

**Licensure Working Group**  
**Summary of Notes: May 10, 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	Sue Lane, DHE
Traci Almeida	Beth Shevland-Trepati, MTA, Observer
Jill Flanders	Lauren Greene, ESE
Tamika Estwick, ESE	Matt Deninger, ESE
Theresa Melito-Connors	Brian Devine, ESE
Daphne Germain	Liz Losee, ESE
Annette Sullivan	Heather Peske, ESE
Nick Balasalle	

## Introduction

- Senior Associate Commissioner Peske welcomed the working group to Malden
- Brian Devine outlined the roles and structures of the working group as well as the objectives for the meeting
- Senior Associate Commissioner Peske outlined the purpose of the working group
  - It's one of a many ways in which we're gathering feedback on licensure policy
  - Purpose of the working group is to be our team of trusted advisors that can help us shape some recommendations for the Commissioner
  - While we want to streamline our regulations and make our processes more efficient, we also want to balance that goal with having a meaningful and rigorous licensure system
  - ESE has been engaged in this conversation for over two years now; the timeline provided sets the context for this working group
  - Our goal is to structure this working group in a way that values your time, and allows us to move forward with the work
  - We want to be bounded within the structures we've set forth; if we try to tackle the whole of licensure policy, we will become quickly overwhelmed
  - To be realistic about the change we can make, we ought to stay within the statute; but anything in regulations would be open to examination/amendment
- Liz Losee went over the norms for the meeting
  - Is the product of the group a summary of minutes? A set of recommendations?
    - It will be a collection of ideas from the working group; consensus is not necessary for an idea to be included. We will use these ideas to gather information from other groups of stakeholders. Eventually, we plan to make recommendations to the Commissioner; but not before we gather much more feedback.

## Discussion of Data

- Brian discussed some of the questions that group members had around data
  - People wanted to know the straight breakdowns of temporary license by race
  - People also wanted to know about the numbers of Professional licenses
  - Number of waivers for particular licenses

## Temporary Licensure

- **Brian reviewed the purpose of the temporary license**
  - It's for out-of state educators who want to move to Massachusetts; gives them some time to pass the MTEL
  - Requires that they are licensed in another state
  - Requires that they've worked under that license for three years
  - If they've failed their most recent attempt at the MTEL, they aren't eligible for the license
  - It's good for one calendar year
- **Brian outlined some of ESE's streamlining recommendations**
  - Require a bachelor's degree from a regionally accredited institution
    - Working group members thought this made sense and was consistent with other license requirements
    - No one in the working group disagreed with this recommendation
  - Remove the requirement that if you failed your most recent attempt at the MTEL, you cannot be issued a temporary license
    - Working group noted that the current policy incentivizes people not to take the MTEL until they're granted the temporary license
    - No one in the working group disagreed with the recommendation
  - Remove the practice that ESE issues the temporary license only to candidates who have out-of-state licenses that are equivalent to our Initial license
    - Working group reflected that the policy is designed for those who have three years of experience, and that the kind of license didn't matter as long as those three years of experience were under their belt
    - No one in the working group disagreed with the recommendation
  - What should "one year" be? Grant flexibility on the definition of "one year."
    - The working group liked the idea of being flexible on the one year requirement
    - Several district representatives like the idea of a year of employment (i.e. one school year of employment from the date of hire, or one specific school year – allow flexibility; rather than one calendar year)
    - Some working group members liked the idea of more than one year; though Brian noted that the statute explicitly states "one year"
- **Other recommendations regarding the Temporary License**
  - Some working group members didn't think that the three year requirement made sense (some experience was desirable, but not necessarily three years), though it was then noted that the three-year requirement is statutory. We probably cannot change this at the moment.
  - Most working group members liked the idea of expanding access. There was general agreement that increasing the pool of qualified educators in Massachusetts was a positive thing. Many people in the room agree that we should give more flexibility to applicants. These are the kinds of educators – experienced educators – that we WANT to attract to the Massachusetts workforce – they're experienced and we want to expand access
  - Some working group members believed that we should allow as many out-of-state equivalencies as we can, even for SEI endorsements
  - There was some concern expressed that since preparation programs in MA have become more rigorous, that some educators would seek to go out of state for their prep program, and then coming back through the temporary license - "back door around the rigorous MA prep programs" to get into the profession
- **Questions re the Temporary License**
  - What happens to those who receive the temporary license? Do they become educators?

## Preliminary Licensure

- **Brian reviewed the requirements/purpose of the preliminary license**
  - Five years of employment
  - Bachelor's degree from an accredited program
  - Passed MTEL
  - For certain licenses, a bit more is required in the way of seminars, etc. to prove specialized content knowledge
- **Brian outlined some of ESE's streamlining recommendations**
  - Have ELAR generate an automatic email that encourages/nudges an educator to get into a program
    - Working group noted that they don't currently have the capacity to look ahead and anticipate future licensure needs of their educators
    - No one in the working group disagreed with the recommendation
  - Have a preliminary "parent" license that's good for five years...period (rather than the situation now where one could teach 30 years if they received 6 different prelims)
    - No one in the working group disagreed with the recommendation
  - Should pedagogical knowledge be assessed?
    - Some participants like this recommendation, but many also noted that it would likely be a huge obstacle and limit people with great content knowledge (i.e. some career changers) from getting into the classroom.
    - While many believe pedagogy is important, adding a pedagogy requirement seems less like streamlining and more like complicating
    - Some participants questioned why we would add a pedagogy requirement if the growth data suggest that there's not much of a difference between preliminary and initial?
    - Some participants liked the idea of including some measure of pedagogy, but weren't entirely sure how we might achieve it and give it the right "touch"
  - Only for those seeking the moderate/severe disabilities license, ESE could eliminate some of the "competency review" process by modifying the Foundations of Reading test to include relevant special education subject matter knowledge
    - Working group members were generally in agreement that reducing this competency review process was a good idea, but cautioned that ESE would have to rename the test if we were going to do this, so as not to create confusion
    - In an effort to streamline the competency review process, a pilot for moderate disabilities and severe disabilities is in the process of being developed
- **Other recommendations regarding the Preliminary License**
  - Connect ELAR and EPIMS!
  - Can we maneuver within the subject matter knowledge without sacrificing standards?
    - Several believed that we should try to clear some of these hurdles.
  - Not hitting the mark on the ESL preliminary license – ESL teachers coming through the preliminary license are not prepared in many cases, anecdotally
  - While some people don't feel like five years is too long, but others feel like beginning teachers need time to decide whether they're going to invest in a career
    - Perhaps there could be benchmarks along the way (at year 1 or year 2, the district could have to attest)?
      - This idea, however, could be a complicating factor, rather than something that streamlines or improves the process
      - This idea could not be achieved unless ELAR and EPIMS were connected

- Use the Candidate Assessment of Performance (CAP)
- **Questions re the Preliminary License**
  - Competency reviews – what are these?
    - If there’s no MTEL, statute says that we need to have a competency review process. Seminars, courses, mentoring/coaching. It’s a labor intensive process for both the candidate and for ESE.
    - Do we have data on how many licenses we issue for the competency review areas?
  - How do we get more men and minorities into the profession? And how do we ensure that minority teachers and men stay in the profession and get into a program in time to start building toward an initial?
  - Is there anything we can do to help districts support teachers on preliminary licenses?
  - What is NOTE?
    - It’s in its early stages – a performance/simulation-based assessment. Just an example of a product that may be on the market soon that could potentially assess pedagogical skill
  - How do we strike that balance between content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge?
  - Can we restrict the grade-spans to whom we issue a preliminary license?
    - There’s nothing in statute that would restrict it, but we also know that educator shortage areas differ by geography
  - Can we revisit these recommendations in the context of the Initial license?
    - Most in the working group agreed that we should revisit these thoughts in the context of having spoken about the initial license
  - Could we institute a panel review for anyone?
  - Can National Board Certified teachers be exempt from the MTEL or be given wider flexibility?

What worked?	What could we improve?
Felt safe to disagree	A square room would be best
People were very respectful	Project notes as we go
ESE didn’t shut anything down	Incorporate polling technology, dots, or surveys
Brian facilitated with a smile	Room to give suggestions outside of the meetings?
Detailed agenda and prep work ahead of time	

## Parking Lot

- 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