

STATE BOARD FOR EDUCATOR CERTIFICATION BOARD MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 4, 2017 AT 9:00 AM
1701 N. CONGRESS AVE. ROOM 1-104

The Board will meet in open session and after determining the presence of a quorum, deliberate and possibly take formal action, including emergency action, on any of the following agenda items:

1. Call to Order

The State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) convened its meeting at 9:04 AM on Friday, August 4, 2017, in Room 1-104 of the William B. Travis Building, 1701 N. Congress Avenue in Austin, Texas.

Present: Ms. Laurie Bricker, Ms. Rohanna Brooks-Sykes, Dr. Arturo Cavazos, Mr. Tommy Coleman, Ms. Jill Druessedow, Dr. Susan Simpson-Hull, Mr. Leon Leal, Dr. Rex Peebles, Dr. Scott Ridley, Dr. Laurie Turner, Mr. Martin Winchester, and Mr. Carlos Villagrana.

Absent: Ms. Sandra Bridges, Ms. Suzanne McCall, and Ms. Sandie Mullins.

2. Associate Commissioner's Comments Regarding the SBEC Agenda

Associate Commissioner Ryan Franklin welcomed the members to the meeting and thanked the members who attended the work session the previous day for their attention and engagement. The work session provided the opportunity for positive discussions that gave staff a lot to go back and reflect on for future Board consideration. Mr. Franklin introduced Sarah Wolfe from the Attorney General's office as the Board's legal representation in place of Nichole Bunker-Henderson. Mr. Franklin also reminded members to turn in their evaluation forms to help the staff with continuous improvement.

3. Public Comment

None

CONSENT AGENDA

4. Consider and Take Appropriate Action on Request to Approve June 9, 2017 Board Meeting Minutes

Ms. Druessedow thanked Mr. Franklin and his staff for the extended minutes that provide a clear summary of the presentation, questions, deliberation, and action that the Board engaged in for each item.

Hearing no corrections, the June 9, 2017 Board meetings minutes were approved.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION**5. Consider and Take Appropriate Action on Adoption of Proposed Amendments to 19 TAC Chapter 230, Professional Educator Preparation and Certification, Subchapter B, General Certification Requirements, §230.11, General Requirements**

Ms. Cook presented this item to the Board. She referenced the lengthy conversation in June about the proposed rule changes and the Board's adjustments to the recommended scores on the Listening and Reading sections of the TOEFL iBT. Ms. Cook shared that those Board-approved edits to the proposed rule went out for thirty-day public review and comment and staff received no feedback. Ms. Cook asked the Board to take a second look at the recommended scores for the four sections (Speaking, Listening, Reading, and Writing) of the TOEFL iBT and directed Board members to their substitute rule text folder for additional information on Item 5 and staff's recommendation for consideration by the Board. Ms. Cook provided a quick overview of the SBEC August 3 Work Session conversation regarding English language proficiency, use of the TOEFL iBT, and staff's recommendation to return into rule the provision to allow undergraduate and graduate degrees earned at institutions outside the United States to satisfy English language proficiency provided English is the official language of the country. Ms. Cook acknowledged that staff was not fully prepared in June with data and information that would have been helpful to the Board's conversation, but assured the Board that since the last meeting, TEA staff did extensive research on verifying the official language used in other countries, reviewed lists of approved countries utilized by Texas A&M and The University of Texas at Austin, reviewed information on the United Nations website, and referenced numerous documents specific to English as the primary language of instruction and/or official language of a country.

Ms. Cook asked for the Board's support in adopting the substitute rule text for item 5, which included a list of the following 27 countries: American Samoa, Anguilla, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Canada (except Quebec), Dominica, Gambia, Ghana, Gibraltar, Grand Cayman, Grenada, Guyana, Jamaica, Liberia, Nigeria, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Trinidad/Tobago, Turks and Caicos, United Kingdom, and U.S. Pacific Trust. Prior to the Board's vote on this item, Ms. Cook mentioned the requirement to pass all four sections of the TOEFL iBT and/or complete degree requirements from one of the 27 countries on the SBEC-approved list provides rigor and reasonable options to demonstrate English language proficiency.

Motion and vote:

Motion was made by Ms. Bricker to adopt the substitute amendments to 19 TAC Chapter 230, Professional Educator Preparation and Certification, Subchapter B, General Certification Requirements, §230.11, General Requirements. Second was made by Dr. Hull, and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

6. Consider and Take Appropriate Action on Proposed Review of 19 TAC Chapter 227, Provisions for Educator Preparation Candidates

Dr. Miller presented this item to the Board. Dr. Miller explained that TEA staff was recommending that the review of this chapter be accelerated a few months so that the public comments that will be received during the review period can be used to inform changes that

need to be made in addition to the ones that are required from the 85th Texas Legislature, Regular Session, 2017. The rules in this chapter provide requirements for admission to educator preparation programs and preliminary evaluation of certification eligibility. Dr. Miller pointed out the summary table attachment that provided the Board with highlights of changes that need to be made because of legislation as well as changes that may need to be made due to other issues that have been raised by stakeholders and TEA staff. Dr. Miller explained that TEA staff would be summarizing public comment and providing draft rules that address any changes for the Board to discuss at the October meeting.

Motion and vote:

Motion was made by Ms. Bricker to approve the proposed review of 19 TAC Chapter 227, Provisions for Educator Preparation Candidates, to be published as proposed in the Texas Register. Second was made by Ms. Brooks-Sykes, and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

7. Consider and Take Appropriate Action on Proposed Review of 19 TAC Chapter 228, Requirements for Educator Preparation Programs

Dr. Miller presented this item to the Board. Dr. Miller explained that this item was similar to the previous item in that the review of the chapter was accelerated, there was a summary table of changes, and TEA staff would present draft rules that address any changes for the Board to discuss at the October meeting. The rules in this chapter provide requirements relating to educator preparation programs.

Motion and vote:

Motion was made by Dr. Hull to approve the proposed review of 19 TAC Chapter 228, Requirements for Educator Preparation Programs, to be published as proposed in the Texas Register. Second was made by Dr. Cavazos and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

8. Consider and Take Appropriate Action on Proposed Revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 239, Student Services Certificates, Subchapter A, School Counselor Certificate, and Subchapter C, Educational Diagnostician Certificate

Ms. Cook presented this item to the Board. She provided brief introductory remarks and acknowledged the great work of both advisory committees. Mr. Scott Kessel, Texas Counseling Association (TCA) spoke in support of the agenda item. Mr. Kessel mentioned he is entering his 25th year working in public education in Texas schools, with 21 of those years working closely with school counselors in his dual role as Director of Student Services and Safety at Aledo ISD, and adjunct faculty member at Texas Christian University teaching courses in school counseling and school counselor practicum. Mr. Kessel shared his excitement to see the standards moving through the process and feels the proposed rule changes will ensure consistency in resources and training available to school counselors; more consistency and value in the delivery of comprehensive school counseling programs; and greater equity in services provided to students across the state. Mr. Kessel expressed thanks on behalf of TCA to the staff and advisory committee for their hard work and investment in the standards development and rulemaking process. Mr. Kessel encouraged

the Board to approve the proposed rules for posting in the *Texas Register* to allow the Board to take final action on these rules in October.

Ms. Lorrie Harris, current president of the Texas Educational Diagnostician Association (TEDA), expressed support of several rule changes incorporated into the proposed rules. Ms. Harris highlighted the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) ensures students with disabilities are provided with the services they need, and she feels the Texas certificate should accurately reflect the range of individuals being served (birth through age 21) by educational diagnosticians. Ms. Harris also spoke on the importance of positive behavior support and the need to have three years of experience as a classroom teacher prior to becoming an educational diagnostician. The years of teaching experience helps a diagnostician become greater at assessment.

Dr. Hull asked a clarifying question about the wanting the reference of birth through adulthood to be reflected on the face of the certificate. Dr. Hull also asked about Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS) and wondered if there is any possibility that specific references would limit a diagnostician's ability to use other reinforcement methods. Ms. Harris indicated she did not believe this would pose any limitations and ended her comments by thanking Ms. Cook and the advisory committee for being great to work with.

Dr. Renee Kwietek, TEDA, expressed firm support for the proposed changes indicating one very dear to her is changing the certificate reference to Birth through Age 21. Dr. Kwietek spoke of the educational diagnostician's critical role in early intervention. Dr. Kwietek explained some parents have refused services from diagnosticians with our current certificate because it says Early Childhood through Grade 12. The certificate appears to limit the diagnostician's ability to provide services in schools to individuals outside the usual age range through grade 12. Dr. Kwietek shared the preparation to become an educational diagnostician already goes beyond grade 12. Difference between supports and intervention needs to get in there as well as the difference between accommodation and modification.

Dr. Hull sought clarification that Dr. Kwietek believed university programs address training beyond grade 12, and wanted to know if all educator preparation programs prepare candidates to provide services beyond grade 12. Dr. Kwietek concurred that assessment instruments and training critical to the role of the educational diagnostician are incorporated into all EPPs preparing candidates for certification.

Dr. Cavazos agreed conceptually with the idea of looking at EPPs across the state that prepare diagnosticians, but also recommended staff look at the team providing support and services to students to determine if there are individuals certified in other areas that provide services to students beyond grade 12. Dr. Cavazos maintained the critical role of the diagnostician in the assessment process and the critical role of other individuals in the educational process. He recommended staff take a thorough look at all certificate areas that may extend services to individuals beyond grade 12.

Dr. Turner expressed her support for the role of educational diagnosticians.

Mr. Coleman asked staff for thoughts on the recommended changes.

Dr. Ridley indicated from his program's perspective, they are working to ensure the diagnostician is fully prepared to support individuals beyond grade 12.

Ms. Sykes highlighted the importance of early intervention and ongoing support for students to ensure a successful post-secondary transition.

Ms. Bricker asked about fiscal impact. Ms. Cook indicated the rulemaking process would have no fiscal impact, but acknowledged there could be impact to educator preparation programs as they redesign to align with the proposed rule changes.

Dr. Miller mentioned special education teachers are the other primary group of individuals that work with students to provide services and support beyond grade 12. Dr. Miller shared that in terms of impact to EPPs, programs have notification to prepare for candidates they begin admitting September 1, 2018. Dr. Miller indicated we did not indicate a fiscal impact for adoption of the proposed rules, but acknowledged increasing requirements to a 48-hour program for school counselors would be a fiscal impact on individuals. Dr. Turner asked about the special education certificate and grade levels. Dr. Miller explained we currently have the following certificates: Special Education, Early Childhood through Grade 12; Special Education Supplemental which allows a person to provide special education training at the grade levels and in the content areas of classroom certificates already held by an individual; Visually Impaired Supplemental Certificate; and a Deaf and Hard of Hearing Certificate, Early Childhood through Grade 12. Dr. Turner provided an example from her experiences as a teacher and feels it would be helpful for everyone to partner with a well-qualified special education teacher to ensure the needs of all students are met.

Mr. Franklin followed up on Mr. Coleman's earlier question to Ms. Cook and confirmed staff has incorporated all recommended comments into the proposed rules with exception of changing the name of the certificate. Ms. Cook asked the Board if they would like staff to explore options to change the face of the certificate.

Dr. Cavazos recommended staff explore this further and acknowledged the value of the work done by educational diagnosticians, but shared other individuals also occupy the space of providing support and services to students. Dr. Cavazos stated we want to be sensitive to the needs of special education students and the individuals certified to meet those needs, but do not want to create silos among members of the student support team.

Public comment was provided by:

Mr. Scott Kessel, Texas Counseling Association

Ms. Lori Harris, Texas Educational Diagnosticians' Association

Dr. Renee Kwiatek, Texas Educational Diagnosticians' Association

Motion and vote:

Motion was made by Ms. Brooks-Sykes to approve the proposed revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 239, Student Services Certificates, Subchapter A, School Counselor Certificate, and Subchapter C, Educational Diagnostician Certificate, to be published as proposed in the Texas Register. Second was made by Dr. Hull and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

9. Consider and Take Appropriate Action on Proposed Amendments to 19 TAC Chapter 234, Military Service Members, Military Spouses, and Military Veterans

Ms. Cook presented this item to the Board. Ms. Cook explained the Board's action on proposed amendments to 19 TAC Chapter 234, the military chapter, would allow staff to quickly incorporate legislation passed during the regular session. House Bill 1934 added a provision specific to military spouses to change issuance of the temporary certificate from one-year to three-years. Ms. Cook explained staff took a proactive step to update rule text to allow spouses issued a one-year certificate prior to the new legislation to be afforded an opportunity to have two additional years and ensure all military spouses of active duty service members are treated fairly and consistently. Ms. Cook shared the only additional proposed change was a clarification to ensure all members of the military community understand they are required to comply with certificate renewal requirements. Dr. Cavazos was appreciative of staff bringing this forward and for making provisions for spouses already in the pipeline.

Motion and vote:

Motion was made by Dr. Cavazos to approve the proposed amendments to 19 TAC Chapter 234, Military Service Members, Military Spouses, and Military Veterans, to be published as proposed in the Texas Register. Second was made by Mr. Coleman and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

10. Consider and Take Appropriate Action on Proposed Revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 231, Requirements for Public School Personnel Assignments, Subchapter C, Grades 6-8 Assignments, and Subchapter E, Grades 9-12 Assignments

Ms. Cook presented this item to the Board. Ms. Cook explained this item requests the Board's action on proposed changes to Chapter 231, as these rules are frequently used by public schools for placement of teachers into classroom assignments. Ms. Cook confirmed the changes proposed are directly related to updating the names of career and technical education (CTE) courses, updating current training requirements, and/or specifying effective dates of new requirements for eligibility to teach specific CTE courses.

Motion and vote:

Motion was made by Dr. Hull to approve the proposed revisions to 19 TAC Chapter 231, Requirements for Public School Personnel Assignments, Subchapter C, Grades 6-8 Assignments, and Subchapter E, Grades 9-12 Assignments, to be published as proposed in the Texas Register. Second was made by Dr. Cavazos and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

11. Consider and Take Appropriate Action on Proposed Amendment to 19 TAC Chapter 232, General Certification Provisions, Subchapter A, Certificate Renewal and Continuing Professional Education Requirements, §232.11 Number and Content of Required Continuing Professional Education Hours

Dr. Miller presented this item to the Board. Dr. Miller explained that the normal rulemaking process included a discussion item, a proposal item, and an adoption item. TEA staff was

recommending that this item begin at the proposal stage because the changes being made are from relatively straightforward legislation from the 85th Texas Legislature, Regular Session, 2017. These changes would add several topics to the continuing professional education (CPE) requirements for all educators, including classroom teachers and principals. Dr. Miller pointed out the summary table attachment that provided the Board with highlights of changes. Changes from Senate Bill (SB) 7 require teachers and principals to include training related to understanding appropriate relationships, boundaries, and communication between educators and students. Changes from SB 1839 require teachers and principals to include training related to digital literacy, teaching, and learning. Changes from SB 179 allow training related to supporting students affected by grief and trauma to count towards CPE requirements. Dr. Miller explained that TEA staff would bring an adoption item to the Board in October that would include any recommendations for changes based on public comment.

Motion and vote:

Motion was made by Dr. Cavazos to approve the proposed amendment to 19 TAC Chapter 232, General Certification Provisions, Subchapter A, Certificate Renewal and Continuing Professional Education Requirements, §232.11, Number and Content of Required Continuing Professional Education Hours, to be published as proposed in the Texas Register. Second was made by Ms. Bricker and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

12. Consider and Take Action on Clinical Teaching Exception Request

Dr. Miller presented this item to the Board. Dr. Miller explained that the Board had previously approved one exception to the clinical teaching requirements during the March 2017 meeting and the University of North Texas (UNT) was the only program to request an exception for the August meeting. Dr. Miller explained that TEA staff had reviewed the request and recommended that the Board approve the request with conditions.

Public comment was provided by:
Dr. Larry Abraham, UTeach

Dr. Ridley stated that Texas Tech University implemented a full-year clinical teaching program. He noted that the study that was included in the UNT request indicated that UTeach replication sites may not have as much of a positive effect on student achievement than the University of Texas at Austin site. He asked if student achievement outcomes were included in the UNT request. Dr. Miller explained that the UNT program would be accountable for student achievement outcomes when student achievement performance standards have been adopted into SBEC rules. The UNT program would need to meet the SBEC performance standards each year. The UNT program would also need to compare its student achievement outcomes with the outcomes of programs that do not use a clinical teaching exception. Ms. Bricker stated that she was in favor of the UTeach program and congratulated it on receiving state and national recognition. Dr. Hull stated that she was also in favor of the UTeach program and asked for clarification as to why the program requested an exception to a full-day clinical teaching model. Dr. Miller explained that the UTeach program recruited students who were pursuing math, science, and computer science majors, students were not able to compete full-day clinical teaching because they had to attend classes for their majors during the school day, and the UTeach program provided additional support to students throughout the abbreviated clinical teaching assignments. Dr. Miller shared that the

percentage of UNT students who pass certification exams, are certified within one year of completing the program, and are employed within one year of being certified were higher than students participating in programs that did not use a clinical teaching exception. Dr. Miller shared that the percentage of UNT students who remained in the teaching profession after five years of employment was slightly lower than students who had participated in programs that did not use a clinical teaching exception. Dr. Miller explained that the Board would annually review the outcomes of programs that had received a clinical teaching exception. If a program was not meeting the outcomes that had been approved by the Board, the Board could impose additional conditions or revoke the exception. Mr. Villagrana asked how many programs had received approval for a clinical teaching exception. Dr. Miller explained that if the Board approved the UNT request, there would only be two programs with an approved clinical teaching exception. The deadline for programs to request exceptions for the 2018-2019 academic year is January 2018.

Motion and vote:

Motion was made by Dr. Hull to approve the recommendation for the clinical teaching exception request with conditions as presented. Second was made by Ms. Bricker and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

13. Consider and Take Action on Educator Certification Structure Redesign Framework

Ms. Pogue presented this item to the Board. Ms. Pogue reminded the Board that the Educator Certification Structure Redesign Framework reflects the Board's charge to staff at the March 3, 2017 SBEC meeting to develop a comprehensive plan for opportunities for improvement in the current certificate structure. Ms. Pogue reminded the Board that this framework was presented by Ms. Cook at the June 9, 2017 SBEC for the Board's discussion and input. Ms. Pogue highlighted the Board's mission, focus, needs assessment, and goal that informed the framework's work plan. Ms. Pogue reviewed the focus and needs assessment of the plan are educator standards that inform the development of the certification examinations as well as are the basis for educator preparation program design. Ms. Pogue clarified that the pedagogy and professional responsibilities (PPR) examination would be addressed during the first phase of the comprehensive plan to help better prepare teachers. Ms. Pogue pointed out that currently the PPR exam spans early childhood through twelfth grade (EC-12). Ms. Pogue illustrated that the first leg of the work would be to move from one-grade banded PPR to three grade bands of early childhood through third grade (EC-3), fourth through eighth grade (4-8), and seventh through twelfth grade (7-12). Ms. Pogue reminded the Board that they approved a standard-development committee in June to recommend standards for the Board's consideration. Ms. Pogue reviewed the deliverables and time-frame of the work plan and clarified that there would be some flexibility in the timeline due to readiness of the advisory committee to recommend standards to the Board.

Dr. Turner inquired about the proposed framework referencing the exploration of elimination of the Grades 4-8 Core Subjects Certificate. Ms. Cook explained that this topic was presented to the April 28, 2017 stakeholder committee meeting since over the years there has been questions about how much school districts are utilizing the 4-8 Core Subjects Certificate and the impact on programs. Ms. Cook assured Dr. Turner that after this first phase of PPR standards development that there would need to be due diligence for stats, use, and need of the current certificate prior to bringing back a recommendation.

Motion and vote:

Motion was made by Mr. Coleman to approve the Educator Certification Structure Redesign Framework. Second was made by Dr. Hull, and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

14. Discussion and Update on Classroom Teacher Standards Advisory Committee

Ms. Wu and Ms. McLoughlin introduced themselves and presented this item to the Board. Ms. Wu reminded Board members that at the March SBEC meeting, the Board requested that TEA reconsider teacher certification requirements and at the June SBEC meeting, the classroom teacher standards advisory committee was approved. Ms. Wu stated that the purpose of today's meeting was to provide an update on the committee's work and that the next action for this item would be in October when the committee's recommended standards for the classroom teacher pedagogy and professional responsibilities (PPR) standards would be brought for proposal and action. Ms. Wu explained the rationale for prioritizing PPR standards and creating three PPR grade bands (EC-3, 4-8, and 7-12). Ms. Wu further explained the make-up of the educator standards advisory committee (67% current teachers) and steps including webinars, pre-work, and in-person sessions to prioritize the PPR standards.

Ms. McLoughlin reported that at the SBEC work session, Board members participated in a similar prioritization exercise that the committee engaged in and that one of the questions raised by the Board was how these broad standards would be translated into discrete skill-based competencies. Ms. McLoughlin shared with the Board that a testing framework process that would be developed by an educator committee, testing vendor, and TEA would ensure that the standards were translated into discrete skills on the assessment. She also stated that the next time the Board would see these prioritized standards would be in October in rule text. Ms. McLoughlin asked the Board if they had any questions or comments.

Comments were provided by the following Board members:

Dr. Hull asked for elaboration on the need for a testing vendor to be involved in the development of curriculum. Ms. Wu answered by stating TEA's role will be to bridge the gap between standards and item creation to ensure that what was intended by the standards is reflected. The role of the vendor would be in creating the items. Ms. Wu asked Dr. Hull to clarify her question regarding curriculum because it would be the role of EPPs to translate the assessment into their own preparation curriculum for teachers. Dr. Hull affirmed the need for an assessment and clarified that her question was regarding the role of the testing vendor in the assessment development process and the quality assurance checks that would be made available to ensure that the discrete skill-based competencies would be represented to reflect the original intent of creating an EC-3 certificate by impacting the change in preparation programs. Dr. Hull also wanted to ensure that this work would not be driven by a testing vendor. Mr. Winchester responded to Dr. Hull's question to give an example of how TEA and ETS are currently conjointly creating the new 268 Principal exam that includes a committee of experts and EPPs. He stated that the testing vendor's role was to help create the committee and facilitate the process and that sign-off would be through TEA and the committee. Dr. Hull asked if the PPR assessments would be under the purview of Mr. Winchester, and he affirmed.

Dr. Hull asked how we would select the vendor to produce the PPR assessments, specifically if they would be chosen from an approved list of vendors or if there would be a separate RFP for that. Mr. Winchester deferred to Ms. Cook to share more about the procurement process. Ms. Cook shared that the RFP would be sent to the current list of vendors on the state-approved list and would be open to anyone to bid on. Ms. Cook assured the Board that the TEA team has worked to ensure that whichever vendor is selected will be held to high standards to maintain the current areas of strengths as well as address areas to increase rigor, reliability, and relevance.

Dr. Ridley commented to state his support for the Science of Teaching Reading (STR) assessment process because of the need of teaching reading at the early grades. He supported Dr. Hull's comments that whichever vendor is selected, we need to ensure that the make-up of the committee is strong. He also stated that he would like to see assessments outside of the reasoning level and to the clinical competency level.

Mr. Leal and Ms. Bricker commented to encourage staff to recruit those outside of the education industry to sit on future committees to bring innovative ideas to the process. Ms. Bricker suggested CenterPoint Energy in Houston. Ms. Bricker also stated support for listing out the names of each committee.

No action taken.

15. Discussion and Action on Request to Approve 2018 State Board for Educator Certification Meeting Dates

Ms. Pogue presented this item to the Board. Ms. Pogue clarified that the proposed SBEC meeting dates for 2018 comply with the statutory requirements that the SBOE have 90 days to review all SBEC proposed rules and the 180 days to take action once the Board proposes a rule. Ms. Pogue informed the Board that the State Board of Education (SBOE) moved their June meeting to earlier in the month, which necessitates SBEC to move their June meeting into May. Ms. Pogue asked the Board to approve the proposed SBEC 2018 meeting dates of March 2, 2018, May 18, 2018, August 3, 2018, October 5, 2018, and December 7, 2018.

Dr. Turner inquired about May 18, 2018 possibly being a testing week for students taking the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR), which could prevent some of the Board members from attending that meeting. Ms. Pogue reassured Dr. Turner that the proposed date was after STAAR testing would be concluded for the month of May to ensure the educator Board members would not have a scheduling conflict.

Motion and vote:

Motion was made by Dr. Cavazos to approve the proposed SBEC 2018 meeting dates. Second was made by Ms. Brooks-Sykes, and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

DISCIPLINARY CASES

16. Pending or Contemplated Litigation, including Disciplinary Cases

A. Defaults**No Answer Defaults**

2. In the Matter of Shasta Ellen Green; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment
Staff recommendation: 1 year suspension
3. In the Matter of Yvonne Gray; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment
Staff recommendation: 1 year suspension
4. In the Matter of Catherine Grimes; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment
Staff recommendation: 1 year suspension
5. In the Matter of Kean Jones; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment
Staff recommendation: 1 year suspension
6. In the Matter of Omayra Mathews; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment
Staff recommendation: 1 year suspension
7. In the Matter of Eronda Menifee; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment
Staff recommendation: 1 year suspension
8. In the Matter of Hazel Morett; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment
Staff recommendation: 1 year suspension
9. In the Matter of Ashley Quarles; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment
Staff recommendation: 1 year suspension
10. In the Matter of Taysha Silva; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment

- Staff recommendation: 1 year suspension
11. In the Matter of Karen Vaquiz; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment
- Staff recommendation: 1 year suspension
12. In the Matter of Lori Welch; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment
- Staff recommendation: 1 year suspension
13. In the Matter of Molly Zaloudek; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment
- Staff recommendation: 1 year suspension
14. In the Matter of Steven Ray Ingle; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment
- Staff recommendation: Permanent Revocation
15. In the Matter of James G. Self; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment
- Staff recommendation: Permanent Revocation
16. In the Matter of Richard Phillip Winser; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment
- Staff recommendation: Permanent Revocation
17. In the Matter of Anthony Wayne Collini; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment
- Staff recommendation: Permanent Revocation
18. In the Matter of Linda Garcia; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment
- Staff recommendation: Permanent Revocation
19. In the Matter of Bert S. Green; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment
- Staff recommendation: Permanent Revocation

24. In the Matter of Frankie McDonald; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment
Staff recommendation: Revocation
26. In the Matter of Stormy L. Witter; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment
Staff recommendation: Permanent Revocation
27. In the Matter of Marisol Garcia Aguilar; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment
Staff recommendation: Revocation
28. In the Matter of Adriana Alejandra Avila; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment
Staff recommendation: Revocation
29. In the Matter of Dena Leslie Hamm; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment
Staff recommendation: Revocation
30. In the Matter of Edward Miles; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment
Staff recommendation: Revocation
31. In the Matter of Crystal Vanessa Morales; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment
Staff recommendation: Revocation
32. In the Matter of Shinika Haigood; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment
Staff recommendation: Revocation
33. In the Matter of Aimee Aldape; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment
Staff recommendation: Revocation

35. In the Matter of Pamela Nnabuife; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment
Staff recommendation: Revocation
36. In the Matter of Jennifer Anne Pettigrew; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment
Staff recommendation: Revocation
37. In the Matter of Tammy J. Sinclair; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment
Staff recommendation: Revocation
38. In the Matter of Melinda Solano; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment
Staff recommendation: Revocation
40. In the Matter of Kathi K. White; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment
Staff recommendation: Revocation

Motion and vote:

Motion was made by Dr. Cavazos to approve staff's Request for Issuance of Default Judgments and enter Final Orders consistent with staff's recommendation for each of the above numbered cases 1-42, excluding cases 1, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 34, 39, 41 and 42. Second was made by Ms. Bricker, and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

The following defaults were considered individually:

1. In the Matter of Claire B. Duncan; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment
Staff recommendation: 1 year suspension
42. In the Matter of Carlos Vasquez; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment
Staff recommendation: Revocation of administrator certification and a 4 year suspension of educator certification

Dr. Hull recused herself from voting on these cases.

Motion and vote:

Motion was made by Ms. Brooks-Sykes to approve staff's Request for Issuance of Default Judgment and enter Final Orders consistent with staff's recommendation for each of the above numbered cases 1 and 42. Second was made by Mr. Coleman, and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

21. In the Matter of Kenneth Ray Johnson; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment

Staff recommendation: Revocation

Ms. Brooks-Sykes recused herself from voting on this case.

Motion and vote:

Motion was made by Ms. Bricker to approve staff's Request for Issuance of Default Judgment and enter a Final Order consistent with staff's recommendation for the above numbered case. Second was made by Mr. Leal, and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

22. In the Matter of Vijayshri Katyayani; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment

Staff recommendation: Revocation

Motion and vote:

Motion was made by Ms. Bricker to approve staff's Request for Issuance of Default Judgment and enter a Final Order of Permanent Revocation for the above numbered case. Second was made by Mr. Leal, and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

23. In the Matter of Cody McCoy; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment

Staff recommendation: Revocation

Motion and vote:

Motion was made by Ms. Brooks-Sykes to approve staff's Request for Issuance of Default Judgment and enter a Final Order of Permanent Revocation for the above numbered case. Second was made by Mr. Coleman. Motion carried with Ms. Bricker, Ms. Brooks-Sykes, Mr. Coleman, Ms. Druessedow, Dr. Hull, Mr. Leal, and Dr. Turner voting in favor, and Dr. Cavazos voting against.

25. In the Matter of Eilene Montalbo; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment

Staff recommendation: Revocation

Motion and vote:

Motion was made by Ms. Bricker to approve staff's Request for Issuance of Default Judgment and enter a Final Order of Permanent Revocation for the above numbered case. Second was made by Dr. Hull, and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

34. In the Matter of Britten Miller; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment

Staff recommendation: 3 year suspension and proof of successful completion of substance abuse treatment program

Motion and vote:

Motion was made by Dr. Cavazos to approve staff's Request for Issuance of Default Judgment and enter a Final Order consistent with staff's recommendation for the above numbered case. Second was made by Dr. Hull. Motion carried with Ms. Bricker, Mr. Coleman, Dr. Cavazos, Ms. Druessedow, Dr. Hull, Mr. Leal and Dr. Turner voting in favor, and Ms. Brooks-Sykes voting against.

39. In the Matter of Michael Eugene Tedford; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment

Staff recommendation: Revocation

Motion and vote:

Motion was made by Ms. Brooks-Sykes to approve staff's Request for Issuance of Default Judgment and enter a Final Order of Permanent Revocation for the above numbered case.

Ms. Brooks-Sykes withdrew her motion.

Motion was made by Ms. Brooks-Sykes to approve staff's Request for Issuance of Default Judgments and enter a Final Order of Permanent Revocation for the above numbered case. Second was made by Mr. Leal. Motion is lost with Ms. Bricker, Dr. Cavazos, Mr. Coleman, Ms. Druessedow, Dr. Hull and Dr. Turner voting against, and Ms. Brooks-Sykes and Mr. Leal voting in favor.

Motion was made by Dr. Hull to approve staff's Request for Issuance of Default Judgement and enter a Final Order consistent with staff's recommendation for the above numbered case. Second was made by Ms. Bricker. Motion carried with Ms. Bricker, Dr. Cavazos, Mr. Coleman, Ms. Druessedow, Dr. Hull and Dr. Turner voting in favor, and Ms. Brooks-Sykes and Mr. Leal voting against.

The following defaults were pulled from the agenda by TEA Legal (no action taken):

20. In the Matter of Theodora Elaine Heath; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment

Staff recommendation: 2 year suspension

41. In the Matter of Lacy Michelle White; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment

Staff recommendation: Revocation

SOAH Defaults

1. In the Matter of Alex Poole; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment

Staff recommendation: Revocation of paraprofessional certification and denial of application for educator certification

2. In the Matter of Shelly Vaughan; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment

Staff recommendation: Permanent Revocation

3. In the Matter of Moncheire Marie Bedford; Action to be taken: Consideration of Issuance of Default Judgment

Staff recommendation: Revocation

Motion and vote:

Motion was made by Ms. Bricker to approve staff's Request for Issuance of SOAH Default Judgments and enter Final Orders consistent with staff's recommendations on each of the above numbered cases. Second was made by Dr. Cavazos, and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

B. Contested Cases

Proposals for Decision

1. Docket No. 701164350.EC, Texas Education Agency, Educator Leadership and Quality Division v. Dante Urquide-Meraz; Action to be taken: Consideration of Proposal for Decision and Issuance of Final Order.

ALJ Recommendation: 1 year suspension

Staff Recommendation: Accept ALJ recommendation

Motion and vote:

Motion was made by Ms. Bricker accept the Proposal for Decision and Issue a Final Order consistent with the ALJ's recommendation. Second was made by Ms. Brooks-Sykes, and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

C. Court Cases

District Court Cases

1. Leo Joseph Tran v. Texas Education Agency, Educator Certification and Standards Division; Cause No. D-1-GN-16-001802, In the 126th District Court of Travis County, Texas.
2. Michael Jimenez v. Texas Education Agency, Educator Certification and Standards Division; Cause No. D-1-GN-17-001964, In the 201st District Court of Travis County, Texas.
3. David Turner v. Texas Education Agency, Educator Certification and Standards Division; Cause No. D-1-GN-17-002298, In the 250th District Court of Travis County, Texas.
4. Anna Luisa Kell v. Texas Education Agency, Educator Certification and Standards Division; Cause No. D-1-GN-17-002347, In the 419th District Court of Travis County, Texas.

DISCUSSION ONLY

17. Discussion of Proposed Amendments to 19 TAC Chapter 245, Certification of Educators from Other Countries

Ms. Cook presented this item to the Board. Ms. Cook shared excitement about having staff members available from Education Service Center, Region 13, that support the VIT program to respond to questions from the June meeting and to provide an overview of the VIT program and their candidates. Ms. Cook provided a quick overview and shared the rule text provided for today's discussion gives an idea of the scope of rule changes to come. Phenomenal job at the start of the meeting in SBEC agenda item 5 with the adoption of proposed changes related to the English proficiency requirements as those changes will ensure Chapter 245 will link to those rules.

Ms. Jessica Prueda, Coordinator of the VIT program, thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak. Ms. Pruneda explained the Texas-Spain VIT program is a cultural exchange program that promotes a spirit of educational collaboration and knowledge of both cultures. Ms. Pruneda shared that 36 states participate in this national program and Texas has participated since 2004. VIT candidates are teaching in 12 participating districts across the state. Region 13 is the sponsor of the VIT program and accountable to the Department of

State for successful implementation and maintenance of the program. Texas participating school districts hire Spanish teachers to fill critical shortage areas. Region 13 meets annually with participating districts to ensure progress is being made and VIT teachers are successfully transitioning from one year to another during the three-year validity period of the VIT certificate. VIT teachers provide the majority of instruction to students in Spanish on a daily basis.

Dr. Lauralee Pankonien, Director of Statewide Leadership and Initiatives at Region 13, provided the Board with an overview of the VIT program's emphasis on accountability and assessments to ensure preparedness of the candidates and strong support from the participating districts. Must meet an Advanced or Above on their English proficiency prior to coming to Texas. High-level screening in Spain. Once in Texas utilize an assessment developed by The University of Texas at Austin. VIT teachers held accountable to all evaluations any teacher in Texas would be assessed on.

Dr. Hull asked if this was a teacher exchange program that is short-term or if these teachers sought a more permanent status to remain in Texas. Dr. Pankonien indicated the J-1 is a cultural exchange program. Dr. Hull assumed the Texas teachers who go to Spain would also be Spanish speaking teachers and stated she would be training a bilingual teacher for another teacher. Lauralee explained most teachers going to Spain serve in the role of educational assistants. Dr. Hull shared she has teachers from Mexico, Honduras, Cuba, and other countries and was trying to understand what the unique attributes of teachers from Spain might be. Dr. Pankonien highlighted the uniqueness of the VIT program and the circle of support around candidates from Spain that have been able to make positive impacts in Texas classrooms and provide a strong cultural aspect.

Ms. Bricker asked about the TOEFL requirement and wanted to know what validation we have as Spain was not one of the countries on the list exempt from taking the English proficiency test. Ms. Cook referred back to the conversation in June about a double-reference to English proficiency requirements in the rules for Visiting International Teacher as we reference 19 TAC 230.11, rules the Board took earlier action on with SBEC agenda item 5, and an additional reference to English language proficiency within the same rules that has afforded VIT candidates the opportunity to be assessed through either the TOEFL or another assessment of English language proficiency.

Dr. Peebles asked out of curiosity why the TOEFL is not being used for the VIT program. Lauralee responded that through the history of the VIT program there have been multiple measures of assessment and preparedness of candidates that no expressed need for additional evaluations had come up.

Ms. Cook indicated today's conversation is an opportunity for moving forward with thoughtful rulemaking related to the Visiting International Teacher program and to take an opportunity to explore impact of rule changes on the VIT program.

Dr. Hull expressed the purpose of the VIT program does not appear to be the same as the program leading to certification.

Mr. Leal asked about the support VIT candidates receive when they come to Texas. Jessica shared the process in place to ensure safe arrival of all candidates. Districts set up lodging

for their teachers and some VIT candidates stay with sponsor families. There is also a community of individuals from Spain here in Texas to offer support to VIT candidates as they arrive.

Dr. Cavazos indicated he was familiar with the program and mentioned it would be helpful to see a side-by-side comparison of the requirements for VIT candidates versus the requirements for out-of-country candidates going through the credentials review process. Dr. Cavazos also wants to make sure that we don't establish exceptions to pathways to certification and our rules that ensure consistent processes and procedures.

Ms. Cook explained the rules for Visiting International Teachers are located in 19 TAC Chapter 230. VIT offers an assessment of English proficiency prior to issuance of the VIT certificate and out-of-country candidates must demonstrate English proficiency through the TOEFL or other options established in rule to verify a degree was issued from an institution whose primary language of instruction is English.

Ms. Drusedow expressed a little pause about VIT candidates serving in a dual-language role but not having their English language proficiency assessed through the TOEFL.

The Board was interested in the percentage of people who remain in the VIT program for one year, two years, three years. Jessica will provide the stats and mentioned there is a small number of candidates that do not stay the entire three years.

Jessica indicated majority of the day VIT candidates are teaching in Spanish.

Ms. Drusedow asked if TOEFL was a requirement for the VIT program that we stopped.

Ms. Cook summarized the list of questions from the Board that need additional follow-up and assured board members she would work with the Region 13 team to obtain the requested information. Ms. Cook thanked the Board for allowing this item to be discussed prior to their lunch break.

No action was taken.

The SBEC recessed for lunch at 12:16 PM and reconvened at 12:49 PM.

18. Discussion of Proposed Amendments to 19 TAC Chapter 233, Categories of Classroom Teaching Certificates

Ms. Cook presented this item to the Board. Ms. Cook stated staff's original intent was to initiate rulemaking related to legislation from the regular session that created the new Early Childhood Certificate: Prekindergarten through Grade 3, and the new Trade and Industrial Certificate for Workforce Training. Ms. Cook explained staff changed the item to discussion to better align with the standards development work highlighted by Ms. Wu and Ms. McLoughlin during an earlier discussion of SBEC agenda item 14. Ms. Cook apologized for the oversight in leaving out 233.8 Special Education from the rule text, but assured the Board when staff brings this item back in October it will accurately reflect all necessary information for Board review.

No action was taken.

19. Discussion of Principal and Teacher Surveys for Accountability System for Educator Preparation Programs

Dr. Miller presented this item to the Board. Dr. Miller updated the Board on the development of a principal survey of first-year teachers that more clearly describes the performance expectations for first-year teachers and more closely aligns with the Texas Teacher Evaluation and Support System (T-TESS) rubric. Dr. Miller also provided an update on the development of a survey of new teachers that is also more closely aligned with the T-TESS rubric. The principal and teacher surveys are factors in determining the performance of educator preparation programs (EPPs). Drafts of both surveys were included for SBEC review and discussion. Dr. Miller explained that the drafts did include input from the educator preparation advisory group and the larger stakeholder group that included EPPs, principals of first-year teachers, and teachers who had taught three years or less. The drafts did not include input from the cognitive interviews of principals of first-year teachers and teachers who had completed one year of teaching on a standard certificate. Dr. Miller explained that the surveys that would be presented to the Board at the October meeting would include input from the cognitive interviews.

Dr. Ridley stated that he was in favor of the direction the surveys were going and suggested that the language be changed to emphasize that the surveys are measuring a teacher's skillful application of knowledge. Dr. Miller thanked Dr. Ridley for his suggestion, pointed out that the surveys were based on principal observations and teacher reflections, and encouraged other Board members to send any questions, concerns, comments, or suggestions to TEA staff so that they could be incorporated into the October agenda item. Dr. Miller also reminded the Board that the approved surveys will be piloted in Spring 2017 and performance standards for the surveys would be presented to the Board based on the pilot data that is collected.

No action was taken.

20. Discussion of Proposed Amendments to 19 TAC Chapter 249, Disciplinary Proceedings, Sanctions, and Contested Cases, Subchapter A, General Provisions, §249.3, Definitions, Subchapter B, Enforcement Actions and Guidelines, §249.12, Administrative Denial; Appeal, §249.14, Complaint, Required Reporting, and Investigation; Investigative Notice; Filing of Petition, §249.15, Disciplinary Action by State Board for Educator Certification, and §249.17, Decision-Making Guidelines

Ms. Moriaty presented this item to the Board. Ms. Moriaty explained that the proposed amendments would implement the statutory requirements of Senate Bill (SB) 7, 85th Texas Legislature, Regular Session, 2017; set minimum sanctions for administrators who fail to report educator misconduct; clarify the reasons for which the SBEC can deny a certificate to an applicant; and require reporting administrators to provide additional factual details in educator misconduct reports. Ms. Moriaty noted the change in draft language that resulted from the prior day's work session, reducing the minimum administrative fine for superintendents who fail to report educator misconduct to the SBEC from \$10,000 to \$5,000 to allow more room for discretion in the interest of justice.

No action was taken.

INFORMATION ONLY

21. Board Operating Policies and Procedures (BOPP)

Information Only.

22. 2015 - 2018 Rule Review Plan for State Board for Educator Certification Rules

Information Only.

23. Requests from Board Members for Future Agenda Items

Information Only.

24. Requests Received from the Board Since Last Meeting

None

25. Adjournment

Ms. Druesedow adjourned the meeting at 1:05 PM.

The Board may go into closed session regarding any item on the agenda to the extent it is authorized to do so pursuant to the Texas Open Meetings Act, Texas Government Code, Chapter 551.