

CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

ADVISORY COMMITTEE for EDUCATOR CERTIFICATION REGULATION REVISION

Tuesday, October 28, 2008

8:30am – 1:00pm

ITBD

New Britain, CT

REVISED MINUTES

Members Present

Moderator: Paula Schwartz, Karen Baldwin, Earle Bidwell, Linette Branham, Carol Clifford, Jackie Colon, Joanne Ellsworth, David Erwin, Janet Finneran, Margaret Mary Fitzgerald, Roch Girard, Linda Goodman, Bob Hale, Robert Hiscox, Andrew Lachman, Margaret Liu, Kelly Lyman, V. Everett Lyons, Edward Malin, Marion Martinez, John Mattas, John Mattera, Mary Monroe-Kolek, Carole Pannozzo, Teddy Sablon-Tauris, Jay Voss, Jacqueline Wasta, Jonas Zdanys

Members Absent

Steven Adamowski, Ania Czajkowski, Mark McQuillan

Staff Present

Lol Fearon, Sharon Fuller, Jacqui Kelleher, Georgette Nemr, Nancy Pugliese, Jen Widness

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 8:40am

Overview of Meeting Agenda

Moderator Paula Schwartz welcomed the advisory group back and had everyone introduce themselves and organization affiliation since some members did not attend the first meeting. The agenda for the meeting was distributed.

Review of Minutes from October 16, 2008

Minutes were approved by all in attendance with one change to add that Christine Thatcher attended for Jonas Zdanys.

Discussion after minutes

Discussion was resumed about the proposals presented on October 16 regarding the integrated endorsements and the special education endorsements. Participants were asked to identify strengths, weaknesses and potential solutions.

Following is a chart of strengths and weaknesses discussed.

INTEGRATED CERTIFICATION	
<u>STRENGTHS</u>	<u>WEAKNESSES</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stronger teachers in special education and core subjects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classes too large for full inclusion; need safeguards, look at regulations and how many students can be in class and still maintain standards
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mimics program changes in special education in school districts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of resources in schools to support intensive needs students
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides greater choice and flexibility for scheduling and career 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will content be sacrificed for additional pedagogical training? Maintain content rigor.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater access to regular education curricula 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paperwork – who will do it?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Might help shortage of special education in elementary; options if no elementary positions available, can serve as paraprofessionals or teachers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May have to increase time in teacher prep program to cover all knowledge and skills
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unifies/aligns professional development for teachers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spec ed teachers need more knowledge about spec ed disb; can't get enough special education in integrated
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breaks down barriers between special ed and regular ed; No longer “them and us” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May not be attractive to new teachers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Won't get all special ed kids in one room if everybody is trained, students distributed across all teachers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How going to show excess costs for reimbursement of spec ed costs?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with RTI 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May not attract people into Connecticut from out-of-state; if pool diminishing will feel effects first in Bpt, New Haven, Htfd
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More training on assessment -use of data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on Praxis II elementary about content not process. Will there be new tests?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers need knowledge to work with special education/difficult behavior students – they are in our classrooms now 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will out-of-state teachers be eligible for positions? Every time we raise standards we think it won't attract teachers but opposite happens as it did with administration. Need to rethink special education in district and how it is implemented like reading specialists are utilized.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special education teachers currently don't have content knowledge -students being short changed in content 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to make regulations <u>VERY CLEAR</u> about what integrated certification and special education certification holders can do. (case manager versus teacher)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Balancing recruitment versus retention (teachers will leave profession if not trained to work with all students) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-integrated teachers would not have same flexibility as integrated teachers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speeds up skill development of new teachers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All current teachers need training on competencies; if left to professional development, creates inequity in training of veteran teachers. Need to get regular ed teachers who have content knowledge the skills to work with spec ed students so that we don't shortchange those students and can get them ready to meet standards/CAPT. Not meeting demands of students in classroom. Teachers are not trained to deal with these types of students. Need this type of training in teacher prep and get experts in spec ed.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Boils down to how districts staff their schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State has to fund professional development; districts don't have money

INTEGRATED CERTIFICATION	
<u>STRENGTHS</u>	<u>WEAKNESSES</u>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team meetings for professional development for competencies -have to be very structured to make good professional development
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New teachers versus veteran teachers – now 2 groups -veteran teachers need training in competencies to equate with new teachers
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recruitment for special education role
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers leaving due to expectation to work with large classes that have many special education students
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fear of special education teachers not being available to assist regular education students and special education students in regular classrooms
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Culture in schools need to change so that students don't need to be labeled in order to get services
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harder to do at secondary level
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If push more into teacher prep, the program gets watered down; can require every teacher to teach spec ed students without changing name of certificate;
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change in teacher prep process raises questions of how and in what direction? Program approval process requires demonstration of how we know what we know about candidates and how to create curriculum that meets the needs of schools, state and national standards. IHEs need to do a better job to be responsive to needs of sped students in reading and content. Process of making change in IHE is grueling. Time for implementing change has to respect the process within the institutions.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not preparing master teachers, a new teacher gains a wealth of experience year after year; new requirements will provide additional training at the pre-service level and better prepare them and move them along the process more quickly. A lot will boil down to school structures—how we pull-out students how we utilize teachers. Weakness at the secondary level. In small districts, must have at least one intervention specialist. We don't hire a speech clinician without a master's and spec ed is equivalent to speech. Beef up callroom teachers for mild disabled students; more intense needs need more specialists.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May limit pathways to getting into teaching.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The naming of endorsements as “integrated” should be reconsidered.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

<u>STRENGTHS</u>	<u>WEAKNESSES</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support teacher could manage resource room 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recruitment of secondary special education teachers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cert regs support goals, initiatives and moral imperatives; goal of increasing knowledge and skills, greater access for our students changing ways that schools must function to meet needs of all students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is continuum of services going to be delivered? Don't know spec ed support teacher role in new continuum of services. Challenge in helping parents understand how needs of students met in a very different delivery model.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I fully implemented, will reduce the number of identified IEP'd students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In small districts, special education teachers must be advanced intervention specialists -don't want to put added time/money requirements on schools because of requirement to hire special education intervention specialist
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gives opportunities to teachers to expand into new areas with new strengths 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why hire special education support teacher? Limited flexibility -if only have inter special education teacher, do we constrict pipeline?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consolidate two spec ed endorsements into one 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same requirements as 90-hours – allows for team time and personal activities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District to decide who can teach in which setting and who is best for certain students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows for more teacher input
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If can reduce the number of spec ed students, reduce the number of spec ed teachers needed, focus resources on primary instruction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need for quality professional development programs
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should be based on improving student performance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most spec ed teachers leave because of paperwork

Discussion of Proposed Increased Professional Development Requirements:

Proposal reflects original intent of CEU Program from Ed Enhancement Act of 1986. Need to strengthen the way in which the 90 hours are met and enhance the skills of current teachers. Need a bottom up model for determining PD needs. Clearly clientele has changed, need to make the 90 hours meaningful. Involve RESCs in helping districts assess needs, design and implement PD plans. Focus PD on work of teacher teams and data teams based on student learning data. Clarify needs of the PD based on training for veteran staff to meet needs of diverse learners. Concerns voiced about increasing hours; initial plans for implementation in 1989 were not fulfilled. Also concerned about lack of infrastructure for CEU record keeping.

Presentation of Educational Leadership Continuum:

Slides were presented outlining proposed requirements for a new Teacher Leader Endorsement, revisions to the Intermediate Administrator Endorsement and the Superintendent of Schools endorsement.

Comments:

Lachman: Teacher leader endorsement will be a contract issue for districts; may raise hurdles rather than serve as incentive for leadership position.

Bidwell: Makes sense.

Hiscox: need to increase number of years of teaching experience for admin cert, not decrease it to 4 from 5.

Malin: change in admin cert does not address issues of people accepting admin positions. Needs to be an incentive. The competencies are helpful to higher ed defining on skills needed.

Kolek: new teacher leader endorsement helps teachers gain specific skills. Then can go on to become admin.

Lyman: Concerned about teacher leader requirement if serving more than 20%. Should it be required if serving more than 40%?

Continuation of Discussions on Nov 6:

We will pick up with other outstanding policy questions at next meeting including the elementary subject area major requirement and consideration of increasing number of professional education coursework prior to admission to a teacher preparation program.

Next Meeting:

Next meeting will be held Nov 6, 2008, at ITBD in New Britain at 8:30 a.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:00.

Respectfully submitted,

Paula Schwartz