



Frank Edelblut
Commissioner

Christine Brennan
Deputy Commissioner

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Division of Educator Support and Higher Education
Higher Education Commission
101 Pleasant Street
Concord, N.H. 03301
TEL. (603) 271-3495
FAX (603) 271-1953**

**Council for Teacher Education
Minutes of the May 19, 2022, Meeting**

**A meeting for the Council for Teacher Education was held at 12:00 p.m. on
Thursday, May 19, 2022.**

Brian Walker, Co-Chair, Designee, Plymouth State University
Tanya Sturtz, Designee, Keene State College
Linda Kalloger, Layperson
Michael Fournier, Superintendent, Bedford School District
Laura Wasielewski, Saint Anselm College
Kathryn McCurdy, Designee, University of New Hampshire (via Zoom)
Laura A. Stoneking, Designee, NH Department of Education
Abigail Blais, Hudson Memorial School
Kenneth Darsney, Franklin Middle School (via Zoom)
Kelly Moore Dunn, NHTI Concord's Community College
Tom Julius, Antioch University New England
Nick Marks, Granite State College
Diane Monico, Co-Chair, Rivier University College
Cathy Stavenger, Southern New Hampshire University
Joan Swanson, Franklin Pierce University
Chris Ward, Upper Valley Educators Institute

The Following were unable to attend:

Jamie Malhoit, Kearsarge Regional School District-SAU #65
Kristine Thibault, New England College

Meeting Participation also included:

Kim Wilson, NH Department of Education, Bureau of Credentialing
Bill Ross, NH Department of Education, Bureau of Credentialing
Shawna D'Amour, Southern New Hampshire University
Anise Statin (phonetic), Southern New Hampshire University
Pat Corbett, New England College (via Zoom)
Dan Carchidi, University of New Hampshire (via Zoom)
Jed Donelan, Dean, College of Liberal Arts, Franklin Pierce University (via Zoom)
John Villemarie, Franklin Pierce University (via Zoom)
Sonya Prince, Franklin Pierce University (via Zoom)

Welcome, Call to Order, and Introductions

The regular meeting of the Council for Teacher Education was convened at 12:03 p.m. Co-Chair Diane Monico presided.

A. Approve the April CTE minutes.

Motion: Linda Kalloger motioned, seconded by Abby Blais, to approve the minutes with correction.

Vote: In a roll call vote, motion passed without dissent, Laura Wasielewski and Kathryn McCurdy abstaining.

CTE Committees:

A. Committee meetings and updates.

Joan Swanson reported that the May Professional Standards Board (PSB) meeting started with a presentation by Amanda Phelps on rulemaking, ending with identifying the rules that will be reviewed for '22-'23. The State Board Chairman Drew Cline spoke on credentialing and stated that declining enrollment in teacher prep programs was a concern. The State Board of Education is considering whether the level of credentialing required can contribute to a critical shortage alternative route. The State Board is looking at degrees less than a bachelor's as potentially qualifying for credentials. There were questions as to whether the bar has been set too high looking for competency but not necessarily the traditional path. The State Board also wants to know the rationale behind the PSB requested changes.

Joan Swanson continued reporting the PSB approved an amendment to Ed. 504.11 Education Interpreter/Translator for Children and Youth Ages 3-21. The Master Teacher license proposal has received funding to do a test panel pilot of a portfolio process. A team is working on recommendations for Ed- 507.48 Comprehensive Marketing Educator and Ed 507.49 Comprehensive Business Educator. They hope to have an initial proposal to present at the June PSB meeting. The subcommittee working on Ed 507.17 ESOL Teacher, reported they are examining standards in light of new

ESOL research. There was discussion of a work-based Learning Coordinator; Study teams reported that they put out a survey and they will be reporting on the responses to the survey. There will be another survey regarding Ed 513.01, 513.03, 513.04, 513.05, 513.06, pertaining to professional development masterplan and renewal, looking at what other states require regarding their credentialing. There was also a discussion of members terms that will be expiring.

Bill Ross elaborated on the comprehensive management/comprehensive business program, stating that the subcommittee is leaning toward recommending the comprehensive marketing endorsement be allowed to expire, and the rather small number of people who hold that credential only, be converted over to comprehensive business; moving forward there would be the comprehensive business credential. With regard to the standards for the ESOL group, a potential consideration is to add language that specifies an ESOL candidate must possess a minimum competence in English language communication, in other words, be able to read, write, speak, and listen in English. The administrative rules Ed 513's, the license renewal rules are under review. It is expected that the subcommittee will reach out to a broad spectrum of stakeholder groups, including this group at some point.

Bill Ross then spoke of the survey conducted throughout the state and across the country asking all jurisdictions if they have a credential for a work-based extended learning opportunity coordinator. Nine jurisdictions have responded, eight allow high school students to get high school credit for work-based extended learning opportunities, and only one of the jurisdictions has a credential required for someone to oversee that process.

Joan gave a list of the administrative rules targeted for PSB review in '22-'23 as follows; Career and Technical Education Teacher, Career and Technical Specialty Certification, Visual Arts, Reading and Writing Teacher, Reading and Writing Specialist, Elementary Mathematics Specialist, and Credential Renewal and Validity.

Laura Stoneking shared that a PSB member did express concern after State Board of Education Chair Cline left the meeting and the presentation that the Board wants to look for competency-based pathways that maybe available. Laura noted that she and Steve have looked at, a pilot that they'd like to propose to some institutions that have licensure only for folks that have an expired recommendation. The State Board is forming a subcommittee specifically to look at all current licenses under the Ed 500s, determining if licenses are necessary, can be combined, or if there are areas that don't need educator license.

A brief discussion of the make-up of the subcommittee led to the conclusion that the designation of members to the committee is in the hands the State Board, not the Department of Education; however, Joan Swanson asked if it would be appropriate to request that the CTE have representation. Such a request will be considered. Bill Ross suggested that if such a request is made, it will be wise to make that request directly to the State Board.

Program Reports:

B. Franklin Pierce Report

Co-chairs were Pat Corbett and Linda Kalloger. After thanking Franklin Pierce for hospitality, Pat reported on three main areas:

- Clinical partnership and practice program documentation and evidence reviewed showed growth and potential in this area. The handbook and strong partnership potentials were impressive. The feedback received from principals and cooperating practitioners was--- the students are very flexible, they're ready to go when they walk in the classroom. Sonja Prince had developed a comprehensive system of record keeping for the clinical experience that clearly identified field hours. Areas needing more growth in varying levels of experiences include providing practitioners with necessary documentation to make a smoother and informative early field experience.
- Candidate assessment, as the comprehensive system develops, there is on-going work that needs to be done. A system is in place to collect data, moved from paper and pencil to electronic, data is organized, the data points that you can collect, your gate check points were clear. The transcript review process was impressive, including the standards on that tracking sheet and meetings with the student, having the student sign off the licensure check list. With all that in place, the next step is for the system to be analyzing the data; it's collected, it's there, it's available, it can be managed and it just needs to move into that clear cycle of data.
- Program assessment has many comprehensive systems in place, with on-going work to move forward to the next level. There is this a solid framework, there are the standards clearly outlined in the courses. The next level would be the addition of individual rubrics after receiving feedback from the reviewer visit, then implement a plan to collect the data at the course level and the program level, further analyze it and work with it.

Linda Kalloger began the discussion of individual programs and the relevant assessment work done in that area; all reviewers rating the programs effective.

- Student progress was monitored and there was a secondary education program, for example, the Gateway program has just one and two TCAPS and they had a feedback survey form.
- Many courses address the need to increase diversity at Franklin Pierce University.
- A learning/education lab has been implemented; it is a great workspace for the students.

- Extra test preparation was implemented to promote student success in the required state testing.
- A Mometrix program and this information is shared with the history faculty to help advise them in their programmatic development of a plan to upload all data in student progress information.
- Faculty advisors worked closely with students to monitor and ensure success.
- Most courses that included a technology component reviewer felt that more needed to be done in that area.
- Field experiences were added to the certification program.
- A plan is in place to address student retention. There was consistent monitoring, partnering and measuring the student-teacher in track.
- Community outreach - Franklin Pierce offers workshops with the community on diversity, violence, or suicide, or whatever, they reach out to the community and provide workshops and they offer feedback from student surveys and put this into practice.

Linda ended her presentation by sharing one of the things that all the reviewers commented on, there wasn't always a clear distinction in the difference in graduate and undergraduate courses as far as different assignments or assessments. This observation was shared with the University.

Reactors for the Franklin Pierce report were Shawna D'Amour and Michael Fournier. Michael Fournier expressed appreciation and understanding of the tremendous time and effort the reviewers and Franklin Pierce University personnel had put forth in this undertaking. He raised several questions based on the written report that made it clear that the relationship between the content faculty and education faculty is very strong which is a real strength, particularly since this report is recommending conditional approval.

Discussion regarding what would go into a progress report versus an annual report took place.

Michael Fournier asked: What is the requirement for candidates with respect to Praxis 1, 2 and Foundations of Reading? The concern was for the statement of one of the elementary reviewers who in the commendations, indicated that they are commending Franklin Pierce for strong foundational classes in literacy, when elsewhere in the report it was stated that there were students taking Foundations up to 5 times, so what is accurate based on data, or is that anecdotal?

Joan explained that 5 times is an extreme outlier. In a recent assessment meeting almost all of practice boards have significantly changed from last year; that's because of the program metrics.

Michael Fournier continued with one more observation and a recommendation that: the chairs remove the table under Number 4, that table is not located on any other review – so it just—it looks different and it stands out, so as the State Board reads this, they may take a look at it question it; removal is recommended.

Laura Stoneking indicated that the reviewer was pretty adamant about having the table and would suggest moving it to the Summary.

Michael Fournier requested clarity in a statement on Page 24, 3rd paragraph, last sentence stating that the library has purchased software, the Mometrix and students and staff have been trained to use this to assist in test preparation or practice and it says core content or both. Since this is a final report, it should be definite. Joan Swanson clarified that it was both core content and test preparation.

Michael Fournier and Shawna D'Amour both stated this report demonstrates that all PEPPs are effective, but yet the report recommends conditional approval. There can't be a conditionally approved unit with effective PEPPs, it just doesn't add up logically. And the other thing shared was because this report comes from this group, gets a stamp of approval and moves on to the State Board. Everything that Pat and Linda said was very positive, encouraging and uplifting, this report does not demonstrate that. This report is much more critical and that's fine. But there's a lot that needs to be done and there's a history of things that have needed to be done and he fears that this will get tossed back to the CTE from the State Board.

Shawna also asked questions for clarification.

- On page 11, under Number 3, it was in regards to Special Ed; it recommended that candidates experience a range of roles and responsibilities, would it be helpful to specifically state the experiences they would get if followed to meet the licensure requirement. They have 105 hours, one of the report states of field experience, so they clearly get a lot of opportunity in the field at all levels. So maybe just make that a little clearer.
- Did the review include any training for the cooperating teachers and the university supervisors for the – liability and calibration of the substance and sum of the data?

Joan Swanson responded that at the beginning of every semester, there is training for supervisors all together, we have training meetings with the cooperating and host teachers one-on-one and then the host classrooms, we also have communications with them.

- On page 22, Number 3, the second part where it says, Annual Reports for just the following recommendations. This is talking about the Life Science program and there are 13 standards and 4 of the standards demonstrate and need improvement rating and it went through the reasons why, which was very helpful; is it helpful to put what will be done at some point?

Discussion regarding what happens next with the report, and when the report goes to the State Board of Education took place.

Shawna finished by stating that she did notice multiple times just the need to differentiate between undergraduate and graduate assignments and assessments.

Discussion took place regarding whether Franklin Pierce can respond to the report. The group discussed past practice and even in a rejoinder, new evidence cannot be submitted after the review has take place.

John Villemarie stated that he thinks the process always works best when it's collaborative. Being able to see information from colleagues who have different expertise and different information, we can really grow the program, so just opportunities to make it dialogic. He certainly would support as the perspective of an end user who witnessing the visits and he has been on several visits, I've chaired visits, I've done it in New Hampshire and out of state. What makes it work best is just the idea of collaboration and ways to avoid the term of rebuttal certainly didn't seem what I would hope to work towards as one which would be met or suited would be one of clarity, so that we can have a clear target for program improvement.

Dean Jed Donelan indicated that he didn't want to get too much into this, it's not his field. He expressed frustration at what was being indicated, the tension between everything being effective, and yet conditional approval and then the amount of recommendations that were being asked at this time. Hearing the positives—you've made such progress, you have such good systems in place, we're going to borrow them for our programs--- so there did seem to be a little bit of a disconnect between some of the thing we were hearing and some of the things that were stated in the report and then the idea of a conditional approval.

Laura Stoneking commented that her experience has been that any program that had any unmet standards, it was considered, at minimum, needs improvement. And there was lengthy discussions with the reviewers and with the chairs, and they were adamant that they felt that the content itself---the content standards were met. The assessment system and the clinical partnerships and practice were not, and therefore why the differences between the two. Laura S. would have presented this as each of the content saying you know, two need improvement. Because if you read the criterion within a needs improvement, that's really where all of those programs show unmet standards along with the other--- the three focus areas are Program assessment, Candidate assessment and Clinical Partnerships and Practice. If it's more reflective to remove those elements from the report, happy to do so, if you would prefer that we go back and pull the review team together to parse out some of those pieces, happy to do that as well.

Michael Fournier hoped to make a reasonable recommendation, which was that some small group go through the report, Abby made a good point with respect to when we train reviewers, we always say, if they've met the standard, they've met the standard, because these are minimum standards. There are pieces of this report, in my opinion, that we probably just need to clean up, maybe remove some things, add some things, make it more reflective and accurate, particularly if there are inaccuracies from Franklin Pierce that are in the original evidence. Once those things are adjusted, bring it back to this group, if we have time to do that, to look at it again.

Laura Wasielewski added to what Michael said and the Council spent some time talking about being consistent in how we write our reports that go before the State Board.

Discussion took place regarding CTE Rule 602 (10) Review, Reports, and Recommendations and 602 (06) Option 1.

Co-chair Diane Monico posed a logistics question since Michael had recommended thinking about the timeline. The expiry date is August 30th 2022. So, we can bring that back to the Council in June.

Motion: Michael Fournier made a motion, seconded by Chris Ward to table the Franklin Pierce Report so that the Co-chairs under the guidance of the DOE can revise the report with input from Franklin Pierce to be re-presented to the Council for Teacher Education at their June 16th meeting.

Michael Fournier recommended that whatever concerns the institution has should be put in writing, so that we know what it is you are concerned about, and Laura S. or the co-chairs can look at that and say, here are some areas that we have some concerns about that they can look at – that the evidence was in fact there, and someone can weigh that back and forth. To Laura's point, we have worked really hard to make sure the reports are consistent and symmetrical, in terms of how they are presented. It sounds like a lot of good things that have come out of this, it may not change the outcome of the recommendation, but at least the report will be consistent and congruent with the recommendations.

Vote: In a roll call vote the motion passed without dissent, Laura Stoneking, Diane Monico, and Joan Swanson abstained.

Diane Monico asked if Franklin Pierce had any questions about process. Hearing none, she thanked Franklin Pierce guests for joining us. Will be on the agenda for the June meeting.

Program Review Updates

A. UVEI (Upper Valley Educators Institute)

Laura Stoneking informed the group that the program review report is anticipated for the June meeting. Upper Valley, submitted factual corrections, the chairs and Chris have met and it's in final draft merging MOU in as we speak. So that is almost completed.

Laura Wasielewski stated that she is a reactor to that report and found out that Diane Monico is the other reactor.

B. Saint Anselm

Laura Stoneking reported that Saint Anselm is on the list, their PEPP request is going into the Higher Education Commission, Tanya and Chris are meeting on Monday. And Laura S. is still gathering reviewers for Saint A's, so we're not planning a CTE review of them until the Fall.

Laura Stoneking stated that she has secured five or six of the reviewers and three tentatives. She has a world language new applicant, a repeating reviewer that needs to have the name put forward and a chemistry reviewer repeat. Other than chairs, there's not a lot of IHE representation, and so she is putting a call out to you to check your people at your places. We're looking for definitely physics and visual arts. If you have or know someone send them my way.

In regard to the Higher Education Commission it was approved through Higher Ed Commission with stipulations under their approval, meaning that the chairs of this review would invite a Higher Ed Commission representative and include them in the process; to align their approval as well.

C. Keene State College:

This is just a placeholder on the agenda for now.

Program Reports

A. AUNE (Antioch University New England) Progress Report, State Board of Education update

Tom Julius had a couple of follow-up questions; and stated that it went very well at the State Board of Education.

Antioch is preparing to submit a secondary Progress Report the end of August. They are doing some really good work based on feedback received. The reviews indicate a full re-review in October. Tom Julius wanted clarity on what's involved in a full re-review, whether that includes another site visit? Where do the rules explain the process that should be followed while Antioch is still under conditional approval? Does a full re-review require a full report?

Laura Stoneking, Chris Ward, and Kelly Dunn contributed to the discussion with regard to the use of another MOU, the fact that a request for a formal review and payment of a fee does not apply in this case because there are elements of this process that this Council has not encountered. There are a significant amount of unmet standards that limited progress had been made which means the initial review and the progress report, that requires looking at that comprehensive system, verification of what is implemented, in process, and being used. The institution has until February 2023 to put this into place and have it demonstrated.

Rather than call it a re-review, it should be considered a focused review towards the standards that weren't met, but CTE has to keep the door open to say to the institution the progress report may not be enough for us, we may need to interview and have conversations with the faculty and students, all those things that wouldn't happen with just a progress report.

The group discussed examples of both Saint Anslem and Rivier University both having been in this situation in the past.

Tom Julius continued with another matter related to not being able to enroll a full cohort for a starting group in the summer. The University made the decision to not enroll a new cohort for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Special Education, so there won't be candidate assessment data for students who have completed the program. There will be a system and data for the students that are in the system, and there can be simulated data for here's how the system will work when students complete, but there will not be completed data for students who have completed the entire candidate assessment system. Tom was checking to make sure the system and available data would be acceptable.

Ken Darsney, Kelly Dunn, and Laura Stoneking responded that if there is a system in place that reviewers are able to review, such as a software package that you purchased in order to be able to do this and see where it is that the information would be entered, so it would be, once there was information, it could be reviewed in the future. So even if there are no students enrolled in a particular area, but if the same system is used with other programs, then it can be said that this is what it looks like in the program under review, and this is what we'll do when we have these students and that is also a demonstration, so you'll have some data.

Tom Julius then proposed a hypothetical question, given that the University administration may at the end of the fiscal year could decide to close licensure programs and some students that are currently enrolled as science students who would not be scheduled to graduate until after February 2023, so the question is, is there an option to teach out, if the University were to decide to sunset the program, the science program and our licensure approval ends in February, would we be able to teach out those students beyond February?

Brian Walker explained that there is a process in place that had been used by Plymouth State University when an advanced program was closed in January 2021, the University submitted a substantive change that these programs were closing and then requested an extension to accommodate the teach-out plan.

D. NEC (New England College) progress report

The New England College progress report will be presented at the June 2022 meeting. Chris Ward and Kelly Dunn co-chairs acknowledged that they were hoping it will be ready by June.

Substantive Change Requests

A. Keene State

Tanya Sturtz presented the Keene State Substantive Change Report involving programs that were put on hold.

- Last summer the secondary science teachers' program was put on hold. All the different areas, including science secondary ed, are on hold, and in the process of teaching out. However, at Keene State College it's a critical shortage area and it is a program the College wants to bring back. The College are currently teaching out not admitting anyone right now, but we're still collecting data and all those pieces in hopes that we'll acquire a full-time tech person in a year or two. Thus, the expiration aligns with all the unit and program expirations in hopes that the science education program is revived.
- Modern Language-Spanish was put on hold. The faculty member was part of all this, and we have not had students consistently in that program. Currently, there is only one candidate left and he's in training in Methods this fall, so I took that into account. So that program on Modern Languages will be done as of 12/30/2024; it will take this next year and the following year to complete the program as we teach it out.
- The early childhood program had a faculty member who mainly taught the work into grade three was let go last summer, so our early childhood program is down to one faculty member; this required making submissions to put the licensure for the 3rd grade on hold this year. The early childhood program is on hold because when they admit students into the program, they have one more cohort going through which is why it will finish up as of next spring and the expiration date would be to 12/30/2023 allowing a semester for students who may be finishing up testing or any other things.

Tanya Sturtz provided additional information on why the programs were on hold, stating that making these substantive changes that don't have the same end date is purposeful. For Modern Language, the faculty member who was teaching it is coming back to teach the student out, and there is a science educator doing methods and student teaching and working with the secondary faculty so that is all set to teach out the students in all those programs. And our early childhood program also has somebody to teach it out.

Discussion regarding when this substantive change request should be submitted took place. Tanya Sturtz then agreed to save this Substantive Change request until next year to submit to CTE because it doesn't affect any of the information that she provided; it's on the College website, students know they can't sign up for certain programs.

B. Saint Anslem

Laura Wasielewski began the discussion by stating that the Saint Anslem Substantive Change Request is being brought to the Council for informative purposes. There's a change in the program, but it doesn't seem to impact the program.

- The first change is in the graduate program in Special Education that we are adjusting the total number of credits from 44 to 37 credits, the faculty teaching those courses do not see that it impacts significantly, and I've the matrix that the standards are still met in the context of those courses, even though there might be tweaks to the assignments.
- The second change: Multiple pathways for licensure. Initially we proposed a 4 plus 1, because our college only basically gave permission to offer 4 plus 1s, they have since, the Board of Trustees have since allowed us to open up to non-Saint Anselm graduates, so we are adding multiple pathways to the Special Education graduate program. 4 plus 1 will stay; we're also adding a pathway for accelerated program, if you will, for non-Saint Anselm graduates or Saint Anselm graduates. The A and B could be one; that one pathway is an accelerated program whether you're Saint As or non-Saint As grad. And then C is for the license educators, could go into the graduate program in Special Education. And we would look at specifically at the I add the internship here. And I can talk more about the internship.
- The third change is that in talking with our students, they would, those that graduated in secondary really would like to continue in secondary and those that graduated in elementary, really would like to continue in elementary or some students would like to have the choice of elementary and secondary. Although certification is K-12, we've embedded into our initial proposal for example, everyone that takes the 5, 10 course has to learn about transitions and transition spanning, so that if there's specific content, it's embedded in the courses and then in the full-year internship, whether you're focused at elementary or secondary you would still have subsequent experiences and observations and visitations at other schools.

And then the third proposed change is that 3 of the 4 summer courses are offered online rather than face-to-face, so in essence, 9 credits out of 37 will be offered online. So those are proposed.

Laura Wasielewski discussed having conversations with partner schools and being approached by partners that have never approached them before, requesting that we think more creatively and more competency based. In order to fulfill a need, we're listening to them and that helps them to get what they need as well.

Discussion regarding partners in Special Education in both private and public schools, using summer school for supervised student teaching credits, or administrative licensures took place.

Motion: Tom Julius motioned, seconded by Linda Kalloger to accept the Saint Anselm Substantive Change report.

Vote: The motion was approved without dissent by roll call vote with Laura Wasielewski abstaining.

Laura Stoneking clarified that this matter does not go to the State Board if this doesn't require a change in their current approval or Board approval.

Administrative Rules

A. Review the Updated 602 Rule Proposal

Chris Ward started with the discussion of 602 rule, we're looking at the Substantive Change Rules primarily today and then there's also the action by the State Board, Records and System of Notification, and Comment section for the 602-14 Substantive Changes.

Christ Ward explained the Substantive Change Proposal. Kelly and Chris thought it worthwhile to actually establish what a substantive change was, rather than just say, it's something that goes beyond what's indicated by the assessment system. So the CAEP policy seemed to provide a pretty good list of criteria. The strategy was to try to have a little more clarity about what constituted substantive change and not just changes beyond those indicated by the assessment system and make sure that CTE has an option to say that if it doesn't affect the terms and conditions, the choice would be to retain, which is what we did today, with Saint A's.

The group discussed using examples to see if the criteria worked for establishing substantive change, defining the word significant and a proposed measure of 30 percent change as significant. No conclusions were reached and Chris offered that maybe if we are able to disagree and say it's not significant, that is the debate we should have here. Such decisions require judgment which cannot always be measured numerically.

Tanya Strutz indicated that she struggled with whether to share at this meeting and felt she should share things that are happening, so that all people know that in a year we're going to wait on that substantive change. The dialog is helpful.

Tom Julius suggested a little bit of word-smithing. For C-2, the example of a program that was going to eliminate TCAP as an assessment tool, that would not be an addition. So, shouldn't all three of those say a change?

Abby Blais asked if it is too broad to add a term that says the CTE would determine what is significant. Chris Ward acknowledge Abby's point and elaborated that if CTE determines that the changes affect the terms or conditions or the original approval in some ways, those are significant if it affects the terms of the approval?

602-15 C 2. – Conditional approval not to exceed 7 years. Chris began a discussion of the next section on the Board actions. The proposed change is that the conditional approval be changed from not to exceed 7 years to not to exceed 3 years. It is considered significant because no one should have conditional approval for that entire term, necessary changes to conditions should be made in three years and made clear that it's a 3-year term and you still have progress reports and still go through whatever has to be done.

It seems that this has been the practice, Chris is not aware of conditional approval, that have exceeded 3 years.

Discussion took place regarding the collection of data and the program assessment process. The group questioned the identification of "from beginning to end".

Chris Ward stated that he, Kelly, and Tom have had the same conversation. Moving forward Chris would like to take all the feedback received over the last few months, put it into a single edited proposal, bring it to the Department of Education, so that Laura, Bill, Steve, and Sue Blake can be part of this revision because when these proposed changes go to the State Board eventually, the committee will know the points of agreement and disagreement. Chris proposed that they come back to the CTE in a month. After this meeting, Chris stated they were not ready to do the 603, 606 yet. But with 602, an e-mail will be sent to set up meetings.

Discussion took place regarding the large agenda for the June meeting. The group decided to start the June meeting at 11:00 am to accommodate the large amount of work that needs to be done.

Continue Review of Annual Reports

On agenda, but not discussed.

NH DOE Updates

A. Bureau of Educator Preparation and Higher Education Updates

Laura Stoneking reported that because Ken Darsney will be employed by the New Hampshire Department of Education, he will no longer be able to be on the Council. When asking who is willing to step into Ken's place and pick up the ball and move forward and co-chair Antioch with Kelly, Brian Walker agreed to replace Ken as co-chair of the review of Antioch's secondary progress report.

Laura also informed the group that Amanda Phelps who is the administrative rules coordinator here at the Department of Education, provided a presentation to the Professional Standards Board. In essence on the process and the requirements of the administrative rules and meetings that are held. It has been requested that she share that same presentation with CTE. Any subcommittee is an extension of the Council, and we are obligated to follow the public right to know laws.

Laura Stoneking stated she's seeking reviewers for visual arts, possibly world language, possibly music, possibly chemistry, and definitely physics, so if you know somebody, send them my way.

Laura Stoneking requests for 5 institutions, looking at alternative pathways to licensure, and with a 3-year window in which a recommendation is valid, Laura Stoneking is looking at working with some institutions that have full approval, that have licensure only pathways so Nick, Tanya, Kelly, Brian and Chris, I'd like to put a proposal out to you, talk with you about what that would look like for expired New Hampshire licensed people and possibly out of state expired, out of state ed prep program people whose recommendation was also expired and what that would look like and how that would be formatted within your current programs. If you are interested, I'll give you a little more information and we can talk about setting up a meeting and piloting programs to look at additional pathways to help support educators that didn't necessarily get into the pipeline of licensure.

B. Bureau of Credentialing updates

Tom Julius questioned whether there was an update about the criminal record check process.

Laura Stoneking said there is no update, it is currently in the hands of the Bureau of Credentialing. They rolled out the electronic system for bus drivers, but the process is still in a holding pattern; wait for a green light from the Bureau of Credentialing to say that it shifts from IHEs to CTE.

Brian Walker asked about licensure of new applicants, such as graduates applying for New Hampshire licensing and the payment of fees for such. Laura Stoneking explained that this plan for licensure had not been implemented; technically the only licensure plans implemented and started are for the bus drivers and monitors.

C. NH State Board of Education updates

The PSB proposed rules went to State Board, the State Board didn't really have an understanding or a summary that gave an explanation as to why those recommended changes were made. There wasn't anyone there from PSB to speak on why or how or what. If they'd had the summary, it might have been helpful.

Adjourn

Motion: Brian Walker motioned, seconded by Nick Marks to adjourn the meeting.

Vote: There was no dissent.