

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

Department of Public Instruction – GEF 3
125 South Webster Street
Madison, WI
January 22, 2018

The Professional Standards Council (PSC) convened Monday, January 22, 2018. The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Chair Diana Callope.

Members Present (via conference call or in person):

Lisa Benz, Deb Dosemagen, Kimberly Marsolek, Andrea Pasqualucci, Joanna Rizzotto, Sherita Kostuck, Amy Traynor, Diana Callope, Elizabeth Lingen, Barbara Van Doorn, Elizabeth Hayes, Kym Buchanan

Members Not Present:

Gus Knitt, Peggy Hill-Breunig, Brad Peck, Karla Schoofs, Rachel Hellrood

Others Present:

David DeGuire, DPI; Ariana Baker, DPI; Tony Evers, DPI; Sheila Briggs, DPI; Mike Thompson, DPI; Jennifer Kammerud, DPI; Jeff Baas, WEAC; Kim Kohlaas, AFT

CALL TO ORDER

Chair, Diana Callope, called the meeting to order at 9:00 A.M.

ROLE CALL

Ariana Baker, called of the names of each PSC member so they could announce if they were in attendance. Also for any observers to announce their presence.

It was noted that the public meeting notice was posted.

REVIEW OF AGENDA

M/S/C

REMARKS BY STATE SUPERINTENDENT EVERS

Dr. Evers welcomed the members of the PSC to the meeting and thanked them for all of their work. Last month the DPI submitted a draft of a rewritten PI 34 to the Legislative Council, and we are currently accepting public comment and holding hearings around the state. Re-writing PI 34 is a very complicated process and he wanted to express his thanks for the help the PSC has provided and also to extend his apologies that the PSC was not made aware of some last minute changes to the rewrite before it was handed in. The draft contains ideas from the Talent Development Framework which the PSC worked on and also from the Superintendent's Leadership group. As he stated earlier, we are currently in the middle of public hearings, and we will also take the comments and thoughts of the PSC into consideration before it advances to the Legislature. Today we would like to focus on Section 10, which concerns the misconduct section, you have been provided with an updated version that has been

revised since the draft was released. We are looking forward to hearing your thoughts and comments today. Many thanks to the PSC for the important role they play!

REVIEW OF OCTOBER 9, 2017 MINUTES

M/S/C

REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED PI 34 RE-WRITE

David DeGuire, Director of Teacher Education, Professional Development and Licensing (TEPDL) team, opened the discussion with reference to the handout that the group had received prior to the meeting, an updated version of Section 10 – the Educator Misconduct section. The goal during the rewrite of PI 34 was to be more transparent, this something that was really strived for in the misconduct section. Essentially, there are two options we would like to have: 1) Suspending a license and 2) a letter of reprimand, which would acknowledge that misconduct has occurred, however not severe enough to remove the teacher from the classroom. This entire section was added to the rewrite just before it was submitted, which is why the PSC was not notified about it prior.

Questions or comments regarding this section:

- Q: How is this new to PI-34? Was this a standalone section prior? Or has it always been a part of PI 34?
 - A: This has always been a part of PI 34. Mandatory reporting is a process that already occurs.
- Q: Under the Investigations section, 1B – Is “Immoral Conduct” defined?
 - A: “Immoral Conduct” is defined in statute and also at the beginning of 34.094 in the “Definitions” section sub 7.
- DPI Comment: One of our goals was to make this section more consistent and transparent to the public. We have been hearing many concerns about the “Boundary Violation” 34.094 sub 3 (a) and (b). Many of the comments are that this section will put a chill on the relationships and trust that students have with their teachers. Due to the feedback we have been receiving, we have completely removed that section.
- Q: Where did that section come from?
 - A: We looked at language from other states. There has been a move nationally to
 - Q: Which states? Can we reach out to those states to see how this is working for them?
 - A: Not sure which states were looked at. The goal of this section was to transparency, we wanted to outline the types of situations that sometimes get people into trouble. Due to the comments we have received, this language has been removed and we do not intend to bring it back.
- DPI comment: Kim Marsolek, you had reached out and expressed particular concern about this section, how are you feeling about this rewrite?
 - A: Feel a lot better about the rewrite.
 - Q: During the hearing process, will the public be commenting on the write of the original rewrite document?
 - A: The public will be commenting on the original rewrite document, as we cannot insert changes in the middle of the hearing process. We wanted the PSC to see this first.
 - Comment: Prefers not to have the “Boundary” language included.
- DPI comment: What else are you hearing from the field?

- Comment: We are mostly hearing about the “Boundary Violations” section. Explanation needs to go out to the field about why it was necessary to include this information in the first place.
- Comment: It seems that the “Boundary Violations” section was what people have really been focusing on...have people looked at any of the other changes? What comments are you receiving?
- PI 34.029 Tier 1, district pathway license, has also received a lot of comments and has since been updated. The public has shared concerns of a school district being the endorsing body.
 - Comment: Concerned about the word “may” in sub 2 (c). Using this word still gives the administrator the power to act as an endorser.
 - DPI Comment: We decided to use the word “may” because if we required the school districts and candidates to go back and work with an Educator Preparation Program (EPP) that is what is currently in existence. We are looking to offer a different pathway for those that do not want to go back to an EPP to take courses.
 - Comment: Not comfortable allowing that to happen, I don’t have faith in administrators to make sure this process is rigorous enough.
 - DPI Comment: The school district/administrator will not determine if the program they create is rigorous enough, either a partnering EPP or the DPI will be making that determination.
 - Q: Looking at sub 5 (b), can EPPs expect school districts to come to them and ask the EPP to endorse a particular candidate?
 - A: EPPs now have the ability to review materials submitted by a potential candidate to determine if what the candidate has done is equivalent to what the program offers.
 - Comment: The EPP would still be doing the endorsing, however how the assessment of the materials is done may be different.
 - Q: What would an administrator be submitting on behalf of a candidate in order for the candidate to obtain the new endorsement?
 - A: The school district will be determining the professional development, possible courses that need to be taken, mentoring, workshop attendance, etc. The candidate will then need to put together a portfolio showing evidence that they are proficient in the content guidelines for either the DPI or an EPP to determine if they are eligible for the endorsement.
 - Comment: The administrator is still designing the “curriculum” for what that educator needs to do. There is no model that has yet been developed that will determine how a school district or administrator determines what an educator needs to do or complete.
 - DPI Comment: There are a few districts who already have a similar system already in place. MPS for example is working to develop classes to offer and have significant resources already developed.
 - Comment: There is already a lack of professional development opportunities for educators, work still needs to be done on this.
 - Comment: This still comes down to trust. Lots of districts have limited options.
 - DPI Comment: This is a pathway and another options for already licensed teachers. The district helps develop a plan to help train the candidate in becoming proficient in this new role. This pathway was designed with teachers in mind, another option other than

needing to return to an EPP. The intent of this option is not about the allowing an administrator the ability to design a program for educators.

- Comment: Concerned about the administrators that are not going to see it that way.
- Comment: Concerned that this option may be abused, we've heard about smaller districts that have difficulties filling one or two sections, it seems with this pathway option a teacher may end up being forced to fill these unfillable sections with no support.
- Comment: Why could this not be started as a pilot? At this point, we have no way of knowing how this will work.
- DPI Comment: Licenses are a property right of the educator, not the district. An employer should not be forcing a teacher to obtain something they don't want, it may happen, but that is not the intent of this pathway. We want to allow well-prepared, high quality teachers to expand their repertoire without having to take the extra time and cost commitments to add-on another license.
- Comment: Would like this more defined regarding what the administrator role is and what their abilities are.
- Comment: This could be helpful for small districts.
- Comment: What is an EPPs motivation to accept a candidate's portfolio and offer the endorsement?
- Comment: This is concerning, EPPs do not have the capacity to review portfolios. This process seems similar to the License Based on Equivalency (LBE) process.
- DPI Comment: There is no reason EPPs would not be able to charge candidates for the portfolio review. This is a part of the recommended partnering.
- Comment: Most districts that EPPs have worked with in the past have no idea what the content guidelines are for each content area. We need to keep in mind there will be a learning curve if districts choose to work independently.
- Comment: Concerned about the damage that could be done by this pathway. Like the idea of a pilot.
- Comment: It seems that it is the educator's decision if they would like to use this pathway. I'm not getting the impression that the administrator will be deciding anything, rather their role is supportive. If an educator doesn't feel like they have a supportive administrator they can choose to go down a different pathway. Ultimately the DPI or an EPP will be endorsing, not the school district.
- Comment: If this pathway will be used to expand the license a grade or two, that doesn't seem too drastic, however when adding on other subjects, this could be a bit of a pitfall.
- DPI Comment: When the Leadership Group originally discussed this, it was to help retain teachers. An opportunity to provide professional development and expand their current license.
- Comment: We keep hearing that this is for teachers, however I don't hear about this being an issue in the field. I'm not hearing that teachers are looking for this option, rather it seems more reactionary for administrators. What this a question that was asked in the educator survey?
- DPI Comment: This pathway idea came from a need to address the shortage areas that we are experiencing throughout the state. This is not as much of an issue in urban districts, it is more of a rural district issue. We do have the need for educators to have the opportunities to add on more certification areas.

- Comment: EPPs are often asked to interface with candidates, school districts and the DPI...we see that as a good opportunity.
- How do you feel about consolidating the subject areas – music, science, social studies?
 - Q: Can you comment on how this affects AP courses and upper level courses?
 - A: Right now educators have to have subject specific licenses for upper level courses. For example if an educator is teaching Physics, they need to hold a Physics license.
 - Q: Will this impact what EPPs need to add to their programs in order to endorse for a Science all license?
 - A: Yes.
 - Q: How will this affect current license holders?
 - A: This will go into effect for incoming educators. It will take a while to get the content guidelines redone and then for EPPs to implement the new guidelines.
 - Q: How will the DPI get this information out to current educators?
 - A: We are still working on how to get this information out to the field.
 - Q: Have there been any further conversations regarding the concern of adding on grade 4 to what are now called Early Adolescence to Adolescence licenses?
 - A: Not really, it seems to be a small change just adding on one more grade.
 - Comment: Understand that it seems a small change, however 15 years ago this license was grades 6-12, then it moved to grades 5-12, so it just seems that this is a very broad grade range that just keeps expanding.
 - Q: For the K-9 option, there was no reference to a minor. For example, right now for the K-8 license they need to have a minor in one of the content areas. Will the minor still be required?
 - A: WACTE requested that the minor requirement be taken out. See PI 34.048 sub 1 (a) – rather than a minor, the new language states that the candidate will need to have at least one course in the curriculum content for Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies.
 - Comment: EPPs are under pressure to stay at a 120 credit limit, adding on the broader ranges makes this very difficult and poses serious challenges to ensure that the teacher candidate is prepared upon completion of their program.
 - Q: In section PI 34.050 the PK-12 section, Speech and Language Pathologist (SLP) is listed here, but it is not listed in the Pupil Services section. Also, the grade ranges are not listed in the Pupil Services section, shouldn't they all be PK-12?
 - A: SLP is a teacher license, not a Pupil Services license.
 - A: We need to revise the Pupil Services section, they should all be listed for grade ranges PK-12.
 - Comment: It's interesting that SLP is considered a teaching license. Isn't this the license that is being looked at for a possible cross license with the Department of Safety and Professional Services?
 - Comment: Concerned about the Special Education licenses expanding by both grades and categories. How will EPPs ensure that candidates will get the training they need in 120 credits? The concern is less about classroom preparation and more about field experiences.
 - Comment: Agree with this concern, very uncomfortable with the broad range for special education.
 - Comment: The more broad licenses are made the less confident I feel in that candidates content knowledge. Concerned that candidates will be going out into the field with

- these very broad licenses that are not qualified in their content. On the other side of this, I'm anxious for the 4-12 range, where you may have an educator that is really confident in their content knowledge, but are they ready for the middle school child?
- Comment: Consolidating both the content areas and increasing the grade ranges at the same time is concerning. Would feel more comfortable if it was one or the other, not both.
 - DPI Comment: We are trying to look at all the factors that make great teachers great teachers. We don't want licensing to be the barrier to a teacher being able to expand their repertoire.
 - Comment: It is one thing to make some of these considerations and options for the experienced/veteran teacher and another for the brand new educator that just completed 120 credits.
 - Q: Is there a way to slow this down and not have a K-12 license right away?
 - A: We currently have K-12 licenses, the Early Childhood to Adolescence (EC-A) license. In order to make this happen it needs to be put into rule now. Keep in mind that the first group of K-12 Special Education educators will not come through the pipeline for several years. As it will take that long to re-do the content guidelines and implement them.
 - DPI Comment: Regarding the consolidated license areas, math is a consolidated content area. How many secondary math educators would feel comfortable teaching AP Calculus fresh out of their program? Probably not most, it is something they work their way towards.
 - Comment: It is a good thought, however the reality is that administrators put teachers into sections they are not comfortable teaching.
 - Comment: There is a section in most contracts regarding involuntary transfer.
 - DPI Comment: The Leadership group asked the EPPs if it is possible to maintain quality by going this route. The EPPs said they could do this while maintaining quality but it would take time. Putting this into rule starts the ball in motion. There was discussion about adding in a deadline for EPPs to establish their implementation plan however it was determined that a deadline would not be helpful to EPPs and not all EPPs have the same resources. For now, EPPs will continue to endorse for what they are currently approved for. Once they have established an implementation plan they will need to go through a new program approval process. This is most likely at least a 5-7 year plan.
 - Comment: Going back to the "Boundary Violation" section, it was stated that you looked at what other states do. Social Workers have a code of ethics that is embedded into every class. In the Social Work profession this is something that we highly regard. Perhaps you could take this into consideration for the ethics section.
 - DPI Comment: We could look at having a presentation next fall at a PSC meeting regarding ethics and highlighting what other states are doing.
 - Comment: When all of this is rolled out, want to make sure that teachers are not targeted for not wanting the "boundary language" in the rewrite.
 - Comment: It would be great if there was more guidance regarding ethics. We see a lot of apprehension from novice teachers about this section.
 - DPI Comment: We are looking to be a lot more transparent. We wanted to make sure there was a section about what is OK for teachers to do or not do.

In conclusion, there are two more hearings that will be held this week for public comment. We are also accepting write-in comments through the end of January. It will take a few weeks to review all the

feedback. We plan to have the PSC convene in February to hear the feedback that has been received and to go over the final rule. The final draft will be submitted to the legislature sometime in March. Once it is with the legislature there are three assemblies that will review it and during this process they can hold additional hearings, ask us questions, ask for reviews to be made, etc. We are anticipating this being finalized by fall.

Motion to adjourn

M/S/C

anb