

MINUTES
September 12-13, 2007
Yakima, WA

MEMBERS PRESENT:

| | | |
|----------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| June Canty | Corinne McGuigan | Stephen Rushing |
| Carol Coar | (representing Terry Bergeson) | Yvonne Ullas |
| Roger Erskine | Kay Nelson | Stacy Valentin |
| Vicki Frei | Dora Noble | Jill Van Glubt |
| Myra Johnson | Sharon Okamoto | Joyce Westgard (16) |
| Shannon Lawson | Grant Pelesky | |

MEMBERS ABSENT: Terry Bergeson (represented by Corinne McGuigan), Gary Cohn, Stephanie Salzman (2)

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

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Van Glubt called the meeting to order at 8:34 AM.

Chair Van Glubt announced it had been requested to switch Tabs 10 and 14 to accommodate the schedule of a presenter for Tab 14. Tab 10 will be presented at 2:15 pm and Tab 14 at 12:30 pm. Members were reminded that in accepting the consent agenda, this change would also be accepted.

MOTION was made by Roger Erskine and seconded by Yvonne Ullas to accept the consent agenda.

MOTION carried.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Chair Van Glubt welcomed Jennifer Wallace back as Executive Director for the board.
- Members were reminded of the November 6 site visit training and asked to sign up if they have not participated in either Dr. Arlene Hett's or National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) training.
- The board will meet from 5:30 to 7:30 this evening for an hour discussion related to governance policy followed by dinner.
- Stacey Valentin attended two presentations for Jump Start and shared those experiences with the board.
- 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.

PRESENTATION: PROPOSED ENDORSEMENT REVIEW PROCESS

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

Dr. Hett introduced David Kinnunen, new associate director in Professional Education & Certification (PEC) and announced two other new people had recently joined PEC, Michaela Miller in National Board and Linda Foster who will run the Teacher Assistance Program (TAP) program. Dr. Hett explained that the PEC had been working for several years to bring the endorsement review process into alignment with the board's goal of improving preparation of teachers in content areas. In order to provide more in-depth assessments, the PEC has developed a policy that is both challenging and rigorous enough to be credible, yet efficient enough to be manageable and sustainable. She invited Larry Lashway, Program Specialist at OSPI, to provide a description of the proposed process for reviewing endorsement programs to ensure that they comply with the respective competencies. Mr. Lashway discussed two important contextual issues related to the process of assessing endorsements, the variety of pathways to get endorsements, and the load of trying to change the system all at once. He explained the complexities involved in this process, but feels it is manageable and believes there is acceptance of the process on the part of institutions. He proceeded to provide a brief summary of the proposed process. Mr. Lashway believes this process accomplishes two things; it provides greater transparency in

generating systematic data and will move all those endorsement programs into a mode where they use the aggregated data in decision making.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Q: We're going to tie this review process to site visits?

A: Yes

Q: How many years will it take to get through all the institutions?

A: Starting next year, probably five to seven years.

Q: Institutions have been asked to respond to endorsement areas with less than 80%. How will this process respond to the fact that the data an institution receives on candidate preparation is sometimes inaccurate?

A: The PEC agrees there are issues that need to be resolved. In terms of program evaluation, they will be looking carefully at what the data means and how they can use the information to improve programs.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Peter Gries, Chair, Music Department, Central Washington University (CWU), representing Washington University Music Administrators Board (WUMA), Member, Washington Music Educators Association (WMEA)

Mr. Gries expressed concern for the new endorsement competencies that merge choral, instrumental and general music into one endorsement area. WUMA agrees with the intent, but feels it is misplaced. He described the challenges they will face and said they will not be able to implement this by September. They have requested to be placed on the November agenda so the board can review the competencies and endorsements.

MOTION was made by Carol Coar and seconded by Myra Johnson to approve the endorsement review process as proposed.

MOTION carried.

PRESENTATION: ESA PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATE WACS

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

Dr. Hett explained that since the board had approved the framework for the Educational Staff Associate (ESA) professional certificate programs during the July meeting, the language to codify that framework must now be approved by the board.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

No questions.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment.

MOTION was made by Carol Coar and seconded by Roger Erskine to adopt the proposed WAC181-78A-010, 509 and 535 language related to the ESA professional certificate framework.

MOTION carried.

PRESENTATION: ESA PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATION EQUIVALENCY FOR NBCT

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

Dr. Hett explained this is the first time this issue has been brought to the board, but it is the same process teacher's use. Approving the language will allow counselors to use their National Board certification in lieu of completing a professional certificate program. Carol Coar commented that other ESAs have advanced National Certification and that this too deserves recognition and compensation.

Ms. Wallace passed out background information related to the boards standing position on this issue and commented that it was perhaps an area for future discussion.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

No questions.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment.

MOTION was made by Grant Pelesky and seconded by Stacey Valentin to adopt the proposed WAC 181-79A-145, 250 and 257 language to create ESA professional certificate equivalency for school counselors who achieve National Board certification.

MOTION carried.

PRESENTATION: CRITERIA FOR SPECIALTY ENDORSEMENTS

Nasue Nishida, Research & Policy Analyst, PESB

Subcommittee Members:

Shannon Lawson

Kay Nelson

Dennis Sterner

Yvonne Ullas

Ms. Nishida informed the board they would be hearing from the subcommittee on this item. Mr. Sterner provided a brief background and overview, reminding the board about the rules they adopted in 2006 related to the specialty endorsement for deaf education. At that time, the board did not determine guidelines to provide direction in case other groups want a specialty endorsement. It is important now to consider the overall criteria for the specialty endorsement category, which would allow other groups the opportunity to obtain the specialty endorsement.

Ms. Nelson presented the recommended criteria/questions in the areas of identified need, hiring implications, unique knowledge and skills and Ms. Ullas discussed the professional development needs. Ms. Baker discussed the contract with Pearson (formerly National Evaluation Systems) and said they have expressed complete willingness to accommodate our needs and work with us as we develop tests for new specialty endorsements. Ms. Lawson stated that the subcommittee wants feedback regarding the criteria they've established and to get the approval to go forward in developing a template for distribution to various impacted organizations. Staff will prepare the appropriate WAC language for adoption in November.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Q: What are the downsides of this proposal, other than the cost factor?

A: Narrowing down the list of criteria. In considering what these people would provide, determining what is non-negotiable. The subcommittee determined they must have a national standard, or at least a standard that was recognized nationally, and also being able to have a letter of support from an institute that would help them through that process. Additionally, the possibility of saturation is a concern.

Q: Some legislators were interested in dyslexia and that we should be looking at that. Will the subcommittee continue to meet to discuss this issue?

A: The subcommittee is considering whether or not to accept nationally based teacher expectations even though they are not listed in the form of teacher competencies.

Q: Did the subcommittee discuss a minimum credit requirement for some specialty endorsements?

A: With the movement to performance-based competencies, credit requirements are no longer relevant. The subcommittee moved away from credits as the driver for endorsement proficiency and has moved to competency. Each institution, whether it's the specialty endorsement or regular endorsement, has to demonstrate to the PESB and the program approval site folks that they are meeting competencies.

Q: Would these specialty endorsements be a part of the endorsement review process?

A: That wasn't specifically discussed, but if it's an endorsement it should be a part of the review process.

Q: If a candidate wants to obtain a specialty endorsement using outcome based measures, what is the incentive for the college or university to help the candidate when they can't charge them tuition?

A: A college or institution could say they don't offer that program. If they do offer it, they would have a program that has been set up and approved by the board and there would be an associated cost.

Q: Has out of state transferability been considered?

A: That will be added to the feedback

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment.

MOTION was made by Myra Johnson and seconded by June Canty to direct staff to prepare WAC language based on the recommendations of the subcommittee related to approving the criteria for specialty endorsements.

MOTION carried.

PRESENTATION: OUT-OF-ENDORSEMENT ASSIGNMENTS/REVISED TIMELINE

Nasue Nishida, Research & Policy Analyst, PESB

Chair Van Glubt explained that this item is the next installment in a series of conversations and actions related to eliminating out-of-endorsement assignments by September 2009 as identified in the board's work plan. During the July meeting, the board requested that Ms. Nishida continue to refine the timeline, specifically identifying data needed to inform board policy decisions. Ms. Nishida asked each member of the panel to introduce themselves and explained they would be responding to issues related to collective bargaining and hiring practices that impact out-of-endorsement assignments.

Panel Presentation

- Jim Meadows, Washington Education Association (WEA)
- Missy Hallead, Executive Director of Human Resources, Vancouver School District
- Kevin Chase, Superintendent, Grandview School District
- Gary Kipp, Executive Director, Association of Washington School Principals (AWSP)

Mr. Chase stated that in his district they must have board approval to get someone in an out-of-endorsement assignment and a mutually agreed upon plan of support between the certificated employee and the district. If there is opposition to being placed in subject areas in which they lack endorsement, the employee simply says they don't agree to the mutual plan of support and there is no recourse. He believes teacher seniority and involuntary transfers are two separate issues and he discussed the various difficulties related to those two issues. Because his district is held accountable, he believes they need flexibility at the local level to make out-of-endorsed assignments.

Ms. Hallead stated she believes districts need flexibility. However, stricter rules on out-of-endorsement assignments are okay as long as they don't make this practice/policy impossible.

Mr. Meadows commented that this topic has received attention at the national level and cited a recent study on collective bargaining and seniority in terms of turnover in high need schools. Collective bargaining agreements co-exist in the same realm with state policies that specify assignment and exception to assignment policies. He believes that experience does matter and it's important to think more broadly about seniority in that context.

Mr. Kipp added that they want the best teachers teaching kids. Seniority doesn't necessarily reflect quality. However, endorsements reflect whether or not the person has knowledge, but not necessarily the quality of the teacher. It's also different when looking at different areas of endorsement, i.e. math versus English. He feels that separating experience from seniority is important and that they are different. He described some of the difficulties and complexities around hiring agreements, seniority and endorsements.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Q: Is there any data on how long a teacher stays in an out-of-endorsement assignment?

A: It varies and the subcommittee will be collecting data from districts this year and will then be able to compare it to last year's data. Rationale must also be provided as to why a teacher is being placed in a particular assignment and provide a plan of support.

Q: Is there a process for responding to districts that don't provide the data?

A: Yes, staff spent many hours on the phone calling every district and received a response rate of over 90%.

Ms Nishida proceeded to discuss the plan & timeline, explaining that the timeline is a guide for working toward the 2009 goal. Ms. Wallace shared information related to House Bill 1906 that established the intent that teachers have adequate background in subject content to teach it and will hold full, appropriate credentials in that subject area. Discussion ensued regarding the many complex issues related to out-of-endorsement assignments, waivers, and the systemic problem of insufficient teachers in shortage areas.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Sheila Fox, Faculty, Western Washington University, State Board of Education Liaison

Ms. Fox discussed enhancement grants that several institutions have received from the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) to increase capacity.

Jennifer Halleck, Vancouver School District, Human Resources

Ms. Halleck reiterated her support for continuing to allow local flexibility in granting out-of-endorsement waivers.

Jeanne Harmon, Center for Strengthening Teacher Profession (CSTP)

Ms. Harmon believes there isn't enough data on the topic and that policy is being made without enough information to understand the problem. She stressed the importance of keeping the student perspective in mind. It's often the newest teachers who are asked to take these assignments and while it is a mutual agreement, it doesn't mean they agree with the assignment and it's not always in the best interests of the children. She urged the board to uphold their goal to end out-of-endorsement assignments.

MOTION was made by Stacey Valentin and seconded by Roger Erskine to approve the proposed timeline with modifications as indicated.

MOTION carried.

PRESENTATION: PROPOSED 2007-08 OSPI BUDGET: USE OF CERTIFICATION FEES

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

Dr. Hett discussed the various issues the board had requested be revised at the July 2007 meeting and explained how the revised budget had been changed. Roger Erskine, Carol Coar, and Yvonne Ullas were members of the certification fee subcommittee. Subcommittee members reported having a better understanding of the OSPI budget and the benefits derived from this understanding. Ms. Hett explained how the funds are used for educational benchmarking and WATEACH.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Q: Can the Reserve Fund be moved from under Operating Expenses to a separate line item reflecting a balance of \$170,000.00.

A: Ms. Hett said she would make that change.

MOTION was made by Roger Erskine and seconded by Carol Coar to approve the OSPI 2007-08 use of certification fees budget.

MOTION carried.

PRESENTATION: ADOPTION OF RESIDENCY TEACHER CERTIFICATE VALIDITY WACs

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

Dr. Hett discussed this is a change in WAC driven by the need to clarify the validity of the residency certificate.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

No questions.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment.

MOTION was made by Myra Johnson and seconded by Yvonne Ullas to adopt the proposed WAC 181-79A-145 language to change the validity period for teacher residency certificates.

MOTION carried.

PRESENTATION: 2008 PESB LEGISLATIVE BRIEFS

Nasue Nishida, Research & Policy Analyst, PESB

This tab contains drafts of three different briefs (Update on PESB Work, Systematic & Strategic Approach to Educator Recruitment, and Educator Data to Inform Policy Decisions), that will be used, based on board approval, to disseminate among legislators and policy makers for this next session beginning in January 2008. Ms. Nishida discussed each of the briefs and provided the board with the opportunity to bring omissions to her attention.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Q: Why don't math & science students choose to go into teaching?

A: That is one of the evaluation questions.

Q: On the data issue, are there any states collecting this type of data?

A: Some east coast states seemingly have some comprehensive data system that does connect teacher assignment data with the certification data with some student data. The California legislature passed bills that created money to develop a system like this. There are some models of other states that have done it in different ways. There was a bill at the last session that provided OSPI with money to do a feasibility study, provide the electronic signature gathering for e-certification, and required that by school year 2008-2009 school districts report teachers assigned to courses and classes.

Q: How many more math teachers will be needed when the State Board of Education increases math requirements?

A: A survey has been sent out to districts asking them how many math teachers they'll need when the new requirement is implemented and that data will be collected and disseminated.

Q: What can we do in this recruitment and math and science initiative to address huge unfilled positions and where does the elementary level fit into this picture?

A: The focus has been on secondary, but it's moving down to middle level and will eventually filter down to elementary level. The endorsement competencies approved by the board has helped strengthen this issue.

Q: Money is an issue. What is being done?

A: At the last legislative session funding was appropriated for a task force to discuss basic education finance, including educator compensation and salary models to appropriately fund educators. Reports will be coming out next year around the compensation issue.

MOTION was made by Roger Erskine and seconded by Stacey Valentin to approve the concepts for the legislative briefs as presented.

MOTION carried.

PRESENTATION: ADOPTION OF SPLIT MIDDLE LEVEL MATHEMATICS/SCIENCE ENDORSEMENT

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

Dr. Hett briefly discussed the action taken at the July 2007 board meeting to split the middle level mathematics and science endorsements into two separate endorsements. Approval of the WAC language will codify this change.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

No questions.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment.

MOTION was made by Stacey Valentin and seconded by Roger Erskine to adopt the WAC 181-82A-202 language to split the current middle level mathematics/science endorsement into middle level mathematics and middle level science endorsements.

MOTION carried.

PRESENTATION: ADOPTION OF ENDORSEMENT COMPETENCIES: MIDDLE LEVEL MATHEMATICS, MIDDLE LEVEL SCIENCE

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

Chair Van Glubt advised the board they would break into teams to review the competencies for middle level mathematics and middle level science endorsements. Colleen Putaansuu, Program Specialist at OSPI, discussed the PEC subcommittees rationale in finalizing the endorsement competencies and the resulting benefits.

All teams reported that the competencies meet each criterion and recommended approving the revised endorsement competencies.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

No questions.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment

MOTION was made by June Canty and seconded by Myra Johnson to approve the middle level mathematics endorsements.

MOTION carried.

MOTION was made by Carol Coar and seconded by Yvonne Ullas to approve the middle level science endorsements

MOTION carried.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Jeanne Harmon, Center for Strengthening Teacher Profession (CSTP)

Ms. Harmon advised the board that she had placed some publications on the table that might be of interest to them.

Dennis Sterner, Dean, College of Education, Whitworth University

Mr. Sterner thanked Larry Lashway and his group for the work they had done on the new program review standards. They will be doing all they can to meet the high standards that have been set. He regretfully expressed disappointment that the board had decided not to address any quality control issues for about a third of the teachers that enter the classroom each year via on line providers or out of state providers operating in this state. He believes the board should reconsider reciprocity agreements with other states to require out of state providers to abide by the same requirements that in-state providers must.

Chair Van Glubt announced that Carol Coar had requested to address the board. Ms. Coar announced that she had retired from her position with the Tacoma School District and therefore, would no longer be eligible for board membership. Ms. Coar expressed her appreciation to each of the members, and members wished her well in her retirement.

Chair Van Glubt recessed the meeting at 2:08 pm

September 13, 2007

MEMBERS PRESENT:

| | | |
|---|-----------------|---------------------|
| June Canty | Kay Nelson | Yvonne Ullas |
| Roger Erskine | Dora Noble | Stacy Valentin |
| Vicki Frei | Sharon Okamoto | Jill Van Glubt |
| Myra Johnson | Grant Pelesky | Joyce Westgard (16) |
| Shannon Lawson | Stephen Rushing | |
| Corinne McGuigan (Representing Terry Bergeson) | | |

MEMBERS ABSENT: Terry Bergeson (represented by Corrine McGuigan), Gary Cohn, Stephanie Salzman (3)

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- No announcements

PRESENTATION: K-6/K-8 SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Nasue Nishida, Research & Policy Analyst, PESB

Kay Nelson, Subcommittee Chair

Nasue Nishida
Ron Scutt
Larry Lashway
Stacey Valentin
Roger Erskine

Ms. Nelson provided background on this issue reminding members it has been a topic of consideration and debate for two years. The subcommittee has arrived at a recommendation to maintain the grade span of the current elementary education endorsement, K-8, and increase the requirements needed to attain the endorsement. Mr. Scutt presented the recommendation responding to each of the questions that had been posed. Mr. Lashway provided details of the recommendation and the rationale behind the recommendation. Mr. Erskine described the efforts the subcommittee took to receive feedback and input from various groups and organizations.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Q: Should this be accepted, what would be the impact of teachers from other states wanting an elementary certificate?

A: Out of state teachers would need to meet the requirements of this state and be expected to pass that second test and revised elementary test.

Q: What are the consequences if we don't approve this today?

A: A big step has been taken to define the needs of teachers K through 8 and there would still be a lot of work to do.

Q: When does a teacher candidate take these tests?

A: They must pass the K-8 test and a test in one other endorsement area. Universities handle it in different ways.

Q: Do out of state teachers also have to take our K-8 exam?

A: Yes, but that is the case now. There is no reciprocity on tests. In the RFP for the WEST-E, there will be comparability studies for Oregon and California which will create reciprocity.

Q: How does having the elementary and the other exam affect out-of-endorsement assignments in this other area, if they don't have endorsement in the other area?

A: There may be a provision for that in the WAC. It would need to be checked.

Q: What is the rationale for the lists of tests people could choose from?

A: The advising process will be important in this issue and we wanted to respect the individual's ability to choose.

Q: If you take the other test and pass it, you're not necessarily endorsed in that area. Is there something extra the candidate could do to ensure they could teach in those areas?

A: They would be able to teach because by taking two tests they could be highly qualified at the middle level, depending on what tests they chose to take and what advising they receive. We would then have highly qualified which is different than endorsed.

Q: Was there discussion of a plan for them to fulfill the other component, the pedagogy?

A: The pedagogy is within the K-8 endorsement so the person could teach K-8. But the federal requirement for highly

qualified is what the extra test could potentially eliminate.

Q: Will scholarship allotments still be available for two tests as there was for one?

A: Yes, we receive 200 vouchers a year, per our contract.

Q: Is there any evidence that passing the test is any indication of a teacher's ability and will testing guarantee competence?

A: The evidence will never completely answer that question, but this recommendation is a move in the right direction.

Q: If you have a K-8 certificate, you can teach at the middle level in a particular area, then what would be the purpose for someone to get a full blown endorsement in that area?

A: You could get a middle level endorsement which would extend authorization through the 9th grade, or sometimes elementary candidates take a P-12 endorsement and in that case, they would be authorized to teach that subject anywhere from 5th through 12th grade.

Q: Does the student have to take any other courses to take that second test, or could they just do whatever the requirement is for the standard K-8 endorsement?

A: Hopefully, colleges and universities are advising students to take the extra credits associated with a K-8 endorsement to help them pass the test.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Cori Mantle-Bromley, Chair, Department of Teaching and Learning, Washington State University

Ms. Mantle-Bromley indicated her comments are related to the impact this decision will have on programs and students. She fully supports increased content preparation of teachers. The issue is content preparation at the middle level. There is a shortage of well prepared people in middle schools to teach, especially in math and science. The recommendation impacts people in their Masters in Teaching (M.I.T.) program in that it would add another year to their program. She believes the unintended consequence of this is that most folks in the M.I.T. program probably wouldn't do that. This could cause the college to lose graduates and will start a shortage at the elementary level, which will intensify the shortage at the middle school level. The college would have to restructure their undergraduate programs, possibly looking at a five year program. She is concerned for students from low income areas who may choose other degree programs that are shorter and without as many requirements as teaching.

Jim Kowalkowski, Superintendent, Davenport School District & Director, Rural Education Center

Mr. Kowalkowski stated that he has met with the subcommittee in the past and he is impressed with the work they have done. He supports the subcommittee recommendation to maintain the current K-8 endorsement and increase the requirements to obtain it. It adds rigor to the undergraduate program, but it also permits and preserves flexibility. He is aware of the supply and demand aspect of this recommendation, but believes the focus should be on kids first and content second.

Jennifer Halleck, Human Resources, Vancouver School District

Ms. Halleck explained that she works with certification of teachers and also highly qualified each of their teachers. She is involved in the hiring of new educators. She appreciates the recommendation to keep the K-8 endorsement, but does have a few concerns about the overall recommendation. She acknowledged there is confusion around certification and highly qualified and that they are two separate, independent topics to some degree. By passing the WEST-E or PRAXIS II exam, it does not add an endorsement to the certification, but it does satisfy the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) requirement to being highly qualified. In Vancouver, they believe certification shouldn't be dictated by the NCLB current rules and regulations – certification should come first then NCLB can follow. Adding a test is a huge distraction to first year teachers and it will be a hardship for out of state candidates. Perhaps an alternative would be to add the additional test to the professional certificate program so they don't have to take it in their first year.

Patty Banks, Superintendent, University Place School District

Ms. Banks stated her primary interest is in student achievement in public schools. She cited 25 years of research that establishes a predictive and causal length between the depth of teacher content knowledge, particularly in math and science, and student achievement. This is critical at the middle level. You cannot make up for a lack of content knowledge with an excess of pedagogical skills. Ms. Banks shared an experience in her district whereby they offered a two week math institute for teachers. After taking courses in math content for five hours a day during the two weeks, teachers still weren't able to pass the pre tests. She doesn't believe they can ignore what they know is a critical problem in students' math achievement.

Charles Wheaten, Washington Association of School Administrators, Small Schools Chair, Wapato School District

Mr. Wheaten said he was impressed with the work of the subcommittee and he expressed support for the recommendation.

Jim Meadows, Washington Education Association (WEA)

Mr. Meadows reiterated his support of the process the board followed. He believes it is the best possible solution for this complex issue. He said they are concerned about the financial impact this policy change will create and believes policy makers need to support educators. Communication will be essential after this is adopted to both candidates who need guidance in test taking and current K-8 holders who will want to know how this affects them. He feels there should be a process for feedback about implementation with check points the board will look at for unintended consequences.

Dennis Sterner, Dean, School of Education, Whitworth University

Mr. Sterner stated his appreciation for the work of the subcommittee, which he was a part of until he recently exited the board. Being involved in the deliberations, he believes he understands the complexity of the issues. He also appreciates keeping the K-8, which testimony from across the state supports, as well as flexibility in the number of tests people can take. He believes concerns about content have also been addressed in endorsement standards. He recommends the board move the two endorsement requirements from residency to professional certificate to allow additional time to pursue the second endorsement and content. He also recommends providing incentives for programs to strengthen math and science and other content areas for elementary teachers. He believes this is the new and improved K-8 and that there needs to be a demarcation between what was and what will be. Institutions are held accountable for sufficient preparation to prepare people to teach at the middle levels.

Sheila Fox, Faculty, Western Washington University

Ms. Fox said her remarks would be from a State Board of Education perspective, although she doesn't speak for the board, related to the primary and elementary teacher preparation in addition to the middle level. They recognize middle level is too late for laying down foundations for math and science. Depth of content knowledge needs to start early so that every teacher has a good appreciation and understanding of math and science as well as other endorsement areas. Universities have a responsibility to advise candidates about this important issue and seek coursework in those critical areas.

MOTION was made by Stacey Valentin and seconded by Roger Erskine to accept the subcommittee's recommendation to maintain the grade span of the current elementary education endorsement, kindergarten through eighth grade (K-8), and to require elementary education candidates become more focused choosing elective coursework that will enable them to pass two WEST-E tests, the elementary education and one other test (excluding traffic safety) by September of 2009.

Grant Pelesky requested a roll call vote.

MOTION was made by Myra Johnson and seconded by Roger Erskine to amend the motion by inserting 'excluding traffic safety' after 'one other test'.

Stacey Valentin accepted the amendment.

Chair Van Glubt stated that the motion stands as amended.

ROLL CALL VOTE

June Canty – No
Roger Erskine – Yes
Vicki Frei – Yes
Myra Johnson – Yes
Shannon Lawson – No
Kay Nelson – Yes
Dora Noble – Yes
Sharon Okamoto – Yes
Grant Pelesky – Abstain
Stephen Rushing – Yes
Yvonne Ullas – Yes
Stacey Valentin – Yes
Joyce Westgard - Yes

Yes - 10
No - 2
Abstain - 1

MOTION carried.

PRESENTATION: TEACHERS FOR A NEW ERA

- Bill McDiarmid, Boeing Professor of Education, University of Washington - Seattle
- Dr. Capp Peck, Director of Teacher Education, University of Washington - Seattle

Mr. McDiarmid explained that the University of Washington (UW) was one of eleven institutions around the country to receive grant funds from the Carnegie Corporation to participate in a national project called Teachers for a New Era. The project has two goals: assure public and policymakers about the value of university-based teacher preparation; and develop programs grounded in evidence on the performance of graduates in classrooms. Mr. McDiarmid and Mr. Peck provided a presentation on Evidence & Teacher Preparation Programs. The presentation described their approach to using evidence to bring about change in the Teacher Education Program at the UW and why. They described the types of evidence they have collected to drive change or practice. They discussed the types of data that are likely to help programs improve. Dr. Peck provided a brief overview of how this project has unfolded at the UW campus. Mr. McDiarmid described how they thought about bringing about change using the kind of evidence they collected and hope to continue to collect.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Q: How far are you in the five year cycle and is there a time when you will be sharing critical findings?

A: The fifth year starts at the end of October. They would be happy to present findings at a later date to the board.

Q: Are you getting equal levels of participation from your secondary candidates and graduates as well as your elementary and special education in the Reconnect & Recharge seminars?

A: They are just starting secondary and it's about a year behind the elementary. They'll have that information in about 6 months.

Q: Can you give us an example of something you've learned from this process?

A: The faculty has learned that there is a gap between what the teachers are teaching and what the students are actually learning. That taught us that this is the nature of the problems that teachers have. This has affected the way in which classroom management is taught at the UW. They learned they needed to change their practices.

Chair Van Glubt explained that this is not an action item and is intended to initiate board thinking related to the goal of addressing the value-added component of teacher preparation to achieve explicit connections between pre-service preparation and skills and knowledge required in P-12 classrooms.

PRESENTATION: STANDARD V IMPLEMENTATION: PROPOSED PROCESS

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

Dr. Douglas provided a brief synopsis on the background of this tab item and explained the timeline is a comprehensive strategy for implementing a change process by which the transition can be achieved. She discussed each of the dates and activities contained in the timeline, pointing out the most significant issues essential to achieving this transition.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Q: Could a college track the number of students or would it be all of the students enrolled in their teacher preparation program that would be going out into the field?

A: During the pilot phase the institutions who would apply to participate would have a cohort of pre-service candidates who would be assigned to a school or schools.

Q: How much money is involved in this process?

A: Modest costs are involved, i.e. stipends for participating teachers, possibly administrators, partnership development of program, etc.

Q: How will it be handled if the pilot phase proves to not be going well?

A: We will develop key points along the way that we will review and adjust. We won't know what those points are until the model is in place

Q: Is there a similar kind of project underway in NCATE to move toward evidence based?

A: Uncertain what NCATE is doing, but if it's different, there could theoretically be two ways of assessing our schools.

MOTION was made by June Canty and seconded by Roger Erskine to endorse the timeline and process for the implementation of Standard V as presented.

MOTION carried.

PRESENTATION: ADOPTION OF ENDORSEMENT PROGRAM REAPPROVAL/MAINTENANCE WACs

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

Dr. Douglas reminded the board that since they adopted a timeline at the May 2007 meeting for implementation of the new endorsement competencies and WEST-E, they now need to adopt WAC language to codify the timeline and process for endorsement reapproval by teacher preparation programs. Dr. Douglas briefly discussed the changes.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Q: Is middle level math and science still on the same timeline given our action yesterday to separate into two separate endorsements?

A: We can make that change, but it doesn't change the timeline or the requirements.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment.

MOTION was made by Grant Pelesky and seconded by Sharon Okamoto to adopt the amended language to WAC 181-82A-206 and WAC 181-82A-215 to codify actions previously taken by the board.

MOTION carried.

PRESENTATION: ADOPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER PROGRAM WACs

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

Dr. Hett explained that the PEC is asking the board to approve WAC language for school social workers. Judy Smith passed around revised information regarding a couple of changes to the original WAC language.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

No questions.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment.

MOTION was made by June Canty and seconded by Yvonne Ullas to adopt the amended language in WAC181-78A-319 as presented.

MOTION carried.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Dennis Sterner, Dean, School of Education, Whitworth University

Mr. Sterner commented he was speaking as a member of the board of the Pacific Education Institute. Environmental education groups across the state have had particular interest in the Standard V approval process. He cited one competency in Standard V related to standards and skills for a globally sustainable environment and said there is a close connection between that standard and the work of the Pacific Education Institute. Mr. Sterner said they are willing to work with the board and higher education to implement that portion of Standard V.

PRESENTATION: ALTERNATIVE ROUTE PROGRAM SHOWCASE

Mea Moore, Coordinator Educator Programs & Standards, PESB

Ms. Moore described the ESD 105 Regional Consortia Alternate Route program and announced that Jim Seamons, coordinator for the Alternate Route program, was not able to participate. She introduced each of the presenters.

Presenters

Karlyn Rath – Cohort I

Randy Wise – Cohort II

Charles Murphy – Cohort III

Mary Rose Tahat – Cohort IV

Mr. Murphy recognized Yvonne Ullas, who had been his 1st grade teacher and Dr. Lin Douglas, who paved the way for him to get in to the program. Mr. Murphy described how he began teaching 11 or 12 years ago for the Yakima school district. After college he came back to Yakima with a degree in Communication and decided to pursue teaching. He worked with high risk youth and grew as a professional. As he worked on his Masters in Education, he learned of the alternate route program. He described the benefits of being in the program and what it has meant in his life. He is appreciative of all the work that goes into making the program a success.

Mr. Wise explained that before teaching at Naches Valley High School, he had been a farmer for 24 years. After he sold his farm, he had another business that operated for four months of the year. To fill his time, he worked as a substitute teacher during the winter months. He heard about the alternate route program and was accepted into it. He acknowledged that traditional programs weren't an option for him considering his family obligations. The alternate route program provided an opportunity for him to get back into teaching, which had been his intention before becoming a farmer. He is very appreciative of the program and especially enjoyed the ability to explore different colleges and the yearlong internship, which he feels was great.

Ms. Rath currently teaches at East Valley Intermediate School in Special Education. She began her teaching career when she got her degree in early childhood education. She put teaching on hold when she married and had her son. When her son started school she volunteered in his class and wanted to teach again. She described the doubts she had about going back to school and getting recertified. She was enrolled at Central when she learned about the alternate route program. It was a great alternative for her. The yearlong internship was a real strength and the financial piece was a huge attraction. Being able to complete the program in a year was an added benefit. She believes it's a wonderful program.

Ms. Tahat thanked Dr. Douglas for allowing her to go into the program. She is currently doing her internship at Eisenhower High School. She has endorsements in both biology and general chemistry and this has provided her with the opportunity to work with and learn from wonderful mentors. Before this program she had worked as adjunct faculty at the local community college and Heritage University. When her children started school she decided to raise them full time. She was still involved as a parent volunteer and reading tutor, leading book clubs at the middle school and Saturday classes for reading and math. After her children got older, she went to CWU and learned of this program. She is now working toward her certificate for K-12. She acknowledged a shortage of teachers and classes in Japanese and would like to be able to give students that option. She enjoys challenges and working at K-12 presents a whole group of challenges. Among them, designing and devising ways to keep students engaged and learning. This program has allowed her to understand the various components of teaching in school. It has been a great eye opener for her because it has given her the tools to teach effectively and she appreciates being able to reap the benefits of this program.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Q: Ms. Tahat, was it a difficult process to have your certificate reviewed from another country?

A: There is a form you fill out and if the schools you graduate from are accredited, you don't have to go through the protocols. But it does take time and the testing dates only come around at certain times.

PRESENTATION: ADOPTION OF WAC CHANGE TO ALLOW DISAPPROVED PROGRAMS TO ADMIT CANDIDATES UNDER CERTAIN CONDITONS

Jennifer Wallace, Executive Director, PESB

Ms. Wallace presented information about a policy proposal that would apply to any institution whose program has been disapproved by the PESB. This option would allow disapproved programs to present to the board an acceptable, feasible compliance plan for how they will address unmet standards and regain approval. If the board approves the plan, they may grant that institution ability to admit candidates for one year from date of disapproval. This would not change the institution's status of disapproved. They must still meet the conditions for regaining approval. In addition to allowing the institution to admit candidates, this provision would have the effect of encouraging institutions to submit these plans and for the site visit team and board to provide them feedback on that plan.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Q. When this proposal is brought back to the board for final adoption, can the board potentially vote against it then even if adopting it now and what would that mean for admitting candidates?

A. Yes and people admitted between now and then can stay enrolled – but they'd have to cease admitting after that point until they regained full approval. Also want to clarify that even if board passes this provision, there may be times when an institution submits compliance plan, but the site visit team advises and or the board decides against it and does not approve the disapproved institution admitting candidates.

Q. This has been reviewed by our AG?

A. Yes, We're adopting WAC and it would apply to any institution.

Q. At 120 days and we'd review and the site visit team would make another visit or review plan?

A. No. The 120 days applies to the emergency adoption of policy that applies to any disapproved institution; not specific to just CWU. If passed today, our next agenda item will be to decide whether to accept CWU's plan under this newly-passed policy.

Q. Please clarify the distinction between 1-year approval, disapproval and this provision.

A. Disapproval = May finish our existing cohort of candidates, but no further admission. Disapproval has serious implications for Title II federal accountability and potentially grant funding. One-year approval has no impact on admissions, but the program has one year to address problems identified and gain full approval. The only difference between this proposed provision and disapproval is that this provision may allow a disapproved institution to continue to admit new candidates for one year.

Q. How will site visit review work?

A. PESB staff would send plan to site visit team, gather feedback from site visit team and transmit this to the full board.

Q. Clarify how the institution would gain permission to admit new program candidates?

A. Site visit team reviews plan and gives feedback to the board. Board would also review the plan and the site visit team's feedback. This would be discussed at a board meeting and a decision made to allow/not allow the institution to admit candidates based on whether the site visit team and board viewed that plan as likely to lead them to meet unmet standards.

Q. So what's the difference between this and one-year approval, why would we add this option?

A. Allowing an institution to admit candidates would be an option – not an automatic condition - related to their disapproved status. It is allowed by definition under 1-year approval. Under this provision they remain in disapproved status.

MOTION was made by Kay Nelson and seconded by Joyce Westgard to accept the proposed language to approve emergency adoption of this WAC.

MOTION failed.

Chair Van Glubt announced that Dr. Soltz, Provost/Vice President Academic Affairs at CWU, would be providing comment on the CWU improvement plan the board had reviewed, but based on the action the board had just taken, there would be no further action taken on this issue. She explained that today's proceedings are not in reconsideration of the board's July decision nor do they relate to CWU's right or the board's process of appeal.

Dr. Soltz, provided the following statement:

Good Afternoon. I am David Soltz, Provost at Central Washington University. With me at the table today are Rebecca Bowers, Dean of the College of Education and Professional Studies and Connie Lambert, Associate Dean and Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning.

I appreciate being given the Board's audience to hear CWU's plan to achieve full program approval for its Residency Teacher Education Program. As a result of your review of this plan, we are requesting that you approve our Residency Teacher Education Program for one year with a focused visit in April 2008 during which we would show progress on recommendations specified by the visiting team. Specifically, we request that CWU's Residency Teacher Education Program be approved to enroll and admit students at least until the focused visit. We also request that the designation "low-performing school" not be used to describe CWU during this probationary period.

Like you, we are committed to ensuring students receive the best possible education and training for service in Washington state classrooms. We want to do all we can to continue to provide outstanding teachers for students throughout Washington. We have taken seriously your directions for enhancing the complement of data that is collected, aggregated, summarized, and shared for program candidates, as you will see in the work plan before you today.

When we learned of the disapproval of the program, we immediately took three steps. First, we stopped admitting students to the program. Second, we captured all of the data that had been available for the site review team and preserved it in hard copy for future reference. Third, we began to identify strategies to strengthen the assessment component of the program, as well as other aspects about which the site team registered concerns.

The plan before you articulates what we have done so far to address the team's recommendations. It also outlines what we will do in the next seven months to enhance the quality and quantity of data for students in the program and to make the data easier to access.

The plan is constructed in three parts:

1. A narrative overview,
2. A timeline of actions taken or to be taken, and
3. A matrix that lists recommendations from the PESB visiting team. The matrix also describes goals, actions, and individuals responsible to address the recommendations.

I'd like to take a few minutes to summarize for you what we have been doing and plan to do to improve our assessment process. I'll also address how we intend to improve the way we communicate our assessment process. Then I'd be glad to answer any questions you may have.

Through the elements of the work plan, we will:

- Enhance program leadership and faculty participation;
- Achieve better coordination and centralization of assessment;
- Reorganize the self-study and exhibits to make them more accessible; and
- Increase student outcome data in LiveText relative to state, federal, and professional standards.

I'll now address each of these elements in some detail:

First, we will enhance program leadership and faculty participation:

- We recently hired Dr. Tracy Pellet who came to us from Minnesota State University, Mankato to serve as associate vice president for undergraduate studies. He will take a leadership role in all specialized accreditation and oversee the university's academic assessment program. He has had extensive involvement with the application of NCATE standards and led the effort to achieve NCATE accreditation at MSU Mankato. When he arrived in July, Dr. Pellett began to provide a fresh perspective on the assessment system for our residency teacher preparation program and recommend ways we can improve both the system itself and the way we communicate about it.
- Each of our endorsement areas is led by a faculty member who has primary responsibility for coordinating the work of the program. They will ensure that all Ellensburg faculty as well as faculty at other locations understand and actively support the components of the assessment system that are specific to endorsement areas. They also will lead the faculty through a review of outcomes data and program modifications, and report the results of the endorsement area's work to all constituents.
- We recognize that less autonomy and more commonality of process are needed. We have designed common reporting formats and timelines that will allow us to monitor progress in all of these areas more closely.

A second area for improvement is better coordination and centralization of assessment:

- Because the lack of aggregated data was a common theme in the report from the PESB visiting team, we have expanded the duties of the research and evaluation office of the College of Education and Professional Studies. The office will be directed by Dr. Jim DePaepe who has served as a statewide and national consultant in the area of assessment. Dr. DePaepe will oversee all data collection, summary, analysis, and presentation to internal and external constituents. His office will make aggregated data available to program faculty for their review and analysis.
- We also are expanding the points of entry to the data. Previously, data were only accessible on-line through an individual class: one could review student progress on artifacts that were assigned to the class. By clicking on the artifact, one could then view the standards that it was designed to measure. In this redesign, we will provide a point of entry to the data through the state standards as well as through individual classes.

A third strategy for program improvement is to reorganize the self-study and exhibits to make them more accessible.

- Clearly we didn't communicate effectively the four transition points that constitute our assessment system and the multiple sources of data at each transition point that determine a student's continuation in the program. We intend to reorganize the evidence to make it more transparent.
- We will provide both electronic and print copy versions of summary documents for each transition point from which viewers can drill down to see greater detail as needed.

Our work plan's fourth component is to increase data in LiveText relative to student outcomes for state, federal, and professional standards.

- As you may know, LiveText is a widely used, web-based tool for developing, assessing, and measuring student learning. CWU has used LiveText for this purpose since 2003.
- Some of our endorsement area programs did not provide a full complement of data on student learning outcomes. Our goal is to ensure that every faculty member and endorsement area program committee fully understands how the unit has agreed to assess student learning outcomes and is fully conversant with Live Text. Therefore, we have required all program faculty to participate in a two-day work session on September 17 -18. On those two days, we will work with individual faculty members and programs to ensure that common artifacts and accompanying rubrics exist for all standards. We'll make certain that required student work products are clearly specified in course syllabi for all sections of classes in which artifacts are embedded. Faculty will build artifacts and rubrics where there are gaps and they will review existing artifacts for fairness, accuracy, and consistency.
- To ensure that we have a full complement of data by April of next year for all endorsement programs, faculty have been instructed that students cannot earn credit for work products associated with artifacts until they have loaded their work products to LiveText. In addition, faculty must critique all student artifacts by the date grades are due at the end of each quarter and our LiveText coordinator, Dr. Ian Loverro, will run quarterly reports providing evidence of compliance.
- Faculty will be required to review LiveText reports related to courses in their programs for the purpose of analyzing student performance and making associated changes in the program.

Work Plan Timeline

The next section of the work plan provides a timeline for the completion of the activities articulated in the work plan. I would like especially to emphasize the cyclical nature of the reporting and monitoring component of the plan. These are not one-time improvements. We are committed to incorporating an on-going dynamic, responsive, and continual assessment/improvement process.

Compliance Matrix

In the last section of the work plan you will find a matrix that outlines goals related to each of the team's recommendations. This section tells how we plan to meet each goal and specifies who is responsible for carrying out each action included in the plan.

Examples of goals include:

- Clarifying the systematic and comprehensive nature of the unit assessment system and its linkage to the outcomes of the conceptual framework;
- Ensuring all endorsement areas are participating in the LiveText portion of the assessment system and utilizing the assessment system consistently, regardless of location (on-campus and at the university centers);
- Ensuring endorsement areas collect, compile, summarize, analyze, report and utilize data; and
- Continually monitoring program use of the assessment system.

CONCLUSION

Thank you again for the opportunity to come before you with a work plan that shows how we will address your concerns about our residency teacher preparation program. We take your concerns very seriously and have worked hard to resolve the problems you identified.

Central Washington University is eager to do what is needed to demonstrate the quality of our program to you and to the citizens of the State of Washington. We hope you will agree that the work plan we have presented substantially moves us toward that goal.

Based on the work plan, I am requesting that you continue the approval status of CWU's Residency Teacher Preparation Program through April 2008 at which time we will host a focused visit from a PESB team.

Dr. Soltz invited questions from the board.

GOOD-BYES/TRANSITIONS

Chair Van Glubt reminded the board that with the return of Jennifer Wallace as executive director, Dr. Lin Douglas has stepped down as interim executive director of the board. Chair Van Glubt expressed her personal appreciation to Dr. Douglas for her leadership in keeping the board organized and efficiently functioning for the past year. Members each conveyed their personal and professional gratitude to Dr. Douglas for all her hard work on behalf of the board.

Chair Van Glubt adjourned the meeting at 2:38 pm.