

Licensure Working Group
Summary of Notes: May 25, 2016 Meeting
Leaders/Facilitators: Brian Devine and Liz Losee | Note-taker: Matt Deninger

Meeting Participation

Dan Murphy	Mickey Buhl
Lindsey Liese	Christine Power
Bev Miyares	Kelly Fitzgerald
Allan Cameron	Theresa Fisher
Sharyn Boornazian	Rob Powers
Tom LaLiberte	Tamika Estwick, ESE
Traci Almeida	Matt Deninger, ESE
Theresa Melito-Connors	Brian Devine, ESE
Daphne Germain	Liz Losee, ESE
Annette Sullivan	Heather Peske, ESE
Nick Balasalle	

Introduction

- Brian reviewed the notes.
 - A working group member raised a question about whether the recommendation to eliminate coursework for the preliminary license that's potentially duplicative in MTEL applied to all coursework.
 - The answer is that there would still be some coursework required. ESE would eliminate only the coursework whose content was duplicated in the MTEL.
- Brian continued with the welcome and procedural checks
 - If working group members have great ideas after the fact, they should feel welcome to send those ideas in to Brian.
 - Brian's team provided some waiver data for the working group.
 - Brian also noted that ESE need to be judicious about the data requests that we can fulfill
- Heather signaled to the group that the recommendations will not include major revisions to the MTEL (it's statutorily required, etc.). We may consider minor revisions to some of the MTEL.

Initial License

- **Brian reviewed the purpose of the Initial license (aka "provisional with advanced standing")**
 - Bachelor's degree (statute refers to appropriate to field)
 - Assessment in subject matter knowledge & communications and literacy
 - Completion of an approved preparation program OR other program approved by Commissioner OR interstate agreement OR PRPIL
 - Core teachers need an SEI endorsement
- **Brian outlined some of ESE's streamlining recommendations**
 - Clarify that PRPIL is available through an ESE approved provider.
 - Some candidates think they can invent their own PRPIL (not knowing that the only way through is via ClassMeasures – the approved provider of PRPIL).
 - ESE is proposing that it would set parameters in an RFR that would require public reporting, a set of expectations for administering PRPIL, etc.
 - ClassMeasures currently doesn't offer SEI endorsement

- Question from the group: could a district apply to be a PRPIL provider if there were an RFR?
 - Answer: It would all depend on the parameters for the RFR and the merits of the proposal
- Could the district or school sponsor someone through PRPIL?
 - Answer: It would all depend on the merits of the proposal
- Some working group members agreed that ClassMeasures should not be the only provider of PRPIL
- Some working group members would be more comfortable if there were sufficient coverage of content via courses, etc. Others pointed out that there's not sufficient research that would suggest that more coursework = better teachers.
- Suggestion to open up PRPIL to more license areas
 - Many agree, but there was some hesitancy regarding the severe disabilities area. The working group seemed comfortable with opening it up to more areas.
- Suggestions to streamline and clean up the language
 - Many agree with streamlining proposals for the now-defunct NCATE, though some caution against making it too open-ended and therefore allowing the potential for any accrediting body to gain approval by the Commissioner
- **Other recommendations regarding the Initial License**
 - *Initial* and *preliminary* are synonymous! The working group is excited about the prospects of changing the naming conventions that the difference is clearer
 - The working group also suggested that ESE be more explicit when granting the license, and naming which pathway the candidate took to get to the Initial license. If we're going to have a two-tiered system, we might want to consider calling this out in the actual name of the license.
- **Additional questions re the Initial License**
 - Could we revise the statutory language around a bachelor's degree appropriate to the field?
 - The licensure requirement is different from the program requirement
 - The group continued to explore the tension between content and pedagogy, and what kinds of credentials signal sufficient content knowledge. Some working group members were supportive of ESE making a strict interpretation of the statute re a bachelor's degree appropriate to the field, and others were supportive of a looser interpretation.
 - How many people come through PRPIL? And into which licenses?
 - It's reported on our Title II website
 - Approximately 300 people go through it each year

Initial Extension

- **Brian reviewed the requirements/purpose of the Initial extension**
 - Change the name from "renewal" to "initial extension"
 - Give people time to apply (allow them to do it in their fifth year)
 - Working group members were concerned with striking the balance between giving people enough time to complete their requirements and pushing them to complete everything
 - Require that they've applied for the Professional license
 - Maybe take the correspondence about the professional license and embed it into the extension. Be very clear in the letter.

- Although eight people agreed with the recommendation in the survey, why require someone to apply for both an initial extension and the professional license (and pay both fees) to receive the extension.

Professional License

- **Brian reviewed the requirements/purpose of the Professional license**
 - One year of standing under an Initial in statute (three full years of employment under Initial in the regs)
 - Should we match the statute? Or should we change the statute to match the regs?
 - Many working group members made points about professional licenses and how it should hold **meaning** (like a career teacher), and therefore three years seems like a minimum
 - What about three years of employment under the preliminary?
 - What about three years of employment under an equivalent out-of-state license?
 - Completed a Master's degree or equivalent
 - Demonstration of successful performance
 - Term is good for 5 *calendar* years
- **Brian outlined some of ESE's streamlining recommendations**
 - Condense the approved routes to licensure to eliminate the scattered options as they exist now
 - Eliminate the ESE-sponsored performance assessment (it doesn't exist anyway)
 - Though this could be part of a new professional licensure program
 - 450 PDP option
 - Would we delineate the proportion of PDPs allotted to particular content/pedagogy areas?
 - Specific concern that this could open the "wild wild west," and allows the school/district to determine each step of the career continuum because all districts are PDP providers. State should retain some autonomy – be careful in moving too much responsibility to the districts/schools.
 - A compromise could be a minimum number of graduate credits (i.e. a minimum of 8), and then an equivalent number of PDPs per graduate credit (i.e. 1 grad credit = 45 PDPs?), making 12 credit equivalents in the end.
 - Do this in a way that forces teachers to reflect on their practice "from outside the echo chamber"
 - Be careful about the difference in quality between PDPs and graduate credits
 - Difference between the Professional license and those entering the profession. The licenses mean different things at these stages.
 - Could the PDPs educators acquire during their initial license be applied to the professional? Most educators don't know that they don't need PDPs until their professional!
 - Are PDP's effective? Are graduate credits effective? Could there be a portfolio project (ala National Board Certification) that is vetted by an outside group? Is NBC effective (what does the research say)?
 - If the candidate has completed an approved program, that should be sufficient (the state shouldn't be digging into individual courses to judge the kind of content/pedagogy within those courses)
 - Working Group appreciated the creativeness of the idea, but did express a concern over Licensure Office capacity to review applications for Professional on a PDP

basis since it would unlikely to be done on an audit basis like the current license renewal process.

- **Other recommendations regarding the Professional license**
 - There was specific concern about taking things from regulation and putting them into guidance – guidance can be changed without public/BESE scrutiny
 - Should we require some kind of leadership training or experience to get the professional license?
 - Include content-based pedagogy that is more flexible than is currently permitted in the 12-credit pathway
- **Questions re the Professional license**
 - For those entering Massachusetts from out of state, they will need the three years and induction.
 - There’s no great incentive to get the Professional license (the reward is beginning the license renewal process)
 - 150 PDPs to get it renewed
 - The clock is ticking faster

What worked?	What could we improve?
The survey was good to prompt thinking before the meeting	Send out the survey ASAP, and provide a larger window.
Great to hear so many professional voices in the working group	Use the survey results more during the meeting
	Provide a flow chart of the licenses

Parking Lot from 5/10

- MTEL as a barrier to licensure – what are the alternatives?
- Options for completer of out-of-state program without MTEL and without experience?
- PRPIL
- Is the MTEL aligned with Common Core?
- Specifics on the Panel/Competency Review
- Interpretations of regulations

Parking Lot from 5/25

- Change the license names (so that they actually make sense)