

**Item 10:****Discussion of Educator Certification Structure Redesign  
Framework and Approval of Classroom Teacher Standards  
Advisory Committee****DISCUSSION AND ACTION**

**SUMMARY:** This item provides the State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) with an opportunity to discuss an educator certification structure redesign framework and to approve the membership of an advisory committee to develop and recommend educator standards for the classroom teacher certificate. The committee would revise the current classroom teacher standards that define educator preparation program (EPP) and certification testing requirements.

**STATUTORY AUTHORITY:** The statutory authority for the classroom teacher class certificate structure is Texas Education Code (TEC), §§21.003(a), 21.031(a)(b), and 21.041(b)(1)-(5). The statutory authority for the appointment of advisory committee members is TEC, §§21.031(b), 21.040(4), and 21.041(b)(4).

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND JUSTIFICATION:** SBEC is statutorily authorized to regulate and oversee all aspects of the certification of public school educators. SBEC is also statutorily authorized to ensure that all candidates for certification or renewal of certification demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to improve the performance of the diverse population of this state.

SBEC is statutorily required to appoint advisory committee members to recommend standards for each class of certificate. The standards are the basis of the certification examinations and set the requirements for EPP curriculum and delivery. The advisory committees include practicing educators, school district personnel, experts, and EPP faculty. These individuals collaborate to create new educator standards or review existing educator standards to ensure that the educator standards align with the commissioner's educator standards, reflect best practices, and where applicable, align with the current versions of the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) that are adopted by the State Board of Education (SBOE).

At the March 3, 2017 SBEC meeting, the Board directed Texas Education Agency (TEA) staff to review the current educator certificate structure, develop a comprehensive plan with stakeholder input, and bring the Board a recommendation at the June 9, 2017 SBEC meeting for discussion. TEA staff convened a stakeholder committee on April 28, 2017 to review the current classroom teacher certificate grade band structure and to provide feedback on potential changes to the current certificate structure. Attachment II includes the list of stakeholder committee members, their summarized feedback, and their recommendations.

On May 15<sup>th</sup>, a group of 30 accomplished classroom teachers met at TEA and discussed the framework for returning to educator standards for pedagogy and professional responsibilities (PPR) based on defined grade bands rather than the current early childhood through twelfth (EC-12) grade band for all certificates. These 30 teachers represented every single grade level from PK to 12, chosen from 13 different districts across 6 regional areas of Texas, and were

selected by Teach Plus Texas Policy Fellows based on their measurable student achievement data. All 30 of the teachers favored narrowing the grade bands for certification as a means to improve the preparation and specialization required for teaching students at different ages. One teacher explained that, “*Narrowing the focus of the certification process will create a more rigorous standard for teachers to meet. This will not only ensure more qualified candidates are entering the profession, but will also raise the prestige of teaching.*” Attachment III reflects that meeting’s attendees.

Attachment IV is the redesign framework for the classroom teacher certificate structure. This item provides the SBEC with an opportunity to discuss the proposed grade bands, timeline, and action plan. The plan will be adopted by the SBEC at the August 4, 2017 meeting to serve as the road map for staff’s work in implementing the changes to guide upcoming work and SBEC action.

To begin the work of revising the educator standards to make recommendations for changes to classroom teacher certificates, TEA staff solicited nominations for the classroom teacher standards advisory committee from the SBEC, professional organizations, educator preparation programs, and other key stakeholders to ensure a pool of well-qualified candidates for selection. This item allows the SBEC to approve the classroom teacher standards advisory committee members. The proposed committee membership list was not finalized at the time the SBEC agenda was sent to print but will be provided to the Board prior to the meeting. TEA staff recognizes the importance of the standards development work and recommends a broad group of educators with unique areas of expertise within content areas that span the grade levels of early childhood through grade 12. These committee members will play a large role in shaping the expectations, knowledge, and skills of new Texas classroom teachers for years to come.

Once approved by the SBEC, the advisory committees will begin the work of reviewing the educator standards for classroom teachers and drafting recommendations to bring back to the Board for review and approval at a future meeting(s).

TEA staff proposes prioritizing standards development work for the following five areas:

- Early Childhood through Grade 3
- Science of Teaching Reading for Elementary Grades
- Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities, Early Childhood through Grade 3
- Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities, Grades 4 through Grade 8
- Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities, Grades 7 through Grade 12

Establishing standards in these areas first establishes a solid foundation for the entire redesign process. The return to grade-banded pedagogy tests will allow certification candidates to further demonstrate their ability to successfully deliver content instruction, manage the classroom, accurately identify and proactively respond to the needs of all learners, design meaningful and effective lessons and other learning opportunities, and maintain professional and ethical behavior in their roles as classroom leader.

Once these first five sets of standards are developed and approved by the SBEC, TEA staff will review the remaining classroom standards for Grades 4 through Grade 8, Grades 6 through Grade 12, Grades 7 through Grade 12, and Early Childhood through Grade 12, and anticipates returning to the Board with a proposal to adopt into rule the use of the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) where applicable and appropriate, to serve as the content

standards for classroom teacher certificates. This transition over the next few years will allow one set of knowledge and skills to be utilized to ensure that all individuals obtaining a classroom teacher certificate can demonstrate the knowledge and skills expected from the students they are certified to teach. Utilizing the TEKS as the content classroom teacher standards will also ensure that the content upon which certification tests are developed and educator preparation programs are designed remains current and can easily be changed to align with student expectations.

**PUBLIC AND STUDENT BENEFIT:** A redesign of the certificate structure will ensure educator preparation programs, school districts, and candidates for certification have a clear pathway toward preparation, testing, and certification in the content and grade level of their area of specialization. Educator preparation programs will be able to intensely focus the design of their course of study to ensure that candidates for certification gain the knowledge and skills necessary to effectively lead our classrooms, differentiate instruction in critical content areas, and provide children with a solid foundation that will lead to long term success in school and beyond.

**ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER'S RECOMMENDATION:** I recommend that the State Board for Educator Certification:

Approve the members of the Classroom Teacher Standards Advisory Committee as presented.

**Staff Members Responsible:** Marilyn Cook, Director  
Educator Certification and Testing

Christie Pogue, SBEC Manager  
Educator Leadership and Quality

Tim Miller, Director  
Educator Preparation

**Attachments:**

- I. Statutory Citations
- II. April 28, 2017 Stakeholder Committee Members and Summarized Feedback and Recommendations
- III. May 15, 2017 Teach Plus Texas Policy Fellows Meeting Attendees
- IV. Educator Certification Structure Redesign Framework

---

**ATTACHMENT I****Statutory Citations Related to Classroom Teacher Certificate Structure and Appointment of Advisory Committees****Texas Education Code §21.003(a) Certification Required (excerpt):**

(a) A person may not be employed as a teacher, teacher intern or teacher trainee, librarian, educational aide, administrator, educational diagnostician, or school counselor by a school district unless the person holds an appropriate certificate or permit issued as provided by Subchapter B.

**Texas Education Code §21.031 (a)(b), Purpose (excerpt):**

(a) The State Board for Educator Certification is established to recognize public school educators as professionals and to grant educators the authority to govern the standards of their profession. The board shall regulate and oversee all aspects of the certification, continuing education, and standards of conduct of public school educators.

(b) In proposing rules under this subchapter, the board shall ensure that all candidates for certification or renewal of certification demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to improve the performance of the diverse student population of this state.

**Texas Education Code §21.040, General Powers and Duties of Board (excerpt):**

The board shall:

- (4) for each class of educator certificate, appoint an advisory committee composed of members of that class to recommend standards for that class to the board;

**Texas Education Code §21.041 b(1)-(5), Rules; Fees (excerpt):**

- (a) The board may adopt rules as necessary for its own procedures.
- (b) The board shall propose rules that:
- (1) provide for the regulation of educators and the general administration of this subchapter in a manner consistent with this subchapter;
  - (2) specify the classes of educator certificates to be issued, including emergency certificates;
  - (3) specify the period for which each class of educator certificate is valid;
  - (4) specify the requirements for the issuance and renewal of an educator certificate;
  - (5) provide for the issuance of an educator certificate to a person who holds a similar certificate issued by another state or foreign country, subject to Section 21

## ATTACHMENT II

## April 28, 2017 Stakeholder Committee Members and Summarized Feedback and Recommendations

**Stakeholder Committee Members:**

Name	Organization
Rose Benitez (unable to attend)	Texas Association of School Personnel Association (TASPA)
Portia Bosse	Texas State Teacher Association (TSTA)
Holly Eaton	Texas Classroom Teachers Association (TCTA)
Barry Haenisch (unable to attend but provided feedback)	Texas Association of Community Schools (TACS)
Cindy Kirby	Texas Association of Secondary School Principals (TASSP)
Kelly Kovacic	The Commit Partnership
Kate Kuhlmann	Association of Texas Professional Educators (ATPE)
Andrew Lofters	Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB)
Casey McCreary	Texas Association of School Administrators (TASA)
Kristin McGuire	Texas Association of School Boards (TASB) Policy/GR
Jonett Miniel	Harris County Department of Education
Patty Quinzi	Texas American Federation of Teachers (TX-AFT)
Lindsay Sobel	Teach Plus Texas
Cody Summerville	Texas Association for the Education of Young Children (TAEYC)
Denise Staudt	Texas Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (TACTE)
Leslie Story	Texas Association of School Boards (TASB)
Mark Terry	Texas Elementary Principals and Supervisors Association (TEPSA)

**Summarized Feedback and Recommendations:**

<b>1. A stand-alone early childhood through third grade (EC-3) certificate.</b>	
<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deeper focus/specialization in early childhood</li> <li>• Aligns with research on benefits for early learners</li> <li>• Better training for early childhood educators</li> <li>• Vertical alignment in early grades</li> <li>• Aligns with current introduced legislation</li> <li>• Overlaps with EC-6 training</li> <li>• Teaching strategies based on learning styles</li> <li>• Addresses student reading outcome data</li> <li>• Meets unique needs of students</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less staffing flexibility for principals</li> <li>• Less flexibility for teachers</li> <li>• There is no need from the field for this</li> <li>• Will lack EC-6 PPR</li> <li>• Teachers having to test outside their areas</li> <li>• Limits principals hiring and retention of narrowly certified teacher</li> <li>• Too narrow of focus to bridge transition from grade to grade</li> <li>• Lack of demand from districts and candidates</li> </ul>
<b>Recommendations:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Call it a “specialization” that is not available by exam only.</li> <li>• Adopt an EC-3 certification. Early literacy and numeracy are critical.</li> <li>• Do not do stand-alone certificate.</li> <li>• We do not need to move forward without better understanding of how this would work and data associated.</li> <li>• Combine with EC-6/dual certification/supplemental.</li> <li>• The movement to a broader range of grades was made out of a desire for flexibility. Why narrow it again?</li> <li>• Make the EC-3 certification standalone and the EC supplemental.</li> <li>• Not needed, too onerous, costly.</li> <li>• Make EC-3 the supplemental endorsement.</li> <li>• Create EC-3 certificate but allow teachers to move to a different grade band with either a year to get their certification or link to student outcome data (e.g. provide flexibility to place teachers if they show results).</li> <li>• Create an EC-3 certification but call it early childhood education certification to respect the research defining early childhood as birth through 3<sup>rd</sup> grade.</li> </ul>	
<b>2. An early childhood supplemental.</b>	
<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allows for expertise/specialization informed by research-based practices for students</li> <li>• Gives candidates more choices</li> <li>• Increases flexibility for educators and districts</li> <li>• Allows specialization with additional training component</li> <li>• Allows already certified to expand certification</li> <li>• Incentivizes EPPs to provide deeper-focused training</li> <li>• Increases cross grade-level flexibility</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not needed due to same info as EC-6</li> <li>• Determining the requirements and scope of work</li> <li>• Limited EPP coursework in early childhood not addressed</li> <li>• Currently a weak supplemental structure: would need prep work not just test</li> <li>• Lack of ability to incentivize</li> <li>• Cost and time to teachers and design of certificate</li> <li>• Not align with current introduced legislation</li> </ul>
<b>Recommendations:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs to have meaning, not just testing. Needs content prep or certain background: use grant money to incentivize this supplemental for underperforming campuses.</li> <li>• Add supplement to new 1-6 or 2-6.</li> <li>• A good opportunity to explore and develop, but should be enhanced to ensure it isn't just passing an extra test.</li> <li>• Makes most sense if supplemental is truly a specialist certification; pass test for supplement and needs content requirement.</li> </ul>	

- I'm neutral on this idea if it's optional. This may be a good way to specialize the EC-6 certificate if the supplement was standard and high quality.
- Create the EC-3 and EC supplemental certifications.
- ESCs can provide training, like Reading Academies, ensure quality and consistency.
- Build in incentive for teacher to pursue.
- Prioritize as best option to address EC.
- If TEA funds and time permits, offer an EC supplemental. If an EC supplemental is provided, include a preparation component in addition to a test.
- Rename certification, needs preparation content.
- Supplemental should only be used for existing teacher. Should not be available without professional development requirement.

**3. Maintain the early childhood through sixth grade (EC-6) certificate.**

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greatest staffing flexibility for principals</li> <li>• Flexibility for teachers/candidates</li> <li>• Increased options for teachers/candidates</li> <li>• More marketability for teachers/candidates</li> <li>• Easier to add EC-3-related items to test</li> <li>• Broader knowledge and skills up and down grade levels: ensures teachers have EC through sixth grade knowledge</li> <li>• EPP's don't have to redo program</li> <li>• Broadens opportunity to ensure teachers teach within certification field</li> <li>• Common understanding and acceptance of status quo</li> <li>• Would not require a restructuring; curriculum is already established</li> <li>• Cost savings for teachers</li> <li>• Teaming is more compatible</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difficult to prepare candidates in depth of knowledge/expertise for EC and 5-6: span is too vast for teachers to specialize</li> <li>• More elementary departmentalization of upper grades: 4-5/6: EC-6 doesn't allow impact of specific core strengths</li> <li>• Not enough emphasis/depth on EC so unprepared teachers teach EC-3 courses</li> <li>• Grades 4-6 different needs and focus than EC-3</li> <li>• Students may not receive the best instruction possible</li> <li>• Need ongoing professional development to provide in depth training</li> <li>• Reduces the course study on each core to accommodate EC-6 curriculum and training</li> <li>• Most schools are through 5<sup>th</sup> grade not 6<sup>th</sup></li> <li>• EPPs can't go deep in EC-3 specific standards</li> </ul>

**Recommendations:**

- Maintain Core Subjects EC-6 certification
- Add supplemental to 1-6 or 2-6
- Maintain the EC-6 certificate; it work because it meets the needs of teachers and students
- Ensure the prep work matches the certification exam
- I support the system that gives maximum flexibility to meet campus/district personnel needs
- Maintain the EC-6, but add more supplemental options
- Keep EC-6 and add supplemental with incentive to acquire and by addressing cost and time constraints
- Examine the feasibility of EC-3 and 3-6 certificates
- Principals have moved great EC-2 teachers to tested grades
- If we keep EC-6, alter requirements to incentivize more teaching about early literacy instruction
- Emphasize reading instruction
- Phase out EC-6 and move toward EC-3 and 4-8

**4. Maintain the fourth through eighth grade (4-8) certificate.**

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers can teach upper elementary and middle school</li> <li>• Single and dual certifications in middle schools allows for content specialization</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raises the question "How many 4-8 teachers are teaching in elementary schools?"</li> <li>• This certification does not reflect the grade level make-up of most district campuses</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides maximum flexibility for staffing</li> <li>• Less expense to maintain the structure already in place</li> <li>• Grade span of certification offers flexibility</li> <li>• Allows you to specialize in those grades and content, even with the generalist</li> <li>• Enables placement of teachers into 8<sup>th</sup> grade assignments</li> <li>• Offers some specificity, but also a range to some extent; affords flexibility for teachers, staffing</li> <li>• Provides some amount of focus on middle school</li> <li>• Certificate specializes in a narrow age group</li> <li>• Specialization could occur through a supplemental certificate</li> <li>• Flexibility for reassignment and teacher job opportunity</li> <li>• Allows teachers to specialize in areas apart from the very early grades</li> <li>• Allows preparation programs to focus on the unique learning styles of middle school grades</li> <li>• Maintains consistency of certificate structure</li> <li>• Broad enough to provide flexibility to teachers in market and district staffing needs</li> <li>• Focuses on unique set of knowledge and skills needed for this age group</li> <li>• A vulnerable time of life for these students necessitating well-prepared, knowledgeable teachers</li> <li>• It's relatively focused on middle grades</li> <li>• It's flexible enough to allow some movement (good for rural districts)</li> <li>• Meets the varieties of grade configurations in school districts (grade-level centers, two grade levels, etc.)</li> <li>• Allows for staffing small and rural schools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raises the question "Could the overlap be prevented between the EC-6 and 4-8?"</li> <li>• Grade level overlap conflicts with EC-6</li> <li>• Causes one to wonder about the number of teachers truly interested in this certification as secondary certification is more popular</li> <li>• Questions how many people are teaching in middle school that would prefer a secondary assignment</li> <li>• Broad range that offers big differences and approaches to teaching and instruction</li> <li>• Middle school and elementary school overlap brings in a lot of challenges</li> <li>• Certificate is limiting in scope of teacher hire/retention</li> <li>• Would guess there are fewer teachers obtaining the certificate</li> <li>• Presumably, harder to attract candidates for this grade band</li> <li>• Vastly different teaching needs (even with respect to discipline and physical size) for 4<sup>th</sup> vs. 8<sup>th</sup> grade</li> <li>• Is it necessary to have overlap in elementary and secondary grades?</li> <li>• Is a teacher actually prepared to teach in the elementary and secondary settings?</li> <li>• Depends on data – how many currently hold this certificate? How does this help address shortage areas?</li> <li>• 6-8 may make more sense since 4 and 5 are usually on elementary campuses</li> <li>• Content areas are so broad – difficult certificate to master</li> <li>• Might limit the number of applicants pursuing certificate</li> <li>• Cuts across two different campus configurations</li> <li>• Does it provide enough depth for departmentalized teachers?</li> <li>• Focused content for middle school students</li> <li>• Assuring depth of knowledge for preparing students for coursework and assessments</li> <li>• Articulation between 4-5 and 6-8.</li> </ul>
<p>Recommendations:</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change to a 6-8 certificate</li> <li>• Figure out how many are pursuing the certification and passing the test</li> <li>• Keep this certificate for districts and teachers</li> <li>• Would be interested to see more data on "utilization" rates at this point and differentiated needs for instruction and knowledge across grade span</li> <li>• Consider eliminating the certificate OR beef up to really concentrate on the unique needs of this age group</li> <li>• Move to a middle-school focused certificate to narrow the scope of expertise to those grades</li> <li>• Make EC-6, 6-12, and EC-12 certificates only</li> <li>• If EC-3 certificate is adopted, break up the grade bands to allow for better mastery of content areas</li> </ul>	



for grades <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain this certificate</li> <li>• Need data on 4-8 certification teaching in elementary and middle school</li> <li>• Data on how many teachers are getting this certificate would be helpful</li> </ul>	
<b>5. Should the fourth through eighth grade (4-8) Core Subjects certificate be maintained?</b>	
Why?	Why Not?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allows for flexibility and broad content knowledge</li> <li>• Need data</li> <li>• Yes and No, I don't know</li> <li>• Yes, it is focused enough to provide what many teachers need, and allows teachers to be prepared to integrate literacy and math across the whole curriculum</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do teachers, principals, and others feel teachers with these certifications feel they are prepared for the whole grade span?</li> <li>• No, eliminate and only offer single/dual certificates because teachers will have a greater mastery of content; however, I suspect this certificate is very important to smaller schools/districts</li> <li>• Are the smaller schools/districts hiring more Core Subjects 4-8 certification than the larger school districts?</li> <li>• With more students in middle school taking high school level courses, 4-8 core content may be losing its relevance. I think 4-6 makes more sense. Need to check data on rural districts and certification</li> <li>• 4<sup>th</sup> grade through 8<sup>th</sup> grade is a wide band of growth</li> <li>• Limiting in a rural setting</li> <li>• Maybe move the grade span</li> <li>• It seems like the certification grade bands could be better aligned with grade levels served at campuses. Then you could discontinue Core Subjects for 4-8. This needs more data to really determine whether the system needs to be changed if Core Subjects certificates are being utilized</li> <li>• Yes for those small school districts that have to utilize small numbers of faculty for the K-12 range of students</li> <li>• May make more sense to limit to 6-8, with more time to focus on content after HB5</li> <li>• Should possibly break up band if research supports it would encourage better quality teachers</li> <li>• Yes, along with specialized 4-8 certificates to allow for best coverage of these grade levels</li> <li>• How many 4-8 certificate holders teach in elementary schools?</li> <li>• Need data on teachers in small and rural schools; by certifications; and all schools</li> </ul>
<b>6. Maintain the seventh through twelfth grade (7-12) certificate.</b>	
Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Content specific expertise</li> <li>• Flexibility – is there data indicating this is a problem?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A 7-12 teacher cannot teach 6<sup>th</sup> grade in middle school if you have them in a middle school</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offers wide range of content knowledge</li> <li>• Allows secondary to teach middle school grades</li> <li>• Secondary courses offered in middle school</li> <li>• Appropriately subject area specific</li> <li>• Covers a wide range of teachers – allows movement between middle school and high school</li> <li>• How do teachers pair certifications?</li> <li>• These are subject area specific. No core subjects type certifications</li> <li>• Focus on teachers who know they want to teach secondary students</li> <li>• Can't think of any</li> <li>• It is broad enough to be flexible</li> <li>• Allows secondary coursework to be taught in middle school</li> <li>• Focus on specific core area</li> <li>• These are subject specific bands to allow for expertise</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Content gaps – cannot teach 6<sup>th</sup> grade</li> <li>• Courses for high school credit significantly different</li> <li>• Expertise in middle school is lacking</li> <li>• Not able to fill 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade positions</li> <li>• Wide span</li> <li>• Allows middle school to teach 6<sup>th</sup> grade</li> <li>• Cannot teach 6<sup>th</sup> grade in middle school</li> <li>• This was done in response to NCLB HQ so needs to be revisited for effectiveness</li> <li>• Cuts across two different typical campus configurations</li> <li>• It may be too broad</li> <li>• Where is the focus of the preparation? There is a vast difference between a 7<sup>th</sup> grade student and a 12<sup>th</sup> grade student</li> <li>• Related as well – depth of curriculum and instruction</li> <li>• Not 6-12, which aligns with school configurations</li> </ul>
<p>Recommendations:</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why did we change from 8-12 to 7-12? NCLB?</li> <li>• Revert back to 8-12 certificates? I wonder if I would still feel this way if I had an opportunity to review data. What do principals say about this?</li> <li>• 6-12 certificate/student data</li> <li>• Leave 7-12 certificate</li> <li>• Same as 4-8</li> <li>• Maintain or move to 6-12</li> <li>• I don't know enough to weigh in</li> <li>• Maintain as is or move to 6-12</li> <li>• Reconsider 8-12 – please provide data on student results when 8-12 certificate was available compared to 7-12 certificate</li> <li>• I'd like to see student outcome data to decide</li> <li>• Provide outcome data to tie to preparation programs and student performance</li> <li>• This is an area more data would be helpful to inform any recommendations</li> </ul>	
<p><b>7. Should individuals be allowed to teach one grade above or below grade level of certification?</b></p>	
<p>Why?</p>	<p>Why Not?</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same content = Yes</li> <li>• Yes when campuses are meeting state and federal statutory requirements and when certified individuals cannot be located</li> <li>• Yes with a waiver and expectations to obtain the correct certificate</li> <li>• It depends based on student population fluctuations</li> <li>• Should be the exception rather than the rule</li> <li>• Yes, if in same content area of certification</li> <li>• Yes in same content area</li> <li>• Potentially worth exploring, if we can create a way to understand outcomes for those who do so. For those who are already certified, potentially give one-year waiver</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Across the board – No</li> <li>• Needs more thinking and conversation before providing input</li> <li>• No, they are not trained</li> <li>• If certification means anything, teachers should only teach where they are certified</li> <li>• Student outcomes are better when teachers are prepared and certified to teach the areas they'll be teaching</li> <li>• We should ensure kids had access to a teacher teaching within their field of certification and knowledge base</li> <li>• Would this meet federal law requirements for appropriate certificate? Notice to parents required?</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain the current system as it provides flexibility while giving a window of time for teachers to get the appropriate certificate</li> <li>• No, not trained in the unique needs of the particular age of the student</li> <li>• Generally, no – only in very limited circumstances like phasing out a former certificate configuration in lieu of new one</li> <li>• By exception; certification should mean something</li> <li>• No, would allow teachers to teach in grade levels they are not prepared for</li> </ul>
<p><b>8. Should individuals certified in one content area be allowed to teach another subject in the same area type?</b>  <b>Examples: History certification teaching Economics; Biology certification teaching Physics; Journalism certification teaching English Language Arts</b></p>	
<p>Why?</p>	<p>Why Not?</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, may have teaching and specializations that overlap</li> <li>• Dual certificates or composite certification</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need more thinking, discussion, and data before offering suggestions</li> <li>• No, I would rather see subject matter experts be allowed to teach, which could be a certified or noncertified individual</li> <li>• No, content expertise is essential</li> <li>• Student outcomes are better when teachers are prepared and certified to teach the areas they'll be teaching</li> <li>• We should ensure kids had access to a teacher teaching within their field of certification and knowledge base</li> <li>• Would this meet federal law requirements for appropriate certificate? Notice to parents required?</li> <li>• However, this is a very commonly used exemption for districts seeking district of innovation plans</li> <li>• No, already have composite certifications for this. Since these are subject-area specific, the teachers need much more specific content area instruction and content area methods instruction</li> <li>• Generally, no</li> <li>• Composite certification allows teaching in multiple content areas</li> <li>• Depends on campus needs – small/rural schools have more challenges in filling positions</li> <li>• Would like to see data on student outcomes related to certification type</li> </ul>

## ATTACHMENT III

## May 15, 2017 Teach Plus Texas Policy Fellows Meeting Attendees

First	Last	Current School	Grades	Current Subjects Teaching
Veronica	Hicks	KIPP Houston	Pre-K	Generalist
Dora	Leija	San Antonio ISD	Pre-K	Generalist
Monica	White	San Antonio ISD	Pre-K	Generalist
Tameka	Holcomb	KIPP Houston	Pre-K	Generalist
Jose	Rodrigu	Leander ISD	Pre-K-5	Other
Brittany	Jones	KIPP Dallas	2	Generalist
Liz	Shafer	KIPP Houston	2	Reading
Amy	Hestilow	San Antonio ISD	2	Generalist
Laura	Laywell	Dallas ISD	3	English, Social Studies
Anthony	Castro	Dallas ISD	3	English, Science, Other
Ali	Ashley	Austin ISD	3	Dual Language
Stephanie	Stoebe	Round Rock ISD	4	English
Sarah	Perez	San Antonio ISD	4	Generalist, Other
Amber	Neal	Houston ISD	4	English, Other
JoLisa	Hoover	Leander ISD	4	Generalist
Stefan	Berthels	Dallas ISD	5	English, Math
Mario	Pina	Austin ISD	5	Generalist, English, Social
Kristian	Lenderm	Spring Branch ISD	6	English
Dana	Wrann	San Antonio ISD	1st-7th	Special Education
Christopher	Green	New Frontiers	7	English
Angela	Burke	Dallas ISD	8	Science
Shontoria	Walker	KIPP Houston	8	English
Shareefah	Mason	Dallas ISD	8	Social Studies
Geoffrey	Carlisle	KIPP Austin	8	Science
Morgan	Latin	KIPP Houston	8	English
Mary	Malone	Amarillo ISD	9	Math
Fernanda	Pierre	YES Prep Houston	9	Math
Taylor	Hawkins	Austin ISD	9 and 10	Specials (e.g., Art, Music, P.E., foreign lang.)
Nicole	Burton	Del Valle ISD	10	Social Studies
Placido	Gomez	IDEA Public Schools	11	Math
Nathaniel	DuPont	San Antonio ISD	6th-10th	English, Social Studies
Kendra	Hart	KIPP Houston	9th-12th	Specials (e.g., Art, Music, P.E., foreign language)

**ATTACHMENT IV**  
**State Board for Educator Certification**  
**Educator Certification Structure Redesign Framework**

**SBEC Mission:** Ensure the highest level of educator preparation to promote student achievement and to ensure the safety and welfare of Texas school children.

**Focus:** The focus is the certification standards to obtain an educator certificate to be an early childhood through elementary school, middle school, or high school classroom teacher in Texas. The standards are the foundation for the certification examinations as well as the basis of educator preparation program (EPP) design to effectively prepare beginning classroom teachers.

**Needs Assessment:** Texas Education Agency (TEA) staff have found that the current educator certification structure for assessing the knowledge of pedagogy and professional responsibilities for classroom teachers is not adequately focused on age appropriate grade bands. TEA staff also recognizes the need for school districts to have flexibility to meet the needs of teaching assignment placement.

**Goal:** Redesign the certification structure to ensure effective beginning classroom teachers for our campuses and classrooms by 1) raising the expectations for demonstrating pedagogical knowledge and skills that is grade-band focused and 2) informing EPPs to ensure alignment of their methodologies to improve preparation of candidates for the teaching profession.

**Work Plan:** The SBEC has charged the TEA staff with providing the Board with a comprehensive plan for the current certificate structure. The Board directed staff to solicit stakeholder input and bring the Board a recommendation at the June 2017 meeting.

**Proposed Educator Certification Structure Redesign Framework**

<b>Current Certificate Structure</b>	<b>Proposed Certificate Structure</b>
<b>Elementary School</b>	
EC-6 Core Subjects Certificate and EC-12 PPR Exam	Maintain existing certificate
	<b>Add: PK-3 Certificate with EC-3 PPR Exam</b>
	<b>Add: Early Childhood Supplemental Certificate</b>
<b>Middle School</b>	
4-8 Grade Band	Maintain existing grade band
	<b>Add: 4-8 PPR Exam</b>
4-8 Core Subjects Certificate	<b>Explore eliminating 4-8 Core Subjects Certificate</b>
<b>High School</b>	
7-12 Grade Band	Maintain existing grade band
	<b>Add: 7-12 PPR Exam</b>

**Deliverables and Work Plan**

<b>Deliverable A. Early Childhood – Elementary School</b>			
<b>A.1 Create EC-3 Stand-alone Certificate</b>			
<b>Objectives</b>	<b>Key Action Steps</b>	<b>Expected Outcomes</b>	<b>SBEC Action Timeline</b>
Improve Content:	Conduct advisory committee meetings to align standards with K-3 TEKS and the Texas Prekindergarten Guidelines	1. Content exam with increased rigor and knowledge of the TEKS and alignment with the Texas Prekindergarten Guidelines for early learners 2. EPPs improving preparation for beginning teachers of early learners	<p><b>June 2017:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approve standards advisory committee</li> <li>• Standards advisory committees begin work</li> </ul> <p><b>August 2017:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approve Redesign Plan</li> <li>• Discuss standards</li> </ul> <p><b>October 2017:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Propose standards for PK-3 Certificate</li> </ul> <p><b>December 2017:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adopt standards for PK-3 Certificate</li> </ul>
Improve Pedagogy:	Conduct advisory committee meetings to create EC-3 PPR standards that reflects research-based best practices for early learners and are aligned with commissioner’s rules	1. PPR exam focused on early learners that is research based and aligned with commissioner’s rules. 2. EPPs improving preparation for beginning teachers of early learners	
Improve Reading Instruction:	Conduct advisory committee meetings to create science of teaching reading standards	1. A Science of Teaching Reading exam focused on early literacy 2. EPPs improving preparation for beginning teachers of early learners	
<b>A.2 Create Early Childhood Supplemental – similar to above</b>			

<b>Deliverable B. Middle School</b>			
B. Update 4-8 Certificate			
Objectives	Key Action Steps	Expected Outcomes	SBEC Action Timeline
Improve Pedagogy:	Conduct advisory committee meetings to create 4-8 PPR standards that are aligned with commissioner's rules	1. PPR exam focused on middle school learners that is aligned with commissioner's rules. 2. EPPs improving preparation for beginning teachers	<b>June 2017:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approve standards advisory committee</li> <li>Standards advisory committees begin work</li> </ul> <b>August 2017:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approve Redesign Plan</li> <li>Discuss 4-8 PPR standards</li> </ul> <b>October 2017:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Propose 4-8 PPR standards</li> </ul> <b>December 2017:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adopt 4-8 PPR standards</li> </ul>

<b>Deliverable C. High School</b>			
C. Update 7-12 Certificate			
Objectives	Key Action Steps	Expected Outcomes	SBEC Action Timeline
Improve Pedagogy:	Conduct advisory committee meetings to create 7-12 PPR standards that are aligned with commissioner's rules	1. PPR exam focused on high school learners that is aligned with commissioner's rules. 2. EPPs improving preparation for beginning teachers	<b>June 2017:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approve standards advisory committee</li> <li>Standards advisory committees begin work</li> </ul> <b>August 2017:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approve Redesign Plan</li> <li>Discuss 7-12 PPR standards</li> </ul> <b>October 2017:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Propose 7-12 PPR standards</li> </ul> <b>December 2017:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adopt 7-12 PPR standards</li> </ul>

<b>SBEC Educator Certification Redesign Timeline</b>				
<b>June 2017</b>	<b>August 2017</b>	<b>October 2017</b>	<b>December 2017</b>	<b>March 2018</b>
<p><b>Action:</b> Approve advisory committee for standards development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PK-3 content standards</li> <li>• PK-3 PPR standards</li> <li>• PK-3 STR standards</li> <li>• 4-8 PPR</li> <li>• 7-12 PPR</li> <li>• EC supplemental</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action:</b> Approve certification structure redesign plan</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Adopt changes to amend 231 (Flexibility in assignments)</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Adopt changes to add new 235 rule text for PK-3, 4-8, 7-12, EC supplemental, PPR and STR subchapters</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Adopt changes to repeal/amend 230(D); 230.35(c) and (d): will be replaced in new 235</p>
<p><b>Action:</b> Provide directives to inform advisory committee</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Propose changes to amend 231 (flexibility in assignments)</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Propose changes to add new 235 rule text for PK-3, 4-8, 7-12, EC supplemental, PPR and STR subchapters</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Propose changes to repeal/amend 230(D); 230.35(c) and (d): will be replaced in new 235</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Adopt changes to amend 233 for certificate grade bands</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Provide feedback on certification structure redesign plan (including future changes to 230(C), 231, and new 245)</p>	<p><b>Discussion:</b> Receive update on advisory committee for standards development</p>	<p><b>Discussion:</b> Changes to repeal/amend 230(D); 230.35(c) and (d): will be replaced in new 235</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Propose changes to amend 233 for certificate grade bands</p>	
	<p><b>Discussion:</b> Propose changes to add new 235 rule text for PK-3, 4-8, 7-12, EC supplemental, PPR and STR subchapters</p>	<p><b>Discussion:</b> Propose changes to amend 233 for certificate grade bands</p>		