

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COUNCIL (PSC)

DPI-GEF 3
125 South Webster Street
Madison, WI
June 16, 2017

The Professional Standards Council (PSC) convened Friday, June 16, 2017. The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Chair Kim Marsolek.

Members Present:

Deb Dosemagen, Margaret Doering, Kimberly Marsolek, Brad Peck, Michael Uden, Heather Strayer, Andrea Pasqualucci, Rachel Hellrood, Katie Roberts, Peggy Hill-Breunig, Joanna Rizzotto, Sherita Kostuck, Gus Knitt, Katie Roberts, Karla Schoofs, Carmen Manning

Members Not Present:

Diana Callope, Lisa Benz, Amy Traynor

Others Present:

David DeGuire, DPI; Shandowlyon Hendricks-Williams, DPI; Ariana Baker, DPI; Michael Thompson, DPI; Carole Trone, WAICU

It was noted that the public meeting notice was posted.

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Kim Marsolek called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM.

REVIEW OF AGENDA

M/S/C

REVIEW OF APRIL 3, 2017 MINUTES AND MAY 2, 2017 MINUTES

M/S/C

UPDATE AND DISCUSSION ON JUNE 2017 EMERGENCY RULE

David DeGuire, Director, Teacher Education, Professional Development and Licensing (TEPDL), and Mike Thompson, Deputy State Superintendent, reintroduced the topic of the Emergency Rule that would be released on Saturday, June 17, 2017. The Emergency Rule was based off of the recommendations of State Superintendent Tony Evers's Leadership Group, which had used parts of the Talent Development Framework that the PSC had helped to develop. Prior to the meeting, the PSC had been provided with the final draft of the language that would be released to the public. David and Mike informed the group of a few last minute changes and additions and also asked the group to share any final questions or concerns. The addition to the rule was creation of a JROTC license, which is a license created for applicants that holds a valid Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps instructor certification from the US Army, Navy, Air

Force, or Marine Corps. This license was added to the emergency rule at the request of a legislator. Also, David informed the group that Section 13, PI 34.21 (4) was originally only for non-Special Education licenses, however after consulting with the Special Education Team at the DPI, it was determined that it would be OK for Special Education licenses to be included in this option. The conversation was then open to questions from the group:

- Can you explain a bit more about the 3-year license option? *We still have not determined how the 3-year license will advance. The school district will need to attest that they will be providing support for the educator on the 3-year license to get a full license*
- So what will be provided in the application? *The school district will attest that they will be providing support to help the teacher become proficient.*
- One of the members shared her concerns about this pathway, it seems to be opening up a “certification mill” pathway. What will DPI be developing to ensure that the proper steps are being followed? *Those are good concerns, which is why we are working under an emergency rule first rather than moving straight to permanent rule. We need to ensure that school districts are not short cutting the licensure system. Districts that do not have the capacity to provide the required training will need to work with another institution to ensure they are getting the proper training.*
- The PSC’s role is to get to the root as to why we are struggling to fill positions and why we end up needing a route like this one.
- If certification through this route becomes transportable after 3 years, how will districts be aware that someone received a certification via the “School District” route? *How do we know now? How do we know if someone has received a license via an Alternative Route or out-of-state? We don’t ID people who have received a license via a content test. So this is really no different.*
- DPI will still ultimately be determining who is eligible for a license. *If an educator does not meet the requirements then, no, they will not get a license.*
- Will DPI be monitoring the school districts that repeatedly do not meet requirements for licensure? *We can look into that to see if it is an option.*
- Could the Archdioceses be considered a school district? Private schools run into the same issues as public schools. Is this pathway an option for them as well? *That is something we need to consider.*
- Section 34.21 (1)(c) reads that the “candidate meet all licensure requirements” – so if a master’s degree is required, candidates need to meet that requirement, correct? *Yes. This rule is for someone who has a DSPS license, and needs to meet further requirements in order to get a DPI license.*
- The plain language analysis says that you can hire someone with only a bachelor’s degree, this is the line that is confusing people.
- Is this eliminating the need to educate Speech and Language Pathologists (SLP)? Or does this allow someone to have an emergency license who only has a DSPS license? *SLP is the only area that we have not issued emergency licenses for in the past. Due to changes in ESSA we are able to use this option now.*
- Regarding out-of-state candidates, some of which are veteran teachers, what are their options for edTPA? *If they have at least one year of experience in their state, they do not need to take the edTPA.*
- Does that also apply to the Foundations of Reading Test (FORT)? *No, the FORT is a statutory requirement. With the ELO system, it is difficult for out-of-state candidates to*

know which application to choose. We are hoping the emergency rule will be able to narrow it down for them.

- *The emergency rule will be released June 17, 2017. We are then hoping to have a draft of the permanent rule completed by the end of July 2017. We are required to have at least one public hearing; however, we are hoping to have at least 4 in various locations around the state in order to make sure we are getting enough feedback.*
- *Pieces in this emergency rule will then be permanent? Yes*
- *This goes into effect 6/17/2017. We are holding a public hearing on 7/6/2017 at the DPI.*
- *Will we see the final product before it goes to permanent rule? Yes*
- *When PSC Members get emails from outside organizations, how do we respond? Encourage people to attend the public hearings or send in written comments.*
- *How long is the process from emergency rule to permanent rule? 150 days for the emergency rule, then possibly two extensions of 60 days each.*
- *Life licenses and other budget proposals*
 - *We still really don't know where the proposal is at.*
 - *Joint Finance is working on other parts of the budget at this point.*
 - *We met with the legislative bureau and encouraged them to move from eliminating 10 to 5 positions on the TEPDL team, not provide a life license to an initial educator, and to allow the DPI to continue the background check process rather than the SDs.*
 - *We are hearing a lot of mixed feelings on life licenses.*
 - *We don't know if anything else will be added.*
 - *We have not heard anything regarding no longer providing National Board stipends to those that qualify.*
- *A lot of these rules will have significant impacts on Educator Preparation. We need to make sure that we give EPPs time to review. We will be working with WACTE in order to go over the recommendations.*

WISCONSIN TALENT DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

David DeGuire, presented the group with a draft of the Educator Survey for the group to review prior to the survey going out. David went over what was currently in the survey. He reminded the group that the questions were generated by the PSC, as well as duplicate questions that were carried over from the School District Survey that went out at the end of last school year. One concern that was voiced was that the data that was received from the Educator Preparation Program (EPP) Survey has been very hard to aggregate, so we want to make sure we are asking a variety of questions in a format that will make the data easier to read. The whole group broke into smaller groups to discuss various portions of the survey: retention, teacher leadership, and recruitment. Below is the feedback from the discussion.

Retention:

- Discussion regarding adding another section, the way the questions are currently written it seems they are mostly around professional development.
- There were several questions that a member had brought along after receiving feedback from other colleagues in her district:
 - Does your district promote longevity, if so, in what ways?

- Are there any incentives provided to staff for remaining in the district 5, 10, 15, 20 years?
- What type of salary structure is offered in your district (salary schedule, career ladder, merit pay)?
- How would you rate the level of trust between administrators and teachers in your district?
- Are there accessible and fair processes for you to have your professional concerns addressed?
- How would you describe the leadership structure in your district? Top down, distributed, collective?
- What are the types of decisions that you believe teachers should be included in making? Does this happen in your district?
- Have you given serious thought to leaving your district?
- Discussion about adding “unsure” as another option in addition to “yes” or “no”
- The group also wondered if adding “Please explain” in the answer section to try and get more information.

Teacher Leadership:

- Added a question: “In your school/district, how are leadership roles assigned?”
- Added a question: “How much of a voice do you have in decision making in your school?”
- Add a question: “Are you interested in leadership opportunities?”

Recruiting:

- Discussion about adding “I wish they would” to the “yes” or “I don’t know” answers – decided that it wasn’t consistent with the format of the entire survey.
- This section is targeting teacher perceptions – what do they think their districts do.

Diversity questions:

- Added a question: “What could/should your school or district do to diversify the work group?”
- Requested we add in a bit more biographical information: gender, developmental level they teach, type of school they are in, race/ethnicity.

David closed the discussions on the survey by discussing the final logistics. He asked the group when they felt the best time to send out the survey would be. The group determined it would be best to send it out now and leave the deadline open through the summer. They suggest having Tony Evers send out a letter to district administrators informing them about the survey and to ask that they encourage their teachers to fill out the survey. We will also be working with the professional organizations, school districts, EPPs, and DPI data to get the survey out to educators.

TEACHER SUPPLY AND DEMAND DATA AND ANALYSIS

Brad Carl, from the Wisconsin Center for Education Research (WCER), presented to the group data that he and several others have been working on based off of the school district survey, WECAN information, licensure data, and the 1202 staff report.

[2017_SD_DPI_b.pptx](#)

[Licensure & Emergency Credential slides for DPI 6-6-17 summary.pptx](#)

After going through the power point with the group, Brad concluded that based off of their findings, the data is showing there is not as much movement due to salary schedules as we had thought. Brad then opened the discussion up for questions and comments:

- It would be interesting to see the regional differences as well as subject differences.
- Geographical parts of supply and demand do not seem to line up.
- Unique teachers is defined as unique individuals as opposed to teachers working in multiple assignments.
- There is a huge jump in people who are on emergency licenses for multiple years...
 - Why?
 - Is it because of edTPA? FORT?
 - Why do we have so many more openings?
 - We often look at this as EPPs providing enough people to fill openings, but often we look at how many educators are leaving the profession to create openings.
- There is a changing population of who is going to college now.
- Is this issue unique to teaching or does this have to do with all professions?
- There are shifts all the time in what people choose to do as a profession.
- What questions do we need to answer in order to make good policy?

REVIEW AND PRIORITIZE ATTRACTING RECOMMENDATIONS FROM STRATEGIC PLAN

David DeGuire provided the group copies of the Talent Development Framework pertaining to Attracting future educators to the profession, which the PSC has been working on for the past few years. He asked the group to review the document and based off of what the group had identified earlier, he wanted them to determine what main ideas they wanted to recommend to the Leadership Group to focus on, as they will be turning their attention to attracting. Below is the group's discussion points:

- Really likes the idea of CTSOs – Component 1, #1.
- Like, Component 3, #3.
- Like the idea of a Workforce Data Center – Component 2, # 1.
- All three recommended activities in Component 3.
- Option 4, under Component 1.
 - There is nothing listed for options under Special Education and Speech and Language Pathology – proposed that we expand option #4 from Component 1, to provide grants to existing teachers to move into high needs areas.
- Creation of a career path for K-12 students to start teacher prep in high school.

- Began discussing that it is hard to attract teachers to the profession based on the current climate. Does something need to be added in about this?
 - All educators need to do a better job of elevating the profession.
 - A lot of teachers feel they are not valued.
 - There needs to be a class required for administrator's to take during their preparation regarding school climate.
 - Review relationships with administrators and teachers.
 - Before Act 10 teachers had a voice. We've been struggling since.
 - Where is there a high rate of turnover?

The group determined that there was not enough time to discuss License Conversion, which was the last item on the agenda and decided to hold off for another meeting.

AGENDA SETTING

- Requested a meeting in August to continue discussing the emergency rules and see where we are at with the permanent rules.

M/S/C

anb