

Item 4:

Request to Approve July 21, 2022 Work Session Minutes

ACTION

ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER'S RECOMMENDATION:

Approve the July 21, 2022 Work Session minutes.

State Board for Educator Certification
WORK SESSION AGENDA
JULY 21, 2022 AT 1:00 PM
1701 N. CONGRESS AVE. ROOM 1-104

The Board will meet in open session and after determining the presence of a quorum, discuss the following agenda items:

1. Call to Order

The State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) convened its meeting at 1:02 PM on Thursday, July 21, 2022.

Present: Dr. Robert Brescia, Mr. Tommy Coleman, Dr. Veronica Galvan, Ms. Cristina Galindo, Ms. Bena Glasscock, Mr. Rex Gore, Ms. Julia Dvorak, Mr. Andrew Kim, Dr. Andrew Lofters, Ms. Courtney MacDonald, Dr. Scott Muri, Ms. Kelvey Oeser, Dr. Alma Rodriguez, and Ms. Jean Streepey.

Absent: Mr. Josue Tamarez Torres.

2. Welcome and Overview

Chair Jean Streepey welcomed the Board, panel members, and TEA staff, and shared the purpose for the meeting.

3. Update from the June 2022 State Board of Education meeting

Chair Streepey provided an overview of the June 2022 SBOE meeting.

Superintendent Kim shared his perspective on testifying at the June 2022 SBOE meeting.

Dr. Muri shared his perspective on testifying at the June 2022 SBOE meeting.

Chair Streepey shared the goal of the work session and timeline for a September 2022 SBEC discussion item.

4. Review educator preparation program requirements, educator preparation program accountability, and educator certification requirements.

Associate Commissioner Emily Garcia thanked the Board for their attendance and provided an overview of the work session agenda.

Associate Commissioner Garcia reviewed the SBEC's Statutory Charge and the levers for change contained in Chapters 228, 230, and 229 of Texas Administrative Code.

Associate Commissioner Garcia provided an update on the Effective Preparation Framework.

Associate Commissioner Garcia debriefed the June 2022 SBOE discussion.

Deputy Commissioner Kelvey Oeser shared the summary of the June 2022 SBOE discussion was a synthesis of the many opinions and considerations discussed during the SBOE meeting, primarily Chair Ellis' considerations and feedback.

Associate Commissioner Garcia shared suggested next steps for the Board and objectives for the work session.

Ms. Laura Moriarty clarified the Board's statutory authority related to program accountability within the Accountability System for Educator Preparation (ASEP) reporting system.

Chair Streepey asked if SBEC can set cut scores in Chapter 230 or set cut scores in Chapter 228.

Associate Commissioner Garcia asked for clarification around cut scores for candidates versus cut scores for programs related to their accountability ratings.

Dr. Muri asked if the student achievement rating within the ASEP system referred to candidates within an educator preparation program or the K-12 students taught by a candidate.

Deputy Commissioner Oeser asked if Texas Teacher Evaluation and Support System (T-TESS) scores within a district can be used for ASEP reporting, and where principal evaluations and surveys fit within this system.

Dr. Muri asked for clarification regarding what principal survey and evaluation data looks like.

Mr. Rex Gore asked for additional clarification around student accountability ratings within ASEP reporting and sought additional context around changes made to the SBEC's statutory authority in 2009. Mr. Gore also sought clarification around the functionality of the ASEP reporting system.

Mr. Gore asked how many programs in the state have met the Accredited threshold within ASEP.

Ms. Galindo asked how programs can be held accountable to the same program requirements when each program varies in the programming they provide.

Superintendent Kim asked for data regarding the number of programs that have been sanctioned in recent years.

Associate Commissioner Garcia brought attention to examples and non-examples of what multiple options for pedagogy exams for different certification fields may look like within the SBEC's statutory authority.

Associate Commissioner Garcia framed the function of the decision matrix and how the matrix supports the Board in answering the questions before them regarding updating the state's pedagogical exam.

Ms. Jessica McLoughlin reviewed Option A within the broader decision matrix.

Mr. Coleman asked for clarification regarding the estimated costs and timelines associated with developing a Texas performance-based assessment.

Ms. MacDonald asked whether out-of-state universities could support the development of a Texas performance-based assessment.

Dr. Muri asked about the timeframe between launching the Texas-based performance assessment and full implementation presented in Option A.

Mr. Coleman asked about striking the balance between urgency and quality when developing a new performance-based assessment for the state.

Dr. Galvan asked whether the increased costs to candidates associated with a performance-based assessment would increase the current teacher shortage, and whether Option A presented a scenario where an assessment was already available to programs and candidates would be duplicated. Dr. Galvan also asked whether it may be more beneficial to redirect the costs associated with developing a new performance assessment to candidates.

Ms. McLoughlin reviewed Option B within the broader decision matrix.

Superintendent Kim sought clarification around what components of Option B would not address Alternative Certification Program (ACP) requirements.

Dr. Galvan asked about updating Chapter 229 Index 1A as it relates to program accountability and how performance-based assessments would be scored and rated for accountability reporting.

Dr. Muri sought clarification around concerns with multiple certificates.

Mr. Gore sought clarification on the presented costs associated with developing a performance-based assessment, and whether it remains an option for programs to implement edTPA.

Dr. Robert Brescia asked whether it would be possible to add a notation to a candidate's certificate indicating they had completed and submitted a passing edTPA portfolio.

Dr. Muri questioned the rationale behind the inclusion of the charge for an annual Response for Proposal (RFP) within Option B.

Ms. McLoughlin reviewed Option C within the broader decision matrix.

Superintendent Kim asked if this option addressed the previous concern with ACP accountability measures.

Dr. Rodriguez asked whether locally developed and administered assessments would be locally scored.

Ms. MacDonald asked whether feedback gathered from the June 2022 SBOE meeting around the need for program accountability resulted in components of the current decision matrix.

Ms. MacDonald asked why keeping the exam, Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR), as an accountability measure would be a desired outcome for certain programs.

Mr. Gore asked how those who hire recent program graduates utilize the accountability ratings in their hiring process.

Ms. McLoughlin reviewed Option D within the broader decision matrix.

Ms. Glasscock asked whether candidates received a benefit from participating in a performance-based assessment rather than the PPR exam regardless of their individual score on their portfolio.

Dr. Galvan wondered if Option D allows programs to determine their own cut score on edTPA to recommend a candidate for certification.

Dr. Rodriguez asked whether there are other professions in which the exam used for licensure must be completed rather than passed.

Ms. Glasscock clarified there was no passing standard during the edTPA pilot and whether there was an impact on candidate effort and persistence during that period.

Dr. Rodriguez asked what the Board is solving by implementing an exam that no one has to pass.

Ms. McLoughlin reviewed additional options the Board could implement alongside any of the options within the decision matrix.

5. Stakeholder panel

Chair Streepey welcomed the Board back from break.

Associate Commissioner Garcia introduced the panelists and framed the purpose and charge of the panel.

Members of the panel include Andrea Chevalier (Association of Texas Professional Educators, ATPE), Karen Dooley (Texas Association of School Boards, TASB), Heather Doyle (Texas Coordinators for Teacher Certification Testing, TCTCT), Jessica Hightower (Texas Alternative Certification Association, TACA), Michael O'Malley (Texas Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, TACTE), and SBOE member Marissa Perez-Diaz.

Member Perez-Diaz read a statement regarding the June 2022 SBOE meeting and the SBOE's focus of program accountability and the development of a Texas-based performance assessment as an alternative to the current PPR exam. Member Perez-Diaz indicated Option C is most aligned with the SBOE's priorities.

Dr. O'Malley read a statement regarding higher education organizations' perspective on the options presented in the decision matrix. Dr. O'Malley indicated Options A and C on the decision matrix are considered most viable from the perspective of the organizations he represents.

Ms. Doyle read a statement regarding certification organizations' perspective on options presented in the decision matrix. Ms. Doyle indicated there were components of Options A and C that aligned with priorities identified by the organizations she represents.

Dr. Chevalier read a statement regarding the perspective of the organizations she represents on options presented within the decision matrix.

Ms. Hightower read a statement regarding the perspective of alternative certification programs on options presented in the decision matrix.

Ms. Dooley read a statement regarding the perspective of administrators and Human Resources' organizations on options presented in the decision matrix.

Associate Commissioner Garcia invited the Board to pose questions to the panel.

Ms. MacDonald asked for clarification around the use of "Texas based-assessment" versus "Texas developed-assessment" and whether there were concerns about quality and bias within a university developed assessment.

Superintendent Kim asked panelists to share more information about which options within the matrix the Board should direct staff to pursue.

Ms. MacDonald asked for clarification around the validity and reliability of the alternative performance-based assessment developed by Sam Houston State University's faculty members.

Dr. Muri asked Dr. O'Malley to elaborate on the use of a performance-based assessment as a formative versus summative assessment and the challenges related to each.

Chair Streepey asked if the addition of a performance-based assessment to Chapter 228 conveys the clear message of program accountability.

Ms. MacDonald asked for clarification from Dr. O'Malley around perspectives from those members in the organizations he represents who have participated in the edTPA pilot.

Chair Streepey asked Ms. Doyle if she believes all programs provide sufficient support to their candidates and whether the responsibility of preparing candidates should fall more heavily on the program or on the mentor teacher.

Associate Commissioner Garcia directed the panel to shift away from considering Options A-D on the decision matrix to the wider group of options documented and provide the Board with priorities to consider and which options to potentially abandon.

Dr. Chevalier shared feedback around Decision 6 from the decision matrix.

Ms. Hightower shared feedback about Decision 7 from the decision matrix.

Dr. O'Malley shared feedback on the option noted in the decision matrix around the use of residences and recommendations from LEA in lieu of a certification exam.

Ms. Dooley and Ms. Doyle echoed sentiments from other panelists.

Mr. Gore asked the panelists if they would prefer Options A or C.

Associate Commissioner Garcia concluded the work session and provided closing statements.

Deputy Commissioner Oeser clarified with the Board whether staff were directed to release an RFP to better understand the cost and timelines related to creating a Texas-based performance assessment.

6. Adjournment

Chair Streepey adjourned the meeting at 5:05 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. The presiding officer of the Board intends to be physically present in Room 1-104, William B. Travis Building, 1701 North Congress Avenue. Some members may attend via videoconferencing.