

Frank Edelblut
Commissioner

Christine M. Brennan
Deputy Commissioner

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Bureau Educator Preparation & Higher Education
101 Pleasant Street
Concord, NH 03301
TEL. (603) 271-3495
FAX (603) 271-1953**

**Council for Teacher Education
Minutes of the January 19, 2023, Meeting**

**A meeting for the Council for Teacher Education was held at 12:00 p.m. on
Thursday, January 19, 2023.**

Brian Walker, Co-Chair, Designee, Plymouth State University
Tanya Sturtz, Designee, Keene State College
Laura Wasielewski, Saint Anselm College
Kathryn McCurdy, Designee, University of New Hampshire – Zoom
Laura Stoneking, Designee, NH Department of Education
Abigail Blais, Hudson Memorial School
Kelly Moore Dunn, NHTI Concord's Community - Zoom
Susan Dreyer Leon, Antioch University New England - Zoom
Diane Monico, Co-Chair, Rivier University College
Shawna D'Amour, Southern New Hampshire University
Kristine Thibault, New England College
Joan Swanson, Franklin Pierce University - Zoom
Chris Ward, Upper Valley Educators Institute - Zoom

The Following were unable to attend:

Michael Fournier, Superintendent, Bedford School District
Nick Marks, Granite State College

Meeting Participation also included:

Kim Wilson, NH Department of Education, Bureau of Credentialing
Bill Ross, NH Department of Education, Bureau of Credentialing
Sue Blake, NH Department of Education, Bureau of Credentialing
Cat Dorfman, NH Department of Education, Bureau of Credentialing
Julie Shea, Rules Coordinator

Chris Schmid, Southern New Hampshire University – Zoom
Cynthia Lucero, Professor of Education Clinical Coordinator, NHTI, PSB Rep - Zoom
Dan Carchidi, University of New Hampshire

I. Welcome, Call to Order, and Introductions

The regular meeting of the Council for Teacher Education was convened at 12:02 p.m. Brian Walker presided as Co-Chair.

A. Approve December CTE Minutes

Motion: Brian Walker motioned, seconded by Tanya Sturtz, to approve the minutes of the December meeting as amended.

Vote: The motion was approved without dissent by roll call vote with Abigail Blais abstaining.

II. Special Guests: Department of Safety Presentation: Criminal Records Check Process

Christine Shea, Supervisor of Criminal Records Unit, and Sergeant Michael Arteaga, State Information Security Officer, were in attendance. Sergeant Arteaga stated they have picked up the portal project.

There are two ways for applicants to get fingerprinted. The preferred method is going to one of seven designated locations. The appointment is made on the portal, pay the fee, get fingerprinted, staff fills out the live scan form and enters the tracking number into the portal immediately. The live scan form gets transmitted to staff. The prints are sent to the FBI, who have 48 hours to respond.

The other option is to get fingerprinted at a local PD. An additional fee may be charged by the police department. The prints are not able to be transmitted automatically. The form is completed, and the prints are mailed to the Department of Safety. The process does take more time.

Diane Monico stated there are hundreds of applicants required to go through the process via individual appointments. She asked if there is a way to set up something with the institutions. Christine Shea responded they have done pop-up events using the

department's portable live scan machines. They can be coordinated with institutions through the Department of Safety. If institutions are sending ink cards in because they have their own live scan machines, do not send in one form of payment for all of the cards. This causes a delay in processing as they have to wait for all of the fingerprinting comes back.

Brian Walker stated Plymouth State does not have a live scan and there is not a location close to the institution. Applicants will have to go the local PD, complete the release form, and mail in the fee. Christine Shea stated they can send check or money order with the live scan form. Brian Walker stated most students do not have checks and money orders are expensive. He asked if there is another method of payment can be added. Sergeant Arteaga asked if 20 or more students are being processed at a time to do a pop-up because it would allow for credit card payments.

Amy Hill, Coordinator of Clinical Practice, Saint Anselm College stated when St. Anselm uses their own live scan, she physically brings it to the Department of Safety rather than mailing it. She asked if it's possible to bring it to the DOE as well. Christine Shea responded they do not go to the NH ED, they still get dropped off with the Department of Safety.

Sergeant Arteaga stated a local PD that uses ink print will need to be mailed to the NH ED. If a local PD sends a live scan card, it will be used to create a phantom portal appointment to link the prints.

Brian Walker asked about the timing between getting fingerprinting and doing the process with NH ED. Christine Shea responded it depends on when results come back from Department of Safety. They have 60 days to process the application. Students should be applying for the NH ED clearance at the same time as making the portal appointment.

Tanya Sturtz asked how the institution can submit NH ED payments. Christine Shea responded a batch check can be submitted with multiple applications.

Brian Walker asked if districts would accept this background check or still require their own before students can work in the schools. Even going in as a volunteer is requiring a district background check. One of the selling points for centralizing the process

was to help students avoid having to pay for multiple background checks. Christine Shea stated a study committee is discussing it with legislature.

Diane Monico asked if students from multiple Institutes of Higher Educations (IHE) can attend the same pop-up event. Christine Shea responded that would not cause an issue. The pop-up schedule must be completed with the names of the students being fingerprinted prior to the event. Release forms must be completed.

III. CTE Committees

1. CAEP Agreement
2. CTE Handbook
 - a. Kathryn McCurdy, Joan Swanson, Laura Stoneking
3. 602-606 Rules
 - b. Chris Ward, Kelli Moore Dunn, Laura Wasielewski
4. Title XV Education 190:1-190:7 (legislative rules – 1951)
5. PSB Update

There was no update. The next meeting will be February 01, 2023.

IV. Program Reviews (Existing and New Program requests)

- A. Review the 2022-2023 Program Approval Schedule and Progress Report Schedule

Laura Stoneking stated St. Anselm has continued work in new program proposals. A progress report has been received from Franklin Pierce by the chairs.

- B. SNHU – Option 1 – Advanced Program Review

Laura Stoneking reported the initial application from SNHU for Option One was received. Kathryn McCurdy has offered to co-chair. Once the second co-chair has been secured, there is already a representative interested in doing the principal's program. The review will be the three advanced programs. The remaining programs will be done through CAEP. The review dates are November 2, 2023 and November 3, 2023.

V. Program Reports (Progress Reports, Approval Reports, National Accreditation Reports)

There were no reports.

VI. Substantive Change Requests

There were no requests.

VII. Administrative Rules Update (602-606)

A. 602 Rules: Review fee structure: Posted in Canvas

Laura Stoneking stated fees in neighboring states: Maine, Massachusetts, and Vermont were reviewed. Vermont is the most similar in terms of size, number of institutions and number of candidates. Maine's is through the general budget. Massachusetts has more oversight and regulation within the fees. A summary was shared of Vermont's fees as well as New Hampshire's reviews, total programs, and approval for each to show the workload. In Vermont, if there is anything below exceptional, there is a two-year report that is done which comes with an additional fee to process and review. It is waived for exemplary reviews. The New Hampshire Board of Nursing also charges a fee for additional reviews as a result of scores reflecting less than meeting regulations.

The New Hampshire fee structure has not changed since at least 2003. They do not reflect the work that is required to complete the reviews. There is nothing to reflect continuation of a review or conditional approvals on a review. The fee structure presented was an attempt to bring fees up to reality, but still does not reflect the amount of work going into reviews.

Kelly Moore Dunn asked if billing will be per program, per unit, per number of people in the program. She also asked how it relates to the cost of national accreditation. Chris Ward suggested a fee cap at a certain level or a sliding scale. Tanya Sturtz suggested some sort of tiered structure with a fee for the unit review and a smaller fee per program. Diane Monico shared concern that there may be an increase in program closures due to increased fees. Closures would most likely be in the critical shortage areas due to low enrollment.

Laura Stoneking stated in some states, national accreditation is the only pathway. Kelly Moore Dunn responded in those states, small programs tend to close, making the only pathway the one large university. The size of a program can prohibit national accreditation.

Laura Stoneking stated another idea discussed is an option where any ed prep completer would not be charged the initial fee to obtain the license. They are looking at student fees vs institutional fees.

Brian Walker suggested a sliding scale for a program on the critical shortage list on the year it is being reviewed. Bill Ross stated the critical shortage list changes every year. There is discussion about the concept of critical shortage going away because it is defined differently by state and federal government.

Chris Ward proposed Option One being a \$2500 flat fee plus an additional \$150 per Professional Educator Preparation Program.

Laura Stoneking asked if the Division is able to take the feedback and come back with a revision. Julie Shea stated the rules expire March 22. A fiscal impact statement is time consuming making the timeline tight. Although the rules are good for ten years, they can be reviewed more frequently given the state of education and the state of the fees. This is an initial proposal and changes can be made prior to the final proposal.

Laura Stoneking stated there is confusion at the NH ED with different names for the same role at different institutions.

Motion: Chris Ward motioned, seconded by Laura Wasielewski, that the CTE accept the changed fees for 602.05, changing Option one to a flat fee of \$2500 plus \$150 per PEPP; for Option two, \$2500; for Option three, \$500 for each proposed PEPP; and for Option four, \$50 for each PEPP.

Vote: The motion was approved without dissent by roll call vote.

B. Discuss/Review the proposed Ed 603-606 Rules: Posted in Canvas

Chris Ward stated at the previous meeting, members were asked to discuss the proposed rules with stakeholders to provide feedback. The rules have been in revision for over two years. They have been looked at in stages by the CTE. They are now together in a single proposal.

Laura Stoneking shared stakeholders at her institution appreciated the edits and the decrease in redundancy.

Brian Walker asked in Ed 604.04 Clinical Supervision, PEPP shall ensure supervision including direct observation and evaluation. He wants to ensure that it can be interpreted for programs like school psychology or school counseling. Psychology and counseling are not able to be observed in the same way as elementary education. Chris Ward responded that section is not an addition. It has been in the rules for the last 10 years. He stated the language should be inclusive of all programs but wanted to be more directive than just supervision.

Laura Wasielewski stated when she hosted interns for school psychology, the institution didn't observe particular sessions. There are other ways to observe: parent meetings, professional learning communities meeting, reporting out on a completed assessment, etc.

Laura Stoneking suggested putting minimum hours for the culminating experience. The current language of comprehensive, prolonged, substantive, and cohesive are not currently defined. Chris Ward stated they kept the previous language, which also did not have minimum hours or days in the rule. Kelly Moore Dunn stated it was discussed. An older version of the rules did have a specific number, but it was removed from the most recent version.

Bill Ross stated there is discussion in the Bureau of Credentialing regarding establishing a minimum expectation of experience hours to be applied for the transcript analysis process. Shawna D'Amour stated if there is a minimum number of hours in the rules, to be sure there is still language to keep it competency based. Laura Stoneking stated certain credentials already have hour requirements.

Kathryn McCurdy asked for the rationale for taking the hours out previously. Kelly Moore Dunn stated it was in terms of semester. There was then discussion about the

length of a semester. Institutions were all interpreting the term semester differently. When there is a review, there is a discussion regarding what happens during the culminating experience, length of the experience, how competency is demonstrated, and the policy for missed time. Bill Ross stated the absence of reference to minimum experience perhaps played a role in a recent issue. Some students weren't doing a field experience, but instead an alternative research experience. A defined expectation may have avoided the issue.

Brian Walker asked why clinical hours wouldn't be counted if they were not part of a culminating experience but were clinically intensive. Laura Stoneking stated for counseling, hours are clearly delineated as to how the hours are accumulated.

Julie Shea stated if all semesters are different lengths, could the semester be defined as being at least 12 weeks. A member stated a problem could arise due to how people pay for college. A semester is a university statement and recorded. If students start before the semester starts, it has to be reported to financial aid. Kelly Moore Dunn shared all content areas contain a statement that students must perform all the roles and responsibilities of that person. All the roles and responsibilities cannot be performed without a culminating experience.

Chris Ward stated research has not yet been done to determine the hours done in a culminating experience within New Hampshire or surrounding states. He suggested qualitative analysis is more important than minimum hours.

Motion: Chris Ward motioned, seconded by Kelly Moore Dunn, that the CTE accept the revisions to the 603-606 rules as documented.

Vote: The motion was approved without dissent by roll call vote.

VIII. Annual Reports

- A. If time allows, begin reviewing the 2022 annual reports.

IX. NH DOE Updates

A. Bureau of Educator Preparation and Higher Education

B. Bureau of Credentialing

Bill Ross reported due to changes to EIS and the recommendation process, some institutions have already begun recommending with the new system. It is easier than the old process. There were some glitches that are being fixed. When programs are being closed, the plan must specify the last date for recommendation. If recommendations are made after the program closure date, it will not go through.

Bill Ross commented on the work of the CCSSO, GSO, NASDTEC, and the U.S. Department of Defense. They are working on an interstate teacher mobility compact. The organizations have drafted sample legislation that has been pushed out to legislature across the country suggesting legislature in that state might want to become part of the interstate compact. Washington was the first state to sign on. When 10 states submit legislation to adopt it, the organization will start drafting the standards which are intended to allow more seamless carrying of a teacher license from one state to another. It would only apply to states within the compact. Kelly Moore Dunn asked if legislature would ask for the Department of Ed's recommendation about that process. Bill Ross was unable to answer that question.

C. NH State Board of Education Updates

Tanya Sturtz stated the State Board did not vote of Keene State's approval. They were not evaluated on their program meeting the standards. They were criticized on the language in their mission statement. She asked if other institutions have been questioned in the same way. Brian Walker stated Keene State CAEP approval was voted on in December at the CTE Meeting. They went to the State Board in January. The State Board of Education tabled the discussion. Tanya Sturtz clarified they tabled it because they were unsure what they are allowed to do and not do.

Laura Stoneking stated the video is available to review. Brian Walker stated members should watch the video and be ready to discuss it at the February meeting. Tanya Sturtz stated Keene State will be going before the State Board again prior to February's meeting.

Chris Ward asked about the evaluation process being used by the Board. There are unknowns on how they are being approved if the Board is not accepting the met standards as basis for full approval. The feedback on the program was an opinion versus based upon the quality of the program created a procedural concern.

Kathryn McCurdy stated the Board stated there were no questions from the report. They felt the report and feedback from the reactors was well incorporated and well written.

Rivier's proposal passed at the January State Board meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion: Brian Walker motioned, seconded by Tanya Sturtz, to adjourn the meeting at 3:04 pm.