

MEMORANDUM

To: Members, Washington Association of Colleges of Teacher Education

From: Jennifer Wallace, PESB Executive Director

RE: Updates for WACTE Fall Meeting

Date: October 23, 2008

Professional Certificate for Teachers Portfolio Assessment

The development phase of the ProCert Portfolio of Evidence Assessment is underway. The first meeting of the development team made up of WA educators was held October 13-15 in Renton. The enthusiastic members have a hefty schedule of meetings to attend in the next year where they will make decisions regarding the assessment framework, scoring and benchmarking, piloting, bias/fairness review and standard setting. After the first meeting of the development phase, a second Request for Proposals (RFP) will be released for the administrations and operation of the assessment developed during the current phase.

Legislative Request Package

The PESB submitted four decision packages to OFM for the '09-'11 biennium – three policy and one operating budget package. The first proposes funding support for both an improved instrument for surveying preparation program completers as well as development and technical assistance related to the new evidence-based pedagogy assessment. The second proposes the Governor convene an Institutional Priority for Teacher Education task force. This reflects the recent AASCU policy statements and initiatives in a number of states elevating dialogue and policy development about strategic enrollment in colleges of education and other issues to the institutional provost/president level. The third proposal was submitted jointly with the State Board of Education and asks for funding and timeline expectations related to the development of an educator workforce data system, including full implementation of e-cert. This one is a bit unusual in that neither Board is asking for the funds; we're asking the legislature to make this a priority within OSPI or whomever they designate to implement. Copies of our full requests may be found on the PESB website (www.pesb.wa.gov) under "policy and plans".

Out-of-State / Online Institutions

Attached is the TAB cover memo prepared for PESB members for their September Board meeting. As it describes, the Board is moving toward adoption of two sets of requirements for institutions approved by other states wanting to enroll / arrange field

placements for candidates residing in Washington State. The two areas of new requirements would be 1) uniform field placement agreements with required elements; 2) a pseudo-approval process by which the institutions must demonstrate how they will contribute to the current field of providers by either offering shortage-area endorsements or serving a region not currently well-served. Institutions seeking this approval would also be required to comply with specified annual data reporting.

With regard to the field placement agreements, field placement coordinators of our current approved programs are meeting in conjunction with WACTE to discuss what elements should be included in all field placement agreements – whether current approved programs or out-of-state / online. The PESB will draw upon their recommendations in formulating policy.

This is a complicated area of policy with which many states are struggling. It is highly difficult to enforce regulation on these out-of-state / online institutions. In some states, doing so has created loop holes that have meant increased costs and licensure hoops for candidates, resulting in no real increased oversight of the institution. We continue to move cautiously forward in developing policy for Washington State.

Task Force: Ensuring an Adequate Supply of Well-Qualified Math and Science Teachers

Stephanie Salzman and Joyce Westgard have represented WACTE at meetings of this Task Force, convened by the PESB to address a related legislative charge for a report with recommendations due December 1st. The Task Force includes representatives from fourteen education stakeholder groups. Meeting agendas, summaries, and preparation and presentation materials may be found on the PESB's home page – www.pesb.wa.gov.

Ideas generated by this group have been many, and have ranged from the “gosh, why haven't we ever thought to do that before!” to the highly controversial. Of particular interest to WACTE may be a recommendation to allow part-time math or science community college faculty, as well as baccalaureate institution faculty, to teach part-time in high schools. Task Force members also support funding for all institutions to implement U-Teach type programs, increased financial aid for individuals pursuing math and science degrees, support and accountability for increased enrollment and production of math and science teachers, incentives for teacher residency/fellowship models, and other alternative route programs. Based on interest expressed at their first meeting, Teach for America and The New Teacher Project both presented to the Task Force at their second meeting. Barnett Berry from the Center for Teaching Quality followed. In addition, district and school administrators see high potential in, and expressed strong support for, growth of the educator retooling program. This has implications for enrollment in endorsement programs in subject and geographic shortage areas.

November Meeting

The agenda for our November 19-20 meeting in Vancouver will be posted on the PESB website on October 28th - www.pesb.wa.gov. Among the agenda items, the board will:

- Conduct standard setting for the new WEST-E
- Discuss and approve reports with recommendations to the legislature on:
 - Teacher knowledge and skills in working with ELL students;
 - Autism awareness; and
 - Ensuring an adequate supply of math and science teachers.
- Review the Draft Annual Assessment Report

For those unable to attend, we will as always send out our list of actions taken and post them on our web site within the week following the meeting and the minutes will be posted on the web mid-December.

Be Heard!

Also for those unable to attend, did you know we have an online comment form on our website for you to provide input on PESB agenda items or our work more generally? All forms are printed and provided to PESB members prior to their action on the topic.

MEMORANDUM

TO: PESB Members

FROM: Jennifer Wallace, Executive Director

DATE: September 4, 2008

SUBJECT: TAB 7 – Continued Discussion / Policy Options: Out-of-State / Online Programs Operating in Washington State

BACKGROUND INFORMATION / PREVIOUS BOARD ACTION

Date	Action
November 06	Board adopts new approval process for institutions seeking approval in Washington for first time. Among new criteria and preproposal phase requirements, institutions must show how they are contributing to state need.
May & July 07	Board addressed concerns about out-of-state institutions placing student teachers in Washington schools. Considered and rejected model in Connecticut by which out-of-state institutions must be state-approved.
July 07	Staff presented initial plan and timeline to meet Board's 9/06-established goal to end out-of-endorsement assignment by September 2009. Key to goal is access and opportunity for teachers to gain Washington endorsements.
November 07	Presentation to Board from Arlene Hett re: Interstate Reciprocity Agreements. Board charged staff with gathering information on out-of-state and online programs schools and earning certification in other states that transfers to Washington via interstate reciprocity that are placing candidates in Washington.
	PESB workplan includes January 2008 start date for "recruiting out-of-state teacher preparation programs to seek program approval to offer programs to increase the capacity to prepare teachers in very specific shortage endorsement areas."

January 08	Staff overview of the overriding issue and board positions and policies to date. Board provided information on: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. online and out-of-state institutions marketing to candidates residing in Washington State 2. current demand for endorsements and access to in-state programs and Pathway II and III for adding endorsements; 3. equivalence of out-of-state endorsements with WA endorsements / WEST-E requirement 4. legislative interest in allowing greater participation by out-of-state and online programs 5. continuum of related policy options
March 08	Board discussion on policy options related to varying levels of state oversight of out-of-state / online programs (detailed below).
July 08	Board receives presentation from panel of out-of-state / online institutions that would be affected by policy options under consideration and reaction from panel of Washington state approved preparation program representatives

BACKGROUND –

In Washington State, there are an increasing number of online and out-of-state institutions enrolling and arranging field experiences for candidates residing in Washington State. These candidates are preparing according to the standards of that institution’s home state, then, via the provision of interstate reciprocity, transferring their credentials to Washington State. On the one hand, these institutions have increased program access for both preservice candidates as well as in-service teachers seeking to add subject endorsements. On the other hand, a number of school districts, and our own in-state preparation programs, have raised concerns about the disconnect between the out-of-state institution’s curriculum and the context of Washington public schools as the field placement setting, as well as concerns about the quality of the field experience and level of supervision overall. To our Board, this seems policy and practice-wise a different situation than that envisioned by interstate reciprocity agreements. Interstate reciprocity recognizes mobility of fully prepared / certified teachers. We’re not sure it envisioned / is sufficient to address programs that “straddle” borders and approval requirements, where the formal coursework of a program meets one state’s standards, but the field experience takes place in another. We have reviewed Connecticut’s new policy, by which accredited institutions approved in other states must still receive Connecticut approval in order to place candidates in field experiences in Connecticut. The Board found this approach, however, too prescriptive. We have continued to explore and identified an initial set of policy options that would increase both candidate access as well as provide a reasonable level of oversight and consumer protection over all programs operating in our state.

At its March 2008 meeting, the PESB discussed a range of scenarios / policy options related to the degree of state oversight of out-of-state / online programs offering endorsement and preparation programs to Washington State residents.

The Board broke into three groups and discussed specific elements related to three overriding scenarios / levels of oversight. It was decided that the next steps would be fleshing out these options and hearing from a panel of in-state and out-of-state institutions about how these would impact them if implemented.

At the July meeting, members passed the following motion:

MOTION was made by Roger Erskine and seconded by Joyce Westgard to direct the Executive Committee to bring to the September 2008 board meeting a proposed policy framework which ensures that all out-of-state/online providers meet Washington State standards for the preparation of Washington teachers, educational staff associates and administrators.

Staff asked for clarification on the intent of the motion. Members stated their belief that out-of-state institutions essentially preparing educators here in Washington State should have to meet the same standards.

Staff prepared questions and options for consideration by the Executive Committee for their charge to formulate a policy framework which was emailed to the full board. They were as follows:

An important first question might be: “what does meet Washington State standards” mean in this context? Two scenarios:

1. *If it means all the same program approval requirements as Washington institutions:*
 - a. *Not feasible as that would require a PEAB and site visits.*
 - b. *This would essentially therefore preclude these institutions from operating field experiences in Washington State. If this is the intent, the Executive Committee would need to consider:*
 - i. *Currently individuals who complete these same programs in another state and then move to Washington State are granted full certification, provided the program is approved by their home state.*
 - ii. *It is likely these institutions would be able to get around this barrier by encouraging their program completers to go through the cost and process of becoming fully certified in that state and then seeking interstate reciprocity for their certificate from Washington. Currently we only require program completion from a state-approved program, not actual certification (cert fees, state specific requirements that do not apply in WA, etc.)*

- iii. If the Board truly wanted to close this loophole, it would mean considering the suggestion raised by Craig Sheiber from City U during the panel discussion in July, suggesting that Washington should not provide interstate reciprocity to teachers coming from other states and/or that they should be issued different, presumably lesser valid, certificates. No other state does this.*
 - iv. The PESB has precluded access to these programs for regions not currently serve in the state and will need to specify how it intends to address the need for access by some other means.*
- 2. If instead it means that meeting standards recognizes in some part that the institution meets certain program approval requirements in their home state, as determined by the PESB and consistent with existing interstate reciprocity agreements, as well as additional Washington-specific requirements, this brings the Board back to the policy options that have been previously discussed which:*
- i. Combine specific home state program approval requirements with Washington-specific requirements*
 - ii. Provide a strong incentive for out-of-state / online institutions to meet these added requirements in order to receive Washington approval, rather than seek ways around it.*
 - iii. Allows greater equity between certification requirements for out-of-state prepared candidates and those residing in Washington prepared by out-of-state institutions.*

At their August meeting, the Executive Committee members clarified that they do not believe it is the Board's intent to essentially "close our borders" to out of state institutions, but instead to bring what degree of oversight and accountability we can, in addition to the requirements of the interstate compact related to the approval requirements of their home state.

The Committee also discussed, and review staff-prepared examples of, a growing push by state policymakers, the business community and others to explore a wider array of preparation options [ATTACHMENT A]. The committee reflected on this being a growing challenge for the PESB --- balancing our mission of upholding the highest possible standards with ensuring access and opportunity to acquire them.

As such, the Executive Committee revisited the policy options presented in March, to which the two panels commented in July.

The policy framework the executive committee recommends to the full board includes:

1) Field Placement Agreements

Require programs approved in other states operating field experiences in Washington State, as well as our in-state approved preparation programs, to have field placement agreements with all school districts in which they are placing candidates for certification or endorsement. The field placement agreements must include, but not be limited to:

- Legal liability issues (fingerprint / background)
- Qualifications of the proposed site supervisor for each site and qualifications of each school's cooperating teacher/administrator;
- Duties and responsibilities of site supervisor and cooperating teacher/administrator;
- Anticipated length and nature of field experience; and
- Signatures from district representative

The Executive Committee further felt that the institution should be required to notify the PESB when a field placement agreement with a school district is no longer in place.

2) State Approval Requirements

In addition to state approval requirements required of the institution in their home state and applicable requirements specified in the interstate agreement, out-of-state / online institutions seeking to offer:

- educator preparation programs with field placements in Washington State; and/or
- programs for teachers to add certificate endorsements to their Washington certificate would be required to submit to the PESB:

State approved preparation programs at a regionally accredited college or university in the professional field for which certification is issued that wish to enroll candidates for certification or endorsement in a supervised field experience within Washington State shall comply with the following:

- (1) Application for Approval. Each institution must submit a proposal that addresses components adopted and published by the Professional Educator Standards Board, including:
 - a. Verification of regional accreditation;
 - b. Verification of state approval;
 - c. Verification of Higher Education Coordinating Board approval (if offering degree program);
 - d. Planned certification or endorsement program;
 - e. Proposed start date;
 - f. Projected enrollment;
 - g. Needs assessment data;
 - h. Indication of Washington school district support for program;
 - i. Explanation of means by which program will ensure candidates have formalized learning opportunities rooted in Washington State standards.
- (2) Field placement agreements.
- (3) Institutions will comply with applicable annual data reporting requirements requested by the PESB.
- (4) The PESB shall publish on its website a list of those out-of-state programs approved to offer field experiences within Washington State. The PESB shall

also post relevant program approval status information on the out-of-state program from the state in which the program is approved.

3) Partnering with In-State Washington Approved Programs

The Executive Committee noted that at the July meeting, the three out-of-state institutions in attendance found no problems / objections with options I and II, but found Option III (partnering with instate institution) not feasible. Even so, the Executive Committee felt that proposed WAC should include language encouraging that to the greatest extent possible, out-of-state institutions pursue partnering with in-state institutions prior to proceeding to establish their own instate offerings. The Committee also believed that these institutions should be encouraged to participate in WACTE since they will also be preparing Washington educators.

ANTICIPATED OUTCOME(s)

- Staff and Executive Committee members share their discussion and proposed policy framework
- Staff share first draft of potential WAC language reflecting this policy framework
- PESB Members provide input to shape further development of WAC language for adoption in November.

Work Plan Goals:

Goal 6 Realistic strategies for ending out-of-field assignment

Ends All Washington teachers will be assigned in roles appropriate for their state-issued certificate to ensure all students receive instruction from teachers who possess adequate knowledge and skills related to the subjects they teach.

Policy:

Goal 8 Enhanced access and expanded program delivery options for pre-service educator preparation

Ends All prospective educators in Washington will have affordable access to evidence-based educator preparation programs regardless of geographic location to help ensure equity and an effective state system of supply and demand.

Policy:

Goal 4 An agreed-upon and widely understood system for review and revision of high and relevant preparation standards and certification requirements for all educators

Ends All Washington educators will be prepared and certified according to high and rigorous standards to ensure they are effective in helping students meet or exceed state learning goals.

Policy: