

MINUTES
November 7-8, 2007
SeaTac, WA

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: Terry Bergeson (represented by Corrine McGuigan), Corinne McGuigan (representing Terry Bergeson), Grant Pelesky (3)

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 8:32 AM.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Chair Van Glubt welcomed new member Lori Blanchard who has been appointed to the "parent" seat on the board.
- The board will meet from 5:30 to 7:30 this evening for an hour discussion related to governance policy followed by dinner.
- Chair Van Glubt reminded the board 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.
- Board members were reminded to state their questions in the form of a question.
- Tab 3 has been moved and will be addressed after Tab 13.

MOTION was made by Myra Johnson and seconded by Roger Erskine to accept the consent agenda.

MOTION carried.

PRESENTATION: PROPOSED OUT-OF-ENDORSEMENT WAIVER PROCESS

Nasue Nishida, Research & Policy Analyst, PESB

Chair Van Glubt reminded the board they had approved an out-of-endorsement plan and timeline to meet their goal of ending out-of-endorsement teaching assignments by September 2009. The waiver process was one strategy in the plan.

Ms. Nishida discussed the draft pre-endorsement proviso process staff has developed and provided information on how this proposed process was modeled after the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction's (OSPI) pre-endorsement waiver. This draft pre-endorsement proviso would allow a teacher to be assigned and provide guidance to a district to select a teacher that has some kind of credit coursework background in the specific area in which they would be assigned out-of-endorsement. The elements are very similar to those OSPI uses to approve teachers assigned to special education classes. Ms. Nishida stated that forms would be an integral part of the process and she presented a draft form that would be developed, based on board discussion, to be used by districts, applicants, and higher education as an element of the process. She asked the board to consider several questions/options regarding the stipulations a teacher will need to meet in order to be eligible for a pre-endorsement proviso. Some of those options may include changing current Washington Administrative Code (WAC) language. She asked the board to direct staff to develop WAC language and forms which will be brought back to the board in January 2008.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

- Q:** Regarding the higher education form, would there be one form that would summarize a teacher's credits from multiple institutions?
- A:** That would be up to the board to decide.
- Q:** Is there any data that would indicate how well the special education waiver has worked in terms of effectiveness on the job or ability to meet student's needs?
- A:** Unsure if that data exists, but will check into it.
- Q:** Is there a state required number of endorsement credit or quarter hours?
- A:** It's based on competencies so a person has to show they've met each of the competencies.
- Q:** Who is the district?
- A:** It would probably be the administrators at the district level.
- Q:** Considering our move to an evidence based system, are we counting credits or asking for evidence of competency relative to standards?
- A:** This process reflects consistency with the current WAC which indicates quarter/semester hours as the determining factor for assignment in an out-of-endorsement area.
- Q:** Has there been an opportunity to take this process to a few districts to see how they would handle it?
- A:** This can definitely be taken out to the districts with more specific direction from the board on what information they would like included.
- Q:** Is it up to the board to decide if clock hour equivalents should be used?
- A:** Yes, the board can decide that.
- Q:** Who decides relevance of credits and what are the criteria?
- A:** The board can decide that and it can be a part of the higher education form.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment.

MOTION was made by Stacey Valentin and seconded by Stephen Rushing to direct staff, based on this discussion, to develop WAC's and forms for the January meeting.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

It was suggested that the teacher have verification of program enrollment at some institution and a plan for completion which would take care of the courses. Members indicated they would like to see the forms reflect a percentage of the competencies so it is appropriate for all potential endorsement areas. Members discussed the issue of time limits for past credits and the topic of competencies vs. credits. Concern was expressed that the form enables people to continue to be able to function in an out-of-endorsed area. It was pointed out that the board has talked about this plan and they did hear strong vocalization from local human resource directors indicating support for keeping the waiver. Members discussed the importance of considering the research when forming policy and the profound impact to the student in the classroom when the teacher isn't qualified. Discussion ensued regarding the process and how it allows the board to put forth careful, thoughtful guidance to districts regarding hard to fill assignments. Members discussed the timeline for reducing out-of-endorsement possibilities and whether the process would be permanent or would funnel down to reduce the number.

MOTION carried.

PRESENTATION: EQUIVALENCY OF OUT-OF-STATE ENDORSEMENTS WITH WASHINGTON ENDORSEMENT/WEST-E REQUIREMENT

Nasue Nishida, Policy and Research Analyst, PESB

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

Dave Kinnunen, Associate Director, Professional Education and Certification, OSPI

Ms. Nishida provided information on this item, which is the first of a two-part discussion the board will have pertaining to endorsements given to teachers from out-of-state. This is a discussion only item. She clarified that this is not to be confused with on-line programs and how they operate. She summarized the WAC related to this issue and explained the complexities involved for candidates holding endorsements from other states that are not named the same as a Washington endorsement. She displayed the equivalency tables the Professional Education and Certification (PEC) office at OSPI uses as a guide for out-of-state candidates seeking a Washington certificate.

Dr. Arlene Hett explained that the equivalency table was developed as a means to deal with this issue and is a part of the implementation process that takes place on the OSPI side of the house. She believes the primary area needing attention is special education.

Mr. Kinnunen discussed the chart, pointing out endorsements identified with an asterisk. Those particular endorsements are looked at more closely. He pointed out table two which helps PEC staff find the best place where endorsements fit.

Ms. Nishida asked the board to consider if they have the responsibility for “the truth in advertising” ensuring full disclosure to local school districts and K-12 students about the preparation/certification of potential employees. She cited an example using the special education endorsement. She also pointed out the issue of grade spans as another area of consideration for the board. She explained the tables could be redefined and redeveloped and that word needs to get out to the districts about what this comparability means.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Q: How many states break down special education in a categorical manner?

A: PEC gets many, but is not sure how many states.

Q: How long are folks with a special education endorsement given to pass the WEST-E.?

A: One year.

Q: Is there any data to show how well people are doing to pass the WEST-E when they come to our state with endorsements that don't match ours very well?

A: PEC will work with Esther Baker to explore putting together data on that issue.

Q: What kind of outcome is PEC looking for?

A: Put together a committee to study the largest issue of special education and use that information as a learning tool to improve the process.

Q: When folks come from other states and there isn't a comparable endorsement, is that marked on their certificate?

A: It is currently used to identify endorsements from out-of-state that do not have a comparable endorsement.

Q: What happens to the person who fits that category?

A: It becomes a hiring issue for the district.

Q: How many issues are there in a year?

A: There are many. We will get that number to the board.

Q: Can we require out-of-state teachers to take more coursework?

A: They just have to take a test.

Q: Is there some reference that describes what the endorsement is, such as in multiple subject.

A: Yes, they have that language and also transcripts to help them figure it out.

BOARD COMMENTS/DISCUSSION

Chair Van Glubt provided a summary and asked the board how they wanted to proceed. Members suggested adding English/language arts and middle level and including in the data collection how many individuals applied for a certificate and were not given one.

MOTION was made by Roger Erskine and seconded by Vicki Frei to establish a subcommittee to work with PESB and PEC staff to further study this issue.

MOTION carried.

June Canty, Stephen Rushing, Roger Erskine, and Myra Johnson volunteered to serve on the committee.

PRESENTATION: WAC AMENDMENT: ADDITIONAL ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENT FOR K-8 ENDORSEMENT

Nasue Nishida, Policy and Research Analyst, PESB

Jennifer Wallace, Executive Director, PESB

Chair Van Glubt reminded the board that in September they approved the K-6/K-8 subcommittee's recommendations to maintain the grade span of the elementary certificate, kindergarten through 8th grade, and require the passage of two WEST-E tests – the elementary test and one other WEST-E test, excluding traffic safety. A WEST-E test is not all that is required to be endorsed in a subject area. Upon further investigation into this item, a few issues were raised that Ms. Nishida and Ms. Wallace would like to discuss.

Ms. Wallace explained that during recent discussions staff had expressed concerns around the second part of the recommendation of the committee concerning adding that second assessment as a requirement for the K-8 endorsement. She provided additional information for the board regarding the rationale for board support of the second test and the counter points for board consideration. The recommended options for consideration are 1) requiring only the additional tests that enable a K-8 endorsed teacher to be highly qualified in a core academic subject area at the middle level grade only and 2) send the item back to committee for further discussion.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

- Q:** Why will a dual K-8/special education endorsement not allow those candidates to teach special education at the middle level?
- A:** It meets state requirements, but not federal NCLB for highly qualified. Highly qualified would require a 3rd test in a core academic subject area.
- Q:** How is it that in a K-8 certificate plus additional test content is at a level that a person knows the information but it doesn't take 5 or 6 years to get it?
- A:** A person is not pursuing a second endorsement; they are simply taking another test, so that's a good question plus relates to what I was saying about the onus being on the candidate. Because this isn't about another endorsement, it doesn't change program requirements, it changes requirements for candidates.
- Q:** The first recommended option is to require an additional test for middle level candidates. Why is it that some candidates for the K-8 endorsement would need to take a second test and some will not?
- A:** No, the recommendation is to confine the list of tests to those that apply to middle level assignment, but all would take them.
- Q:** With a longer list of tests, what options does that open for the teacher related to assignment?
- A:** This doesn't have anything to do with earning endorsements, so it won't help with opening up more assignment options --- unless it is a Pathway I test and they are able to earn the endorsement through the test only.

BOARD COMMENTS/DISCUSSION

Members discussed the impact to teachers in limiting the tests and the advantages of keeping options open. It was pointed out that the candidate can take any test and it puts the onus on the institution to guide the candidate. This isn't requiring a person to change their endorsement program in any way. It's simply about knowledge and the content test. Policy-wise, taking the additional test will accomplish goals previously set forth by the board. Ms. Baker shared information from the Content Advisory Fairness Review Committee meeting she had recently attended. Feedback from the field indicated the need for the content related instructional methodology and the pedagogy assessment to be as strong as the WEST-E. It's as important an issue as verifying teacher assessments. Members discussed concern that an elementary candidate would not automatically pass the WEST-E in any middle level endorsement. It was pointed out that candidates may need to take more coursework due to the depth of content in the individual middle level subjects. Another concern was raised regarding the K-8 competencies not matching the knowledge expected of K-8 teachers. In order to meet the Federal requirement and if Washington is going to make the decision to keep the K-8, then the K-8 competencies need to meet the highly qualified definition. There is frustration on the part of the candidate that they don't get feedback when they don't pass the WEST-E test. This makes it difficult for candidates to be better prepared. Members expressed concerns whether actions taken at the last meeting to accept the committee's report, actually ensure that the best prepared teachers are working for the students.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment.

MOTION was made by Roger Erskine and seconded by Stephen Rushing to take recommendation number two and submit it back to the committee and have the committee discuss the impact of this change and come back to the January meeting with their thoughts.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

Members requested the committee compare competencies for middle level math, science, and humanities as well as the secondary math and science and K-8. Concerns were expressed related to marketplace and recruitment issues and that limiting a second test for just the middle level would be an unintended consequence for people going into teaching. Considering humanities includes social studies and language arts, this would be an area primary teachers would be comfortable with. Members felt this motion is focusing attention on only one outcome and they would hope for wider discussion to include option two. It was clarified that this motion does not rule out consideration of other options as well.

MOTION carried.

Chair Van Glubt asked for volunteers to serve on the K-8 subcommittee. Kay Nelson, Roger Erskine, Stephanie Salzman, June Canty and Shannon Lawson volunteered.

PRESENTATION: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND TIMELINE FOR THE TEACHER PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATE UNIFORM AND EXTERNAL ASSESSMENT REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)

Esther Baker, Program Director, Teacher Assessments, PESB

Mary Jo Larsen, Program Specialist, Professional Education and Certification, OSPI

Ms. Baker provided background on this item and discussed the foundational work that had been done, resulting in the guiding principles for the ProCert external and uniform assessment. Ms. Larsen explained each of the eight guiding principles, which focus on ProCert as both a process and a cultivating assessment. The guiding principles reflect the input from a variety of stakeholders who were involved in their development and will help those who submit proposals to understand the context of the RFP. Ms. Baker discussed the conceptual framework of the RFP, which will be a five year contract to develop, pilot, and implement a uniform and external Portfolio of Evidence Assessment for all teachers completing the ProCert program. She also outlined the estimated schedule of activities timeline involved in the process.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Q: What group would be best to grab in a pilot?

A: We're looking at a cross sampling from all institutions across the program and will work with programs to identify folks who will finish in late spring, early summer of 2008. We'll use their portfolio to pilot the program.

Q: How do these relate to new Standard V?

A: The new Standard V shift to focus on evidence is reflected in the assessment process and how the portfolios are being assessed externally from the individual who's guiding them through that process. We're looking at an assurance of consistency.

Q: How do we pay for this?

A: The pilot was funded by the legislature and part of the guiding principles is using the pilot to determine the funding structure and logistics for implementation and what needs to be shifted to ensure it doesn't become an undue burden for educators.

Q: Will the board get to see some of the examples of this pilot of what portfolios would pass and which ones won't?

A: Yes. During the planning document phase we will consider the specificity the board would like to see of the pilot results.

Q: Will the pass/fail information be forwarded to the universities and will that information adversely affect the candidates?

A: Yes, this pilot will be a no-fault to the candidate.

Q: Is it possible to build into your timeline formal opportunities to share feedback with the group that's preparing the pedagogy assessment for the residency certificate?

A: Yes, we can do that.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Lucinda Young, Washington Education Association (WEA)

Ms. Young thanked everyone for the hard work that has gone into this issue. She believes many of the issues around this topic continue to be heard and monitored, but she does have concerns and suggestions regarding the issue of ensuring the ProCert is uniform and rigorous and of the same quality across the state. This resulted in an additional high stakes assessment of the teacher. She believes the portfolio will be a good solution to that particular problem. She stated that a certificate is a property right with due process and appeals and a high stakes test complicates that factor. The ProCert certificate still has no level of recognition, no salary increase and a teacher is not viewed differently today for having a ProCert certificate than they do when they have their residency. Ms. Young discussed the unintended consequences of the fair and equity issue of the licensure process and suggests as the RFP is developed, taking a sampling of teachers to explore how to make the ProCert experience better. She discussed considering the cost to teachers and institutions and that this shouldn't be perceived as a barrier, but should reflect the teacher is the best they can be at that time.

MOTION was made by Gary Cohn and seconded by Roger Erskine to approve the conceptual framework and timeline of the RFP for the ProCert Uniform and External Assessment.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

No discussion

MOTION carried.

PRESENTATION: ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENT TO REVIEW THE WEST-B CUT SCORE AND PASS RATES IN JANUARY 2008

Esther Baker, Program Director, Teacher Assessments, PESB

Ms. Baker explained that this item is informational only. She asked that the record show that in January 2008 the PESB will hear five years of WEST-B pass rate test data and possible action will take place in March 2008. She advised the board that a presentation will be made in January 2008. She pointed out the draft of the 2006-2007 annual assessment report results and informed the board they will also hear a presentation on this in January 2008.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Q: In preparation of the January meeting, how much of the draft should be digested?

A: Staff will deliver a corrected draft in a timely manner for the January meeting.

Q: What format changes will there be?

A: WEST-E and Praxis II data is not formatted well. It will be in a better format at a later date.

PRESENTATION: REVIEW OF WASHINGTON'S INTERSTATE RECIPROcity AGREEMENT

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

Chair Van Glubt reminded members of the concerns the board has discussed at past meetings related to whether there may be a problem regarding our high standards for educator preparation in Washington versus standards of other states whose graduates we award Washington certification. Dr. Hett explained the criteria that form the basis for Washington's interstate reciprocity agreement with other states. The National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) is the organization that represents boards and commissions and departments of education in all 50 states. She presented a report for informational purposes only that described a plan to provide candidates who are moving from state to state ESD certification fee report with certificate reciprocity. She stated the focus is on balance between high standards and flexibility.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Q: When someone transfers to our state do you look at the database that collects the black marks on certification before you accept them?

A: Absolutely.

Q: Are other states required to share that information?

A: Yes.

Q: What's our protection if a person gets certified in another state for a year and then they want to come to Washington?

A: They need to bring in three years of experience.

Q: Are the only actions in the report from that database the official actions of OSPI?

A: Yes. Districts are required to report activities and actions to OSPI and they're investigated by the Office of Professional Practices. The appeals process goes through the PEC office. All those are reported.

Q: Have you seen states provide a greater definition and develop more criteria to the notion of state approved programs?

A: Yes. The key word is supervised teaching experience. If there is a great shortage in a state, that's often when standards get lowered.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment

BOARD COMMENTS/DISCUSSION

Members discussed the on-going issue of on-line courses and whether or not the people who take those on-line courses may or may not meet our standards.

MOTION was made by Roger Erskine and seconded by June Canty that the staffs of the PESB and PEC will work together to bring specific information regarding on-line courses that lead to out-of-state certification.

MOTION was made by Joyce Westgard to amend the motion to include face to face and on-line courses and programs.

Roger Erskine accepted the amendment.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

Members indicated more information needs to be gathered as well as considering global challenged states to see how they deal with this. It was pointed out that the distinction isn't solely about on-line courses, but the students who take on-line courses from another state and then come here to student teach. The specific issue is people who are Washington residents who do a program that is on-line from a university located in another state are eligible for another state's certificate and then qualify for a Washington certificate through the reciprocity agreement.

Chair Van Glubt stated that the motion stands as amended.

MOTION carried.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Peter Gries, Chair, Department of Music, Central Washington University

Mr. Gries stated that he was representing the Washington Universities Music Administrators (WUMA) and introduced fellow WUMA members, David Robbins, Chair, Pacific Lutheran University (PLU), Keith Ward, Chair University of Puget Sound (UPS), David Feingold, Chair Western Washington University (WWU), and Pat Krueger, Music Education Specialist at UPS. Mr. Gries affirmed that the members of the consortium are unanimous in opposing the revisions in the 2007 endorsement competencies in the three areas of music, choral, general, and instrumental. He believes the impact of these changes has made them essentially identical to include almost all the competencies of all three endorsement areas in each individual area. He proceeded to comment on the process by which the changes were made and the practical consequences of these changes. He offered a recommendation for redressing the problems he feels they all face and requested the 2007 endorsement competencies be put on hold and that an ad hoc committee be formed to explore ways in which the issue of multiple area music competencies can be addressed.

Bob Cooper, Director of Visual and Performing Arts, South Kitsap School District

Mr. Cooper stated that his comments are from the perspective of someone who hires teachers. He believes his job is to provide his students with the best teachers he can and give them opportunities to create, perform, and respond in the arts, especially music, and to support those teachers and make them successful. He feels that with an endorsement in music, they will be able to do that. The reality is that teachers are being asked to conduct band and choir and he hopes there will be a resolution to this dilemma soon.

Anne Renee Joseph, OSPI

Ms. Joseph expressed appreciation for the six arts endorsements, three of which are in music. Many states only have one and some don't have any. She feels they are still minus endorsements that will get them to what they need in the future, a K-12 endorsement in the arts and a multi-art endorsement. She suggests three avenues for moving forward with competencies. 1) Move forward with the endorsed areas the way they are, 2) Delay this process until January 3) Move forward and wordsmith and keep the endorsements the way they are and keep us on schedule to ensure this type of communication breakdown doesn't happen in future. She stated their goal is to prepare all the teachers. The 2002 endorsements don't get them there. She believes they need to move forward to prepare educators for the jobs waiting for them and the endorsements following the process are there to do that.

PRESENTATION: REAPPROVAL OF ENDORSEMENT PROGRAMS

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

Chair Van Glubt provided background on this item explaining that with the revisions the board has approved related to teaching certificate endorsement competencies, WAC requires that institutions revise their program requirements to meet these new competencies and have these revisions approved. She noted that today they have a long list of endorsement programs and institutions for approval and stated it was originally on the consent agenda. However, it is only appropriate for an item to be on the consent agenda if it is non-controversial, and given the concerns expressed, it was decided in advance to pull it off the consent agenda so public comment at the 11:45 time this morning could be taken into consideration on this action item.

Dr. Hett explained that the PEC has been revising all of the endorsement competencies for some time. Those represented today were approved in January 2007 in Phase 1. After approval the revised competencies were sent out to all the deans and directors who were asked to supply their information as to how they would meet these competencies. The PEC has

thoroughly reviewed the applications for preapproval of the endorsement programs, but if the board would like to review them, they are available on the staff table.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

- Q:** Is it appropriate to approve their endorsements if we didn't approve their program?
A: At this time, there aren't any institutions that are not approved. But yes, it would be appropriate.
- Q:** Has there been any feedback from institutions where the three music courses are offered related to the compartmentalization of the three components into one.
A: This has been an on-going conversation with higher education and the executive committee and is a process like any other endorsement review that's been conducted.
- Q:** What can the board do to respond to concerns expressed when the approval of the competencies is relatively routine?
A: The PEC would like to resolve the concerns and would be willing to host a meeting to discuss how these competencies can be implemented.
- Q:** Would approval of the music programs preclude the ability of a group to convene to clarify wordsmithing language?
A: No, any time there is something in the WAC related to competencies, they can bring a group together to determine if editorial changes would be appropriate.

MOTION was made by Gary Cohn and seconded by Kay Nelson to reapprove the endorsement programs as described.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

This is a reasonable path that negotiates the sets of concerns.

MOTION carried.

PRESENTATION: WAC AMENDMENT: PREPARATION PROGRAM APPROVAL STANDARD V – KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS STANDARDS FOR TEACHERS

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

Chair Van Glubt provided background on this item reminding the board they adopted the new program approval Standard V – knowledge and skills standards for teachers last July. In September, the board approved the process and timeline for the implementation of the new Standard V requirements.

Dr. Hett explained that there are needed amendments to WAC related to this new standard and pointed out the changes in the WAC language included in this Tab item.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

- Q:** What is the timeline for work on the principal program administrators?
A: We've just formulated the committee and are just beginning that work.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment

MOTION was made by June Canty and seconded by Myra Johnson to approve the proposed WAC 181-78A-270 related to Preparation Program Approval Standard V – Knowledge and Skills Standards for Teachers.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

Members stated that this is a big step forward and a huge challenge for the universities and they are happy to see them in final form.

MOTION carried.

PRESENTATION: REPORT ON USE OF CERTIFICATION FEES BY EDUCATIONAL SERVICE DISTRICTS IN 2006-07

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

Chair Van Glubt provided clarification on this item explaining that it addresses both use of cert fees for pre-service purposes by the Professional Education and Certification Division of OSPI and for in-service purposes by the ESDs. As the board knows, they have previously discussed and changed policy related to their expectations for certification fee

budgets submitted by OSPI and the ESDs going into a fiscal year. She requested that members give thought to any changes in year-end reporting they might want.

Dr. Hett explained that the report in this Tab is a summary from each of the ESD's regarding professional education activities that have occurred in their respective districts. She pointed out the budget included in this tab for reference.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Q: Previous to the use of the new form the ESD's were asked to submit, has the amount of paper work changed?

A: No, that hasn't changed.

BOARD COMMENTS/DISCUSSION

No comments/discussion.

PRESENTATION: PROPOSED REVISIONS FOR EDUCATIONAL SERVICE DISTRICT PLANS FOR USE OF CERTIFICATION FEES IN 2007-2008

Dr. Lin Douglas, Senior Associate, Policy & Programs, PESB, PESB

Chair Van Glubt reminded the board that in May, Bill Keim presented several options to the board for consideration with respect to options for funding certification services at the ESDs. The board did not take action or endorse any of the options presented and requested that the Certification Fee subcommittee, Lin Douglas, Roger Erskine, and Yvonne Ullas, request additional information and bring back a recommendation.

Dr. Douglas discussed the steps the subcommittee took to arrive at a recommendation. She stated that the subcommittee recommends that the board, in collaboration with OSPI and the ESDs, support a change in RCW language that would permit the board to authorize the ESDs to use their portion of the certification fees to support certification services. This is a flexibility issue that would provide the opportunity for the PESB to revisit the use and distribution of certification fees as well as ensure accountability for the expenditure of these funds. If the RCW language is adopted by the legislature, the board would have the opportunity to reconsider this issue which would also require substantial WAC changes. Mr. Erskine stated that this recommendation is straightforward and was developed from good conversations and thinking and resolves the issue and clearly fixes the authority. Ms. Ullas added that the ESDs conducted a survey, the results of which are included in the Tab, and the language will allow for the needed flexibility.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Q: Since this is basically support for a legislative proposal and this is a core function, why isn't there better funding around the core budget rather than different use of certification fees?

A: The core functions, while identified as such, have never been fully funded for the ESD's.

A: Why wouldn't they be pursuing that?

Q: Mr. Keim responded that they have been pursuing this issue of core responsibilities versus core funding for about twenty years. The more urgent issue is whether this service can continue for teachers. The sense is that this money is much less important in terms of the on-going professional development needs, than it is for the on-going service in helping people work through the maze of certification requirements.

MOTION was made by Roger Erskine and seconded by Kay Nelson to support the language change for RCW 28A.410.060.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

Members discussed the issue of core funding and how the superintendents have sought to obtain core funding. This decision would not only say the board could approve to use and distribute certification fees, but also that they could retract that approval at any point if they felt it were necessary. Members asked for clarification of language contained in the RCW and it was explained the language allows for choices on how the certification fees are used.

MOTION carried.

PRESENTATION: WAC AMENDMENT: WRITTEN COMPREHENSIVE EXAM FOR EDUCATION STAFF ASSOCIATES (ESAs)

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

Chair Van Glubt explained this item deals with a WAC amendment to clarify the WEST-E requirement for school counselors, school psychologists and school social workers.

Dr. Hett introduced Judy Smith, Program Specialist, OSPI, who has been working with the certification office and ESA folks to determine the best way to deal with this issue. Dr. Hett provided information and rationale for the changes to the language in the WAC that clarifies the written comprehensive examination requirements for ESA's

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Q: How many candidates take one of the national exams versus how many candidates take the institutionally proctored exam?

A: Most are getting their exam at the institution from which they graduated.

Q: If a person opts to take the national counselor exam, it doesn't make them nationally certified does it?

A: No

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment.

MOTION was made by Stephen Rushing and seconded by Stacey Valentin to adopt the WAC amendment as presented for written comprehensive exam for Educational Staff Associates.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

No discussion.

MOTION carried.

Chair Van Glubt announced there would be a revision to the evening schedule - the policy governance work session, open to the public, will be moved back to 4:45 pm and dinner will be served at 5:45 pm.

PRESENTATION: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORT

Jennifer Wallace, Executive Director, PESB

Ms. Wallace reported on staff activities including recent presentations staff has made to various organizations and to Governor Gregoire, conferences attended, and subcommittees served on. She told members that board alumni are interested in still being involved in board activities and mentioned some of the opportunities available. She acknowledged new member Lori Blanchard and provided an update on filling other board vacancies. She briefly discussed the Central Washington University appeal, the PESB audit report, and issues related to Grand Canyon University.

Chair Van Glubt adjourned the meeting at 1:55 pm to closed session per RCW 42.30.140 regarding review of the appeal in the matter of Gary Walkup, Certification No. 230581, Office of Administrative Hearings for the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Cause No. 2006-TCD-002. The review of the appeal is on the agenda for November 8, at 1:30 pm.

November 8, 2007

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	Stacy Valentin
Vicki Frei	Dora Noble	Jill Van Glubt
Myra Johnson	Sharon Okamoto	Joyce Westgard (17)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Terry Bergeson (represented by Corrine McGuigan), Grant Pelesky (1)

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Stacey Valentin announced she has been recalled to active duty with the Navy effective November 19, 2007.
- Chair Van Glubt and Joyce Westgard shared their experiences from the WEST-E Test Development Conference they recently attended.
- Roger Erskine discussed the recent Pearson Conference he attended along with Esther Baker and Arlene Hett.
- Ms. Baker reminded members that the WEST-E Test Development Conference would be running for another week and she invited them to participate in the various test development sessions.

PRESENTATION: WAC ADOPTION: CRITERIA FOR SPECIALTY ENDORSEMENTS

Nasue Nishida, Policy and Research Analyst, PESB

Chair Van Glubt recapped that in September the board approved the criteria brought forth by the specialty endorsement subcommittee. The intent of developing criteria is to filter requests to determine eligibility for inclusion as an approved specialty endorsement.

Ms. Nishida provided background on this item, reminding members that the subcommittee, Kay Nelson, Shannon Lawson, Yvonne Ullas, and Dennis Sterner, came forward at the September 2007 meeting with some criteria by which the board can examine and evaluate whether or not a proposed specialty endorsement should become official. She provided the history of this item stating that it was originally a legislative mandate to develop a deaf education endorsement. The board decided to create a different category of endorsements called specialty. However, in doing so, the board realized there could be an influx of areas that would be very interested in having a specialty endorsement and in response to this realization, developed the criteria for specialty endorsements. Ms. Nishida explained that specialty endorsements are different than the other endorsement areas. They are non-restrictive and are not required for the assignment of the teacher. They are an enhancement to the teacher's certificate and identify to a hiring district that the teacher has a specific specialty area. Ms. Nishida discussed the two criteria necessary for a specialty endorsement: 1) documentation of nationally-recognized teaching standards and 2) a letter of support from an approved educator preparation program interested in offering the proposed specialty endorsement program. She discussed the specialty endorsement WAC language and the application forms contained in this tab.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Q: Do you know of anyone ready with a proposal?

A: Yes, we've heard that gifted education, environmental education and visually impaired are interest areas.

Q: Is it possible for a university to propose a specialty endorsement that there's no subject matter assessment for and then would the board be responsible to develop one?

A: Yes, the board could determine what kind of assessment you would want that specialty and those candidates to do.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment

MOTION was made by Gary Cohn and seconded by Yvonne Ullas to approve the specialty endorsement WAC language and direct the executive director to implement as necessary and appropriate.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

Staff has done great work on this and it's appropriate that we approve the WAC language and the directions to our policy director to implement.

MOTION carried.

PRESENTATION: ECERT UPDATE

Dr. Arlene Hett, Director, Professional Education and Certification, OSPI
Dave Kinnunen, Associate Director, Professional Education and Certification, OSPI
Corina McCleary, Director of Application Development, Information and Technology, OSPI

Chair Van Glubt recapped that OSPI has started a tool through their website called ECert that allows an individual to apply for or renew a certificate on line. She stated Corina McCleary, Director of Application Development, and Dr. Hett and Mr. Kinnunen from Professional Education and Certification, would provide an update on ECert.

Dr. Hett indicated this has been an ongoing, complex process. This item is for informational purposes and will provide an update of the current status of the ECert system including upgrades completed since the last update to the PESB and remaining system development and actions needed to finalize the system. Ms. McCleary described the three components of the data system alignment, S275, Educational Data Warehouse and Research Development System (EDWARDS), and ECert. She explained how the educator workforce data system will provide the public, educators, and policymakers with appropriate and useful information about educator quality needed to inform policy development and analysis. Mr. Kinnunen provided an overview of the ECert status and described the various components, including applications and advantages of the ECert system. The big picture and vision of the ECert and Professional Development Management System (PDMS) was briefly presented. Mr. Kinnunen presented the 2008 supplemental budget request and explained the various reports the system can accommodate. He stated that a shared vision and collaboration with stakeholders is critical to the success of the ECert system.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

- Q:** Regarding the employment information, how is that collected and reported?
A: Through the status coming from the S275 data collection, at least in the test environment, we've been able to integrate all that data through the different linkages.
- Q:** If the ultimate goal is to tie the duty code to S275 to inform whether or not a person is in their endorsement area, how will the descriptors be able to compare with the endorsements?
A: One of the screens indicates the certificates an individual holds and all the endorsements tied to those and through that and the alignment of the extended EDWARDS system, we'll be able to determine which teachers are actually instructing within their endorsement areas.
- Q:** The EDWARDS data will be based on common course descriptors all the districts will use?
A: Ideally, yes in the long term. In the short term, no, we'll be collecting course catalogs for each individual school. We will pilot a program this year in mathematics to determine the level of effort needed and report that information to the legislature in November 2008 with a full cost estimate.
- Q:** Will this system have the ability to collect a person's coursework over the years?
A: That is the intention that the system will collect transcript data. After you've entered your data, you would only need to provide updates.
- Q:** Can you explain the grants line item?
A: Grants are to the ESDs to help them through this process. \$50,000 to each of the ESDs to change from the paper process to the electronic process.
- Q:** How many applications are approved and what's the frequency of people who get denied?
A: We do collect statistics on approved/denied people and that's a great idea for adding to the aggregate reports and that can easily be done.
- Q:** How long will it take before the data reflects the real picture?
A: With the budget request, we're hoping to go totally electronic and determine a phased in approach of turning off the paper system. It's dependent on resources to move this system forward.
- Q:** How is the higher education institution interfacing with this system?
A: Our intention is to work with higher education institutions so they can continue to provide us with their electronic file and we'll have that data go directly into the ECert system.
- Q:** How will all credentialed folks be advised of changes?
A: We will rely on folks from private systems to invite us to events to share information about the system. The summer institutes are a great opportunity to spread the word as well as distribution of bulletins.

- Q:** When do you expect to go live?
- A:** It depends on receiving additional budget and based on that, we hope to have the ECert component go live a year after receiving the additional support.
- Q:** What kind of automatic verification levels will this system be able to produce?
- A:** We do plan on opening up the system to district personnel so that appropriate people are gaining access to the system. Current verification we plan on making available would be application status and certificate expiration with different priority levels.
- Q:** Is the ESD the only place that digitized documents would be able to be submitted or attached?
- A:** The information could be digitized by OSPI or the individual applicant. The digitizing is a transition period and the paper component will be completely eliminated.
- Q:** What is the role of the ESD?
- A:** We are having ongoing conversations with the ESD superintendents, the PESB and OSPI around the issue of making this work well. When this is completed it will be much easier for our office to communicate directly with educators and them with us.
- Q:** Will this system be responsive to low tech areas, such as those with dialup connections?
- A:** We'll keep this in mind as we progress.
- Q:** Private schools don't report graduation rates. How do private schools enter this data?
- A:** We don't currently collect very detailed information on private school students. Once a year we get an aggregate report that gives us a snapshot of the student population.
- Q:** Will the EDWARDS system utilize a common identifier that can track a student's performance longitudinally?
- A:** The state student identifier has been in place since the 2002-03 school year and fully utilized since the 2003-04 school year. The student assessment data is tied to that student identifier with the 2004-05 school year, so we do have data we can track longitudinally.
- Q:** How do you ensure the stability of the data such as data that's difficult to obtain or gets lost?
- A:** We use various back up strategies and data storage practices so that data is always available.
- Q:** How specific is the student data and can a person see someone's grade history?
- A:** There is no intention of opening up this information beyond the education community. Initially, the only person who could see that information would be the school or the school district.
- Q:** Will the teachers be responsible for entering grade information?
- A:** Each school and school district has different methodologies for submitting the data and reporting to OSPI. They will probably continue to use the same process and over time may decide to change.

BOARD COMMENTS/DISCUSSION

Members expressed disappointment that a system couldn't be developed that did not include a role for the ESDs. The fees should go to those who need to expand their professional growth and not channeled into administrative detail. Dr. Hett responded that the PEC honors the work of the ESDs and they deal with people in the field who express appreciation for the services the ESD provides. Members expressed optimism that this system will allow a student to create an account that takes them through their career. The issue of forms of payment was raised and members discussed the challenges some students who may not have a credit card will face. Ms. McCleary said there are issues around the E payment portion and they will look at other options. Members pointed out that all of this work is subject to existing privacy rules and raises some interesting issues related to obtaining such information. Conversations about the parameters will need to be made clear to teachers and the public about this.

PRESENTATION: LEGISLATIVE PREVIEW

Nasue Nishida, Policy and Research Analyst, PESB

Chair Van Glubt advised the board that it is important that the PESB know about the related legislative priorities of other educational agencies and associations, and where appropriate, have a position and weigh-in on these priorities. It is also important that the board provide a position and direction to staff for the upcoming session. She stated at the end of this item she would ask for volunteers to serve on the legislative subcommittee.

Ms. Nishida stated that this tab is a preview of what the board might see for the supplemental session from different organizations, associations and other agencies regarding their various positions. She displayed a table which highlighted some of the priorities of other educational organizations and juxtaposed those to the goals of the board. She noted that many of the other associations' positions are in alignment with those of the board and stated that this is a testament to the valuable work the board has done and will continue to do in the future. She discussed the relevant OSPI supplemental budget requests, including scholarships to recruit high-demand CTE teachers, funding to complete ECert, pro cert bonus

of \$2,500 and changing the definition of challenging schools for NBCT bonus. She asked the board to direct staff for the legislative session regarding their packages/priorities.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

- Q:** The document in the tab was discussed at the WACTE meeting a few weeks ago and changed significantly. Was a revised document sent to staff?
- A:** There was some misunderstanding at the WACTE meeting about the proposal and that expanding the alternate routes program would yield dollars for programming design. The fact is funding from alternative routes is only for scholarships.
- Q:** Is the ProCert bonus for the life of the certificate?
- A:** Yes, but it is subject to the legislature appropriating money every year. The board is also responsible for developing a uniform and external assessment for the professional certificate.
- Q:** If it passed would it only be for people who are required to do professional certification?
- A:** Anybody who obtains the ProCert would be eligible.
- Q:** What kind of feedback are you getting from legislators who desire to have information, but it doesn't get funded?
- A:** Data driven decision making is becoming increasingly important to rely on for good policy. There is a general consensus that there is a deficit in the statewide data we have to inform and answer different policy questions. The price tag for the state to undertake that kind of technology is discouraging to legislators.
- Q:** How would a university know not to accept a candidate that wasn't a residency teacher?
- A:** It's part of the application process for the program along with certification information and a letter from the university.
- Q:** What does our existing policy document say about ProCert?
- A:** It refers to a long term solution with a salary schedule that is old and confusing. This is not in the direction the board has taken with performance based competencies and a system with a certificate that is performance based. There needs to be an alignment between the knowledge and skills based certificate and what a teacher receives, compensation wise.

BOARD COMMENTS/DISCUSSION

Members encouraged OSPI to re-think this issue of a bonus as opposed to adding \$2,500 for people who complete ProCert to their basic salary. As long as this is a requirement it should not be bonus, but should be regular compensation that goes to the teacher and is counted for retirement purposes. Members pointed out that private institutions refer to this as professional certification compensation. Staff discussed the ProCert bonus as more of a temporary stop gap measure until a salary schedule is revamped developed, or whatever else might happen. These are measures to larger underlying compensation issues around both the adequacy and compensation system. Staff also discussed the rationale behind the legislature's data feasibility study. The bill passed last year requires OSPI to collect teacher assignment data along with other components. Members agreed on the agency/association legislative proposals as presented.

Chair Van Glubt asked for volunteers to serve on the legislative subcommittee which would provide on-the-spot direction/guidance/position to staff throughout the legislative session. Roger Erskine, Joyce Westgard, Stephanie Salzman, and Jill Van Glubt volunteered.

PRESENTATION: REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF NORTHWEST UNIVERSITY'S PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATE PROGRAM

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

Chair Van Glubt reminded the board that in May, the PESB approved Northwest's pre-proposal and invited them to submit their full proposal for potential approval today.

Dr. Hett introduced Gary Newbill, JD, EdD, Dean, School of Education, Northwest University and Mary Jo Larsen, Program Specialist, OSPI. Mr. Newbill stated that the teacher ProCert program is a logical, necessary evolution in the process of working with teachers. The university has prepared entry level teachers for over twenty years and last year began offering the Master in Teaching program for the residency certificate. He believes the teacher ProCert program will be a benefit to the geographic community as well as assisting the university in expanding.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

- Q:** Regarding the courses candidates sign up for in the Core section, if a candidate is earning a M.Ed./ProCert and they sign up for 6 credits in the Core that count toward both, how many credits and what's the cost when the candidate also enrolls in the 3 classes where they meet with their team, etc.?
- A:** The Core, laid out in 3 2-credit segments, is the highly individualized program and there is no more cost to it than the

credits: 2 credits each are the 6 credits of the Core program.

Q: If a candidate wants to take 2 3-credit courses from the university to use as their core, they also have to register for these 3 2-credit courses?

A: Yes, that's correct.

Q: Can the candidate choose not to do any in-service training and just complete the 6 credits?

A: Other experiences would contribute to the development of the evidence, but would not be required in addition to the 6 credits.

Q: What kind of financial commitment is the university making to support this program besides the fees?

A: The fees cover everything.

Q: When candidates take those 6 credits, can they take classes at the university also to fulfill those credits?

A: Yes, but the key is the professional growth plan and they will know through the pre-assessment seminar what the intention of the learner is and they will support the candidate. As a clarification, the program will not disappear if enrollment drops.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment.

MOTION was made by Gary Cohn and seconded by Dora Noble to approve Northwest University's Professional Certificate Program.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

Members concurred with the university's mentoring partnership agreements with neighboring districts and taking into consideration the work of the professional growth team, but expressed concern for the cost of the Core subjects. Some members spoke against the motion based on their understanding of the WAC regarding ProCert and concern that this program is in alignment with the WAC. They believe those 6 credits cannot be mandated and that choice is so important in this program. Concern was expressed that the in-service training requires additional cost and time to an otherwise time intensive program. It was discussed that the board determined this was a market driven program when they approved the pre-proposal. There is one set of criteria the board applies to all universities and finances are not one of the criteria. The proposal must meet the WAC requirement and that should be the only focus. Members pointed out that this is an institution with a set of core values and a fine record in the community and offers a variety of programs with a significant financial aid program and support for students. Members pointed out that there is a range of opportunities and a list of courses for a candidate where they would not need to pay additional fees. The board has a responsibility to make sure this program can be sustained. After reviewing the WAC, it was determined there is nothing in WAC that precludes an institution from making an institutional decision that their design would have requirements around coursework and no indication that the Core shall be what the candidate decides it to be.

MOTION carried.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Lucinda Young, Washington Education Association (WEA)

Ms. Young stated that Ms. Nishida did contact WEA regarding their legislative agenda. WEA's official agenda is a huge document they put out last year. For the supplemental year their priorities address two main issues: 1) the 2 years Initiative 732 was frozen, where no public school employee received a raise, and 2) working toward reinstating the 3% raise. Ms. Young summarized the various other issues WEA is committed to supporting, including class size initiative, which calls for a 6 year plan to reduce K-3 class size to one person staff team, issues around space and teacher availability, and goals around student accountability and assessment will also be continued.

Chair Van Glubt read an e-mail from Frank Klein regarding the controversy related to music competencies. Mr. Kline expressed regret that music educators didn't have better representation on the music endorsement committee.

PRESENTATION: ALTERNATIVE ROUTE PROGRAM SHOWCASE

Mea Moore, Coordinator Educator Programs & Standards, PESB

Chair Van Glubt discussed how these showcases are a wonderful opportunity for the board to hear directly from prospective teachers about their experience and for the board to see the fruits of their work. Ms. Moore announced that representatives from City University's Classified to Certified Alternative Route Program would be sharing their impressions of the program. She explained the City University (City U) program is delivered in partnership with Seattle Public Schools and the Seattle Education Association. She introduced representatives in attendance: Judy Hinrichs, Acting Dean,

College of Education, City U.; Craig Schieber, Director, Teacher Certification, City U.; Corll Morrissey, Faculty Program Coordinator, City U.; Kim Van Atta, Professional Development, Seattle Public School District. Ms. Moore provided a short biography and introduction for each of the presenters.

Presenters

Frank Whitten

Any Kopiloff

Merrilyn Carpenter

Tan Minh Le

Ms. Morrissey expressed her gratitude to Dr. Lin Douglas and the PESB for making this program possible. She shared her thoughts about the program and the merits to the candidates and institutions as well. Ms. Van Atta explained her role within the Seattle School District and how the Alternative Route program fits with the goals of the district. She provided information on how the program was borne and is funded.

Mr. Whitten decided when he was 14 and worked as a summer day camp counselor that he was an educator. He's worked the last 10 years at Alder Academy, which is housed in the King County Juvenile Detention Center. He teaches a life skills & behavior modification system to high risk youth. He believes this program allows him to follow the path he was destined for and he expressed gratitude to various people for providing him with this opportunity.

Ms. Kopiloff was born and raised in Uruguay and wanted to be a teacher since the 3rd grade. She started her teaching program when she was 21, but after 2 years she moved to the United States where she found it difficult to pursue her dream to be a teacher. She didn't speak English or have the money to follow her dream. She enrolled in the instructional assistance program at Seattle Public Schools where she worked as a substitute instructional assistant before being hired on as a regular employee. She has been working at Northgate Elementary School since 1996. In 2005 she heard about City U. Alternative Route program. She was awarded a scholarship and entered the program. She believes that without this program, she would still be dreaming of fulfilling her desire to be a teacher. She expressed her gratitude and appreciation to the people who helped to provide her with this opportunity.

Ms. Carpenter never thought she would be a teacher and admitted that she barely graduated from high school due to the death of her mother and periods of time in foster care. After graduation she married and worked as a banker for 12 years. She realized she enjoyed working with children and moved out of banking and into childcare. Her foster brother told her about a position as an instructional assistant with Seattle Public School and she began working with a special needs child. That was 5 years ago and it changed her life. After that she worked in a classroom of highly impacted special needs children and that's when she knew she had found her calling. A friend told her about the Alternative Route program where she could keep her job and get certified in special education. It's been life changing to realize she can teach any child and she thanked everyone who has made this possible. She believes this program is changing the lives of 21 paraprofessionals and positively impacting the lives of children.

Mr. Le is a bi-lingual instructional assistant teaching high school. He is also a member of the classified to certified program. He expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to be in the Alternative Route program. He was born in Vietnam and grew up there during the war-torn years. Children had to work in the rice fields with their parents to make a living and they couldn't go to school. He feels he was one of the lucky ones because he was allowed to be educated. 35 years ago he intended to be a teacher, but circumstances forced him into the army and he was a war prisoner after the war ended. In 1992 he left Vietnam with his wife and son and came to the United States. They had a difficult time. He worked in the day as an instructional bilingual assistant and attended college at night. After graduation he decided to stay in the school system. For more than 10 years he has worked in a diverse school with bilingual and special education students that speak his language. He understood the cultural and language barriers his students faced and he realized he could help them with the unique problems they faced. This program opened the door for him to be a teacher. He thanked all those involved for helping to make his dreams come true.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Q: Are graduates getting a K-8 certificate for elementary with a special education endorsement?

A: It's a K-12 special education in K-8 elementary, with the intent being to fill the shortage area of special education.

REVIEW OF THE APPEAL: IN THE MATTER OF GARY WALKUP CERTIFICATION NO. 230581 – OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION CAUSE NO. 2006-TCD-002

Chair Van Glubt announced that following presentations, the board will deliberate in closed session per RCW 42.30.140. For the record, Chair Van Glubt stated the date, November 8, 2007 and the time 1:24 p.m. She announced this is the review of the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Final Order issued by Administrative Law Judge Janice Shave from the Office of Administrative Hearings in the Matter of Gary Walkup, Teacher Certification Cause No. 2006-TCD-0002. She stated for the record, her name, Jill Van Glubt, PESB Chair, representing Career and Technical Educators. She asked each board member to introduce themselves and state the position they represent on the PESB. Dierk Meierbachtol, Assistant Attorney General, representing OSPI and Charles Schreck, Director, Office of Professional Practices, OSPI, identified themselves and it was noted Mr. Walkup and his attorney Tyler Firkins were not present.

Chair Van Glubt provided the following information:

As provided in WAC 181-86-150, Administrative Law Judge Shave conducted an administrative hearing on behalf of the Superintendent of Public Instruction regarding Mr. Walkup's request for a formal hearing under WAC 181-86-150 of OSPI's order imposing a sixty day suspension of his teaching certificate. OSPI took this action as authorized under WAC 181-86-070(2) and WAC 181-86-130.

On July 2, 2007, Administrative Law Judge Shave issued Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and a Final Order upholding the order of suspension. Mr. Walkup filed a timely appeal of that order to the PESB as authorized in WAC 181-86-155. The Board's review of the ALJ's decision is confined to the agency record developed at the administrative hearing and the briefs submitted by both parties. For the record, each Board member was provided a copy of the administrative record, as well as copies of the briefs submitted by both parties, in advance of this hearing.

WAC 181-86-155(4) allows for oral argument to be presented to the PESB if requested. A request having been made, the Board will now hear the oral argument of the parties. Chair Van Glubt advised Mr. Meierbachtol that he had 15 minutes to present oral argument on behalf of OSPI.

Mr. Meierbachtol thanked members of the board for hearing the oral argument and acknowledged Mr. Schreck. He said he had been tasked by OSPI to investigate school district complaints and allegations against teachers. He stated he understands that reviewing appeals is a new responsibility for the board and he will answer any questions the board might have. He briefly provided the statutory and regulatory background of this issue, particularly related to moral character and professionalism.

Chair Van Glubt thanked counsel and asked the following questions/clarifications:

Q: Would you clarify the 60 days per item?

A: If the board accepted Mr. Walkup's argument that there wasn't sufficient evidence introduced or produced at the hearing that he lacked good moral character or fitness to teach because there wasn't evidence that a student was actually negatively affected by the so called "Miyagi Minutes", then it would be their position that the 60 day suspension would still be warranted as Mr. Walkup doesn't challenge to this board the conclusion he engaged in unprofessional conduct.

Q: Are all of Mr. Walkup's education certificates affected?

A: No, it's the teaching certificate that's affected, not his endorsements.

Q: Does his certificate number stay the same?

A: Yes.

Q: Please define 60 days. Is that academic or calendar?

A: They're calendar days and the teacher doesn't have a choice as to when their suspension takes effect. It takes effect when the superintendent signs the order.

Q: Does a school district check on a teacher's certificate before hiring them?

A: Yes, they must check with OSPI for sexual misconduct and many schools check for other allegations.

Q: If someone gets a suspension, is it on the certificate forever?

A: Yes, disciplinary action is reflected in the OSPI data base, which has a retention schedule of 50 years after they're closed.

Q: When an action of 60 days suspension is taken, how are school districts notified?

A: Several years ago OSPI sent out notification by bulletin. Now we use a database that is updated monthly and on the OSPI website for the public.

Chair Van Glubt stated that the Board having heard oral argument will now proceed to deliberate in private regarding its decision. As provided in WAC 181-86-055(6), an order will be issued within 10 days of the Board's final decision. The hearing is now complete. The time is 1:50 p.m. We will now adjourn the public portion of the meeting of the Professional Educator Standards Board.