many people state that online programs simply fit into their life.

Ms. Wallace introduced Molly Ringo and Chris Burton who had been invited to address this issue.

Molly Ringo, Executive Director, Human Resources, Everett School District

Ms. Ringo stated that she understands the issues with online programs and looks at them from multiple perspectives. The Everett School District creates partnership agreements with different higher education institutions each year. The agreements spell out the responsibilities for all parties. They have had standards for years around field experience and supervision of interns. These standards are very effective. However, some of the on-line institutions do not have the systems, procedures, and processes for in-state field supervision. In Everett they have denied internships in district for institutions that are not able to meet those requirements. Ms. Ringo stated that the Grand Canyon issue had shed some light on this problem and surfaced from two different perspectives. First, she shared an experience of a long time teacher in their district who was obtaining his masters and ultimately his principal certification through GCU. He was unknowingly misled by GCU when he learned he would not be eligible for a grant for his internship in the principal preparation program because GCU is not approved to offer endorsements to Washington State certificates. Second, GCU was advertising in their area, indicating they have a partnership with Everett Schools and actively recruiting and indicating scholarships were available. The information was misleading and unethical and individuals with good faith unknowingly were misled into believing the programs were approved and supported by the Everett School District. The issue of access for remote locations is understandable, but the issue of keeping the standards in alignment is paramount to ensuring quality teacher preparation.

Chris Burton, Executive Director, Washington School Personnel Association (WSPA)

Mr. Burton said the biggest concern with online programs among WSPA members across the state is field experience. Less concerns were expressed when online programs were used by a teacher to add an endorsement. In fact there were many pros, such as access and lifestyle choices. For mid-career professionals or new graduates looking to acquire their teaching certificates, there were huge concerns, despite needing access or lifestyle flexibility. Communication and collaboration with the district is difficult. Where field experience is concerned, the correlation between student achievement and classroom management and the correlation between classroom management and peer-to-peer

discussion is difficult to attain. In an on-line environment there isn't the shared experience around different classroom management. Mr. Burton expressed other concerns for teachers with online programs. Some of the online institutions allow the teacher candidate to videotape their classroom experience, submit it and it counts as direct observation for the institution. He also wondered who, if anyone is fingerprinting and performing background checks for folks enrolled in online programs. For administrator candidates there are many disadvantages to online programs. Internship hours were not only quantitatively less, qualitatively they were able to be met by observing and not having to undertake or do anything. Most districts large and small want to be able to pre-approve their administrative candidates and they were unable to do that with online programs. Quality control of the experience throughout was absent and there was no mentorship or supervision.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

- Q:** How concerned are you about teacher candidates training in an out-of-state program not being aware of essential academic learning requirements and grade level expectations?
- A:** The Everett School District recruits primarily on the west coast and standards exist in most states. With that framework the transfer is not a significant issue.
- Q:** Are you aware of how out-of-state institutions are handling the state mandated pedagogy assessment for teachers and portfolio assessment for principals?
- A:** There is no conversation between Everett School District and these online institutions regarding this. They have a recruiter in the area and that's the extent of it.
- Q:** What quality requirements would you like the board to consider?
- A:** The background check is critical, as is defining admission requirements, field experience, supervision, collaboration, communication, direct observation, ethics, and the integrity of these programs. It needs to be determined how these out-of-state programs build quality in.
- Q:** Is there an increase in people getting Masters through online programs?
- A:** Yes and doctoral degrees too.
- Q:** Do all districts have agreements?
- A:** We don't know how many districts have agreements. It depends on the size of the district, their resources and the numbers of individuals.

Ms. Wallace stated that the board would hear from a panel representing higher education institutions on this issue.

Dennis Sterner, Dean, School of Education, Whitworth University

Mr. Sterner stated he was representing the Washington Association for Colleges in Teacher Education (WACTE) in bringing forth three points that had been agreed upon by its members. First, WACTE understands access is an important issue and difficult for some people, especially for those in rural areas. Second, WACTE is willing to work internally to improve access as well as working with the PESB in developing innovative solutions to the access question. Third, WACTE affirms the belief that all institutions providing preparation for educators in this state should be held to consistently high standards and those standards should be developed and overseen by the PESB with the same level of quality and accountability. Mr. Sterner read a prepared statement outlining the problematic issues related to quality and accountability for out-of-state providers operating in Washington. In making the distinction between being prepared by an out-of-state institution in its own state versus Washington State, he cited Old Dominion as an example. He believes it's a false assumption to think the same program is being delivered out-of-state that is being delivered in-state by the same institution. He believes this impacts the state's ability to assess the quality of the out-of-state institution, which affects teachers, students, and the PESB's ability to provide any information or assurance to the public about those programs. Out-of-state institutions operating in Washington are under no expectation to use an evidence based approach in educator preparation. It's unfair to in-state institutions that spend considerable resources to comply with state rules and regulations when out-of-state institutions aren't required to do so. He urged the PESB to demand the quality of programs being offered in Washington, whether they are in-state or out-of-state institutions, meet the same high level of standards and that all institutions be held to the same high standards of performance and level of accountability.

Dan Bishop, Director of Continuing for Professional Education; Instructor of Education, Seattle Pacific University;
Washington Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (WACTE)

Mr. Bishop stated that there is a relationship between quality and demand and as demand for teachers has increased, in the past, the requirements to prepare those teachers has often decreased. In the era of education reform, where quality preparation is not equivalent to credits but rather to competencies demonstrated through evidence of student learning, we must now take a different look at that idea of quality to address demand issues and get more people in the pipeline. There is a move from an inputs based system to an outputs based system. He discussed the inequity created when there is a differential system. He stated that RCW describes reciprocity that was outdated and based on mobility before the internet

or online programs. This changes the complexion of the work they do as educators and in preparing, supporting and supervising in the field.

Sheila Fox, Director, University and School Partnerships, College of Education, Western Washington University
Ms. Fox spoke from a systems perspective stating the words she feels describe what we are doing in the State of Washington: reform, P20, seamless, continuum, and aligned. Alignment is important and people who come through the teacher preparation programs and in-service placements need a system that's on a continuum and understandable as they move through the steps and perhaps on into national board certification and beyond. She believes what is needed is a coherent, purposeful preparation system. She believes we need to pay attention to what we have in-state. The board has approved three different routes to endorsements as well as multiple routes to certification. She believes that as we move into the next decade we need to look at ways to extend opportunity around the state. She stated it is ultimately a fairness issue and questioned whether teachers who prepare through unregulated programs are as effective as teachers who prepare through approved programs. She also questioned what impact this has on our learners.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Sharon Straub, Gonzaga University

Ms. Straub read a statement from Cori Mantle-Bromley regarding online and distance endorsements. Ms. Mantle-Bromley wanted the board to know that the WSU Pullman ESL add-on endorsement is available entirely online. Additionally, the WSU Specialty Ed add-on endorsement is available in a combination of online and video conferencing delivery. She wanted the board to know there are options available through WSU.

Ms. Wallace pointed out a chart in the board packets depicting individuals residing in Washington State and the role of out-of-state institutions in adding endorsements to Washington teaching certificates, and residency educator preparation. She discussed the types of policy options within the board's authority and stated that the underlying question is on an on-going basis what does the board need to know about the quality of the programs conducting business in Washington State.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Members discussed the difficulty in creating a uniform standard and determining which measure of program approval to use. There is a difference in the source of quality and the board needs to consider at what point candidates from other out-of-state institutions are held accountable for meeting the Washington sources of evidence. There needs to be a way to find competency performance-based accountability relative to the candidate. There also needs to be consumer protection for the candidate. Members discussed the importance of having some sort of agreement and felt that the agreement the Everett School District uses would be a good model. Reciprocity should be after the fact and the problem with these programs is it is within the process. Members discussed the challenges in keeping up with the approved institutions and the placements. They felt there should be criteria for those who come into the state and already have endorsements to determine if those previously acquired endorsements meet the current standards.

Ms. Nishida provided an overview regarding endorsement equivalency and mentioned a subcommittee consisting of Roger Erskine, June Canty, Stephen Rushing, and Myra Johnson had been formed to discuss equivalency and review the processes. The subcommittee will also solicit feedback from district and human resource folks. Members stated they would like to see the options with a matrix of requirements in order to stay strong to the core values. Members expressed concern for liability insurance, fingerprinting, background checks, and the obligation of the candidate to provide positive impact on student learning. Candidates should have to go thru district human resource departments. Members asked for board and staff consideration in devising a means to align policies and priorities, reviews, and then subsequent action planning that maintains a higher level of fidelity implementation.

PRESENTATION: SHOWCASE: ST. MARTIN'S UNIVERSITY SECONDARY TEACHER ALTERNATIVE ROUTES (STAR) PROGRAM

Mea Moore, Coordinator of Educator Programs and Standards, PESB

Ms. Moore provided information about the Saint Martin's University STAR program, which is delivered in partnership with numerous school districts whose participation varies yearly depending on the opportunities provided by accepting districts. She noted that the STAR program is unique in that it is a secondary education program in shortage areas. She introduced Anne Gentle, Assistant Professor, STAR Program Director and the panel of presenters in attendance to share their experiences in the STAR program.

Ms. Gentle expressed her gratitude to OSPI and the PESB for the support of this program, specifically, Lin Douglas, Mea Moore, Joyce Westgard and Steve Sierra. The program has grown to 24 students this year. Ms. Gentle discussed the extensive program students must complete, including the classes and requirements students must meet. An advisory committee consisting of past and current students and faculty helps the program continue to evolve.

Presenters

Jeff Berland

Mr. Berland joined the St. Martin's program after earning a BA in Science and Humanities from Iowa State University, where he majored in Anthropology and earned a minor in American Indian Studies. In the STAR program he earned his Secondary Certification and endorsements in Special Education and Social Studies. Mr. Berland is currently teaching Special Education at Komachin Middle School in the North Thurston School District

(Keiko) Lani Kawasaki

Ms. Kawasaki came to the St. Martin's STAR program holding a Master of Education degree from Seattle University in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages. Through her participation in the STAR program she earned Secondary Certification and endorsements in Japanese, Bilingual Education and English as a Second Language. Ms. Kawasaki is currently teaching Japanese at Bainbridge Island High School, Bainbridge Island School District.

Mary Medeiros

Ms. Medeiros holds a Bachelor of Arts degree in English from Chaminade University, Hawaii. As a candidate in the current Saint Martin's University STAR Program, Ms. Medeiros is seeking to earn her Secondary Certification and endorsements in English as a Second Language, English Language Arts and Middle Level Humanities. Ms. Medeiros is completing her yearlong mentored internship teaching in the ESL/ELL classroom in Lochburn Middle School in the Clover Park School District.

Steven Shepherd

Mr. Shepherd holds graduate degrees from the University of Iowa in Music and Music Performance. As a participant in Saint Martin's University STAR Program, he is seeking Secondary Certification and endorsements in Choral Music and Instrumental Music. Mr. Shepherd is currently completing his yearlong mentored internship teaching Music at Mt. Solo Middle School in the Longview School District.

Annette Siemssen

Ms. Siemssen attended Ellis College and the New York Institute of Technology where she earned a Bachelor's Degree in Science with a major in Interdisciplinary Studies. In the Saint Martin's University STAR Program she is earning her Secondary Certification with endorsements in Math, Middle Level Math/Science. Ms. Siemssen is currently completing her yearlong mentored internship teaching high school math at Prairie High School in the Battle Ground School District.

PRESENTATION: REPORT FROM K-8 COMMITTEE RE: PROPOSAL FOR A REQUIRED 2ND ASSESSMENT FOR K-8 ENDORSEMENT

Kay Nelson, PESB Member

Roger Erskine, PESB Member

Chair Van Glubt reminded the board that at the November meeting, staff had brought forward unintended consequences related to a piece of the K-8 recommendation requiring a second assessment. She asked Kay Nelson and Roger Erskine to share a synopsis of the subcommittee's deliberations and recommended direction. Ms. Nelson reiterated that the existing action taken by the board at the November meeting to retain the K-8 endorsement still stands. She thanked Ron Scutt, Dennis Sterner and Stacey Valentin, who are no longer on the board, for their contributions over the two years that the subcommittee met. She noted that when the subcommittee was first formed, the K-8 elementary competencies were just beginning to be reviewed. With the current competencies at that time it didn't constitute a strong enough case for being highly qualified at the middle level in math and science. However, in July the board heard the newly revised K-8 competencies. The subcommittee discussed the pros and cons of an additional second test and she pointed out several other states that do not require additional certification requirements. Ms. Nelson stated that as a result of discussion and review the subcommittee's recommendation is not to require a second test for any candidate given the fact that the newly revised endorsement competencies in elementary education will also have a newly revised WEST-E test that will be more rigorous. Mr. Erskine added that the board is constantly trying to improve their work and make it much more relevant and there isn't a need for that second test.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Q: Will the revised elementary competency process provide enough math courses to someone and the methodology to do a good job at the middle level?

A: The revised math competencies portion in elementary competencies would go through algebra 2 and appears to be equivalent in the area of science in terms of rigor.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Dennis Sterner, Dean, School of Education, Whitworth University

Mr. Sterner stated that he supports the recommendation as he was on the subcommittee and he believes this is an appropriate proposal. He said he will pass on to the president and the executive committee of WACTE the importance of working together as a group with the PESB on this issue. He would welcome incentives to encourage more teachers at the middle level, especially in math and science.

Sharon Straub, Gonzaga University

Ms. Straub read a statement from Cori Mantle-Bromley, Chair and Professor, Department of Teaching and Learning, WSU. Ms. Mantle-Bromley expressed appreciation to the PESB for their willingness to reexamine the K-8 endorsement decision made earlier in the academic year. She understands the time and energy that goes into committee work and into recommendations, as well as the multiple, conflicting perspectives. She thanked the board for their commitment to the process in making the best decisions possible.

MOTION was made by Grant Pelesky and seconded by June Canty to accept the subcommittee's recommendation to not require a second assessment.

MOTION carried.

PRESENTATION: DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OF FINAL DRAFT OF PESB POLICY GOVERNANCE POLICIES

Jennifer Wallace, Executive Director, PESB

Ms. Wallace presented a brief history of how the board adapted the Policy Governance model and pointed out the ongoing nature of these policies, noting that some will change more than others over time. She discussed the set of four policies: Governance Process, Ends policies, Executive Limitations, and Board-Director Relations. She explained the major revisions and additions that had been made since the issue was discussed at the November work session.

MOTION was made by Roger Erskine and seconded by Kay Nelson to accept the changes to the Governance Policies as proposed.

MOTION carried.

Chair Van Glubt adjourned the meeting at 2:19 pm