



**STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
TRUSTEES OF BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY
TRUSTEES OF IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY
TRUSTEES OF LEWIS-CLARK STATE COLLEGE
BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO
STATE BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION**

**APPROVED MINUTES
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
November 13, 2014
Special Board Meeting
Boise, ID**

A special meeting of the State Board of Education was held November 13, 2014. It originated from the Capital Building, meeting room WW17, in Boise Idaho. Board President Emma Atchley presided and called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m. MST. A roll call of members was taken.

Present:

Emma Atchley, President	Richard Westerberg
Rod Lewis, Vice President	Debbie Critchfield
Don Soltman, Secretary	Tom Luna
David Hill	Bill Goesling

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS (PPGA)

1. Pending Rule Docket 08-0202-1401 – Rules Governing Uniformity – Certification

M/S (Westerberg/Critchfield): To approve the Pending Rule Docket 08-0202-1401 in substantial conformance to the form submitted in attachment 1. A roll call vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously 8-0.

Mr. Westerberg, chair of the Planning, Policy and Governmental Affairs committee, indicated this special meeting is to consider a pending rule on teacher certification. He clarified that in August, the Board passed the proposed rule on tiered licensure as presented by the Governor's Task Force. After an open comment period, the proposed rule was modified to reflect concerns and suggestions and is now being presented for approval.

Mr. Lewis, Co-chair of the Tiered Licensure Committee, lead the Board through a review of the changes between the proposed rule and what is being considered today. Mr. Lewis summarized some of the concerns communicated during the public meetings. One of the primary concerns expressed (most frequently) was concern about accountability measures in aspects of licensure. Other concerns included the feeling that the statewide assessments are not valid growth indicators and should not be required; that administrators in small districts may not have access to train observers; that no credit was being given in the proposal for additional education and thus no incentive for teachers to earn advanced degrees. Other concerns included the feeling that there was too much responsibility at the local level to determine

certification and compensation, and certification should be made at the state level; and comments that administrator evaluation should not be a determinant of teachers receiving substantial increases in pay; additionally that the proposal would pose a reporting burden on schools and districts. One final comment was that the Danielson model is designed to support teacher growth and not certification or compensation.

Mr. Lewis summarized the proposal before the Board includes proposed changes in response to the comments received. The biggest change is the reduction in the proposal to only two tiers; a residency tier and a professional tier. With respect to the professional tier, the proposed changes would remove all accountability from the professional certificate and move it all to career ladder. Secondly, with respect to the professional tier, it would continue as it currently exists; only credit requirements would be required for renewal. With respect to the residency tier, statewide assessments (SmarterBalanced and IRI) would be listed as options but not required. Local districts, in collaboration with teachers, will have the ability to choose growth measures they feel appropriate from the list provided. Also in the residency tier, the option is provided for districts to extend the residency period from three years to four years at their discretion. Also related to the residency tier, there is a deletion of references to the domains and requirements relating to the final year. It is also proposed that teachers would be allowed to submit additional artifacts evidencing proficiency and effective teaching in their application for a professional certificate. The requirement for two separate observers was removed; two observers would be used only at the request of the teacher or administrator.

Mr. Lewis also added that they anticipate changing the career ladder for increased compensation for additional or advanced degrees.

Mr. Luna asked for more detail about the Danielson domains and what expectation there is for an evaluation in residency or professional license, and in moving from one to the other. Mr. Lewis responded that as described previously, the professional certificate would continue as it is today and be renewable every five years. Mr. Luna asked for clarification on how the 22 components of the Danielson framework are measured and what impact that has on moving from residency to professional licensure. Mr. Lewis responded that as to the residency, the resident would receive a three year non-renewable certificate. As to the teacher's evaluation, they must successfully complete those evaluations two out of three years. As to the evaluation, part of the application would include evidence that the teacher has achieved proficiency on 16 of the 22 components referred to as the Danielson framework, regardless of the number of basics in any one of the four domains.

Dr. Hill asked about any changes for teachers coming from outside of the state. Mr. Lewis responded there is no change being recommended in that regard from what was proposed by the committee; the committee proposal is being used in regards to out of state teachers. Dr. Goesling asked about out of state teachers with four or more years of experience. Mr. Lewis responded the proposed rule included provisions for out of state teachers. The committee urged that teachers coming in from out of state receive equal treatment to those who are in the state. Out of state teachers with fewer than three years of experience would be required to meet the requirements of a resident teacher. Teachers with more than three years would be required to show evidence of proficiency and growth and have at least one year proficiency in student growth in the state of Idaho before they receive their professional certificate.

Mr. Critchfield asked what provisions are available to mentor and help a teacher coming to Idaho from out of state. Mr. Lewis responded that mentoring and collaboration are major

recommendations from the committee. The committee recommended mentoring for at least the first three years. The intent of the proposal is that they receive the same level of mentoring as in-state teachers. If the teacher does not show evidence of proficiency or student growth, they would be allowed to go back and receive additional education as to the areas of deficiency, and reapply for a residency certificate.

Dr. Hill applauded the principle of fairness. He asked if the Board has considered creating a reciprocal agreement from state to state. Mr. Luna interjected that the Department of Education currently has language that creates a reciprocal relationship with other states from around the country. He indicated that the language can be found in either Idaho Code or Administrative Rule, and that staff could provide that information to the Board. Mr. Westerberg commented that the residency mechanism in tiered licensure is to assure there is a quality product and a quality teacher, and that there is provision to require the same from out of state teachers.

Dr. Goesling requested that paragraph two on the second page of the agenda regarding the comments received be read aloud (PPGA Tab 1, page 2). Mr. Westerberg obliged and read aloud that section as requested.

Mr. Lewis publicly thanked the Tiered Licensure Committee and the Task Force for their work on the process leading to this rule. He expressed his appreciation for how open, inclusive, and collaborative the process was. He also recognized from the audience Dr. Linda Clark as co-chair of the committee and publically thanked her for her work.

Ms. Atchley also extended the Board's appreciation for the amount of work put forth by the Task Force and Tiered Licensure Committee on this rule. She expressed that they feel they have come up with a rule that will work, and reminded the audience that there is flexibility in the process and that rules can change. Ms. Atchley pointed out that she has agreed to establish an Implementation Committee which will oversee and analyze the process of the implementation of these rules as they go forward. She asked for people to please recognize that all of the Board members are parents, grandparents, and have been involved in education for a long time, and are doing what the Board feels is good work for the state of Idaho. She concluded by saying that we are taking an important step forward today.

OTHER BUSINESS

There being no further business, a motion to adjourn was entertained.

M/S (Westerberg/Critchfield): To adjourn the meeting at 5:04 p.m. The motion carried unanimously 8-0.