

NC Education Human Capital Roundtable Meeting #10 NOTES

Attendees: SREB: Stevie and Megan; John Denning;

Purpose: Host a focus group conversation with external educators to privately vet the Licensure Reform agenda.

10:00 AM Finalize Facilitation Guide: Completed on the Working Agenda

Member Updates:

Leandro Case Decision and Governor's Commission Response on 1/23/2020:

<https://www.newsobserver.com/news/local/education/article239509303.html>

NCCCS - Teacher Associate update [Link](#)

JLEOC meets next Tuesday (Feb 4) - SB 599 and HB107 will be on the agenda + child nutrition. State Board meets on Feb 5-6.

11:00 AM FOCUS GROUP CONVERSATION:

Attendees: Marion, Julie, Matt, Shirley, Mariah, Ve-Lecia, Hank, Aaron, Tony, Ann

Patrick - Introductions and Vegas rules

Jill- Open, honest conversation please. Anxious for feedback. Used PPT slides with bullet points - led with simplifying licensure system. We need advice and communication suggestions on how to talk about these ideas.

Some heads started to nod as Jill walked through the slides.

Wesley- we've been living this for a long time and need help

Andrew L- what are we missing - we are only firm on our principles just listed.

11:16 am Tom T- I am tasked with licensure policy. As I've worked on it for 7 years I can say: the process we use now is incredibly complex. Very difficult to get teachers to focus on the moving requirements. (Lots of head nods) So that has led me to say "why does it need to be this complicated?" What can we eliminate and tighten to make this clear and simple.

Second thing - we want to put highly effective teachers in front of students. But my data analysis shows we have really poor proxies for determining effectiveness - i.e., current licensure exams. So we have at least 3 years right now to determine if a teacher is effective in the classroom. So if we have this data, why do we hold the proxy (test) higher than this? But this begs the question, do we have the proper effectiveness measures and data?

Last issue - universally from the legislature to the teacher, I find a lack of confidence in the ultimate decision that is based on our process. I haven't found anyone who says the first three years worked to give us a picture of their abilities and this person should no longer teach. I find

universal protection of all teachers facing (initial) licensure expiration. This makes me think we have a fundamental disbelief in the licensure model and its usefulness now.

How can we build a better model - and all parts - is a useful licensure model.

Does anyone have a different experience?

Ann - the playing field is not equal. We live in the land of exception, not equity so I think reform is needed.

Marion- as we have students come from all different paths and asking why are the rules different for each path, makes it very hard to support current system.

Matt- I hear a lot of urgency for this work from various voices because of the increasing shortage of teachers. Charter school flex has fed into the discussion. This is the time.

Ve-lecia- struggles with getting teachers to pass the tests. I have provided funds to help students retake the tests. Get calls from schools needing help getting teachers to pass in time. I have seen plenty of awesome teachers from all paths and plenty who don't pass the test.

Hank- this is totally tied to teacher pipeline discussion. We used to be able to recruit in all pipelines.

Andrew L. - Inputs vs. Outputs - disconnect between student achievement and requirements in higher ed and licensure.

11:30 am - Andrew S. - Can we create an open gate at the start? Are there ways to make the journey easier? Can we leverage outcomes to make decision making over the inputs?

1. Can we let anyone in with a college degree?
2. Then you have to demonstrate content and pedagogy at some point - so by License 3 you demonstrate both. The column below shows the options we envision to achieve this level. We are using content exams b/c that is what is required in law. The point is to show a clear step-wise ladder for a teacher to follow.
3. Salary and PD dollars increase as you go along. PD dollars can be used to leverage help from traditional or other training options. Opens the door for a variety of vendors. State dept would be purveyor of all the options for training for content and pedagogy. As you move from one stage to the next, compensation increases, PD dollars increase.
4. To get to License 4, you have to demonstrate effectiveness. As Tom said, we use our data and measures to demonstrate.
5. Value for traditional pathway is getting a degree and pass the tests before graduation and could enter at Stage 3 with higher compensation.
6. 5-year window to meet criteria in first 3 stages, but you can go through as fast as you like.
7. Continuing pathway - can stay at license 4 forever, or you can move into advanced role to get more responsibility and compensation. Options include supporting as mentors, or supporting in other leadership roles in your school's context.
8. Mentor teachers help beginning teachers and prove their effectiveness at that job, and can then in a free-market get more mentees (I think he implies PD dollars go directly to mentor bonuses???)

Andrew L- I underscore a few things.

1. This is agnostic to how you start your career.

2. We have explored demographic patterns and younger generations, and this provides options for all pathways and the 5 year minimum so candidates can pick their own path.
3. OR is built in here very intentionally. There are lots of things to figure out (legislation, data, etc). We think that there needs to be options at each spot we use OR

Ann- How do you move from stage 1 to stage 4 and skip 2 and 3. Jill- by proving effectiveness. What is that data? Tom T- we don't have a sufficient system, but we do have EVASS for certain number of teachers. Other things in other states - peer review process, Tom Kane's Best Foot Forward related to principal observations (even a show is a useful piece of data if coupled with multiple measures), SB 621 and elimination of final exams and we are on the hook to deliver options to the GA on how to measure effectiveness in lieu of these exams. No matter what, we need a list of options to make up the two pieces of evidence we suggest requiring.

Hank- so then inputs and outputs are equal? Peer review is an input review (it shouldn't just be - they should be looking at live student effects in the classroom).

Freebird-

Andrew L- SLO's, student surveys, we have tossed around a lot of ideas.

Matt- pedagogical skill - would be great to add NBCT. 2nd- it would be great for EPPs to have a 3-year commitment to teachers with no pedagogical training, coach the teachers for 3 years and in conjunction with school data, make a recommendation as to whether they should get a professional license.

Ann- Any convo on the lack of inter-rater reliability on the current teacher observation tool? Tom T- I have beat that drum. But that will resurface with the elimination of final exams. Signal of employment with principal observations drowns out signals of improvement (that gets to peer review). Ann- yes and teachers shouldn't have review related to employment. Tom- licensure and employment are separate but connected. Teachers are the most stalwart defenders of the integrity of the profession. So I think this would outway their fear of peer review.

Matt- I coach observers, and I can tell you peer review will have to be external because of the school culture. But there is tremendous capacity of teachers to assess other teachers. I can say that adjunct professors aren't quite as good at this, even if former teachers.

Ann- you have reliable and valid instruments - be careful about bias.

Shirley- question the entry-level requirement of a bachelor's degree. I know we have a major shortage. I can see us hiring too many, I know we do that now. I know of no other profession that would allow that. I don't see this as raising the bar.

Mariah - does the OR in license one - do you mean you let in those without bachelor's degree? That seems iffy - is there going to be a list of certifications allowed?

Jill - you practice medicine in a residency - that is a good comparison of what we suggest - let folks have a try if they want to teach.

Geoff- this isn't changing current requirements - 39% of our teachers haven't passed exams today.

Lunch break

12:22 LaTanya- One word reaction?

Matt- promising

VeLecia- interesting

Julie- motivating

Ann- Bold

Aaron- Overdue

Shirley- vague

Marion- unchanged

Ann- conceptual

Aaron- somewhat complex

LaTanya- wanted to get an idea if there were positive and negative reactions. About equal. So positives first. What is attractive, what interests you, what stands out as strengths?

Tony- as a pilot district, very promising that you are putting in advanced roles. It is challenging to open the pipeline but I like how it closes but stays open too.

Mariah- I like multiple pipelines and progression within the same track.

Matt- I like that the word alternative isn't anywhere in this document

Ann- I like increased salary in each block and increased PD dollars in early blocks

Julie- motivated to get to the next box even if it is only for the \$. But other motivations too. That will increase buy-in from teachers.

Marion- Licensure 4 advanced credentials and the option to stay as a teacher with higher role

Aaron- appears to be a hint of ownership in this for the educator. They have choices.

Benefits for higher ed, admin, others?

Hank- depending on compensation \$, that is a tool we can use to help recruit candidates into the majors/profession. Group of kids asked if \$50k start and \$100k later, would you teach? Yes.

Shirley- principals can help the profession to grow with this

Mariah- increased pay on each step - where does the starting salary start in conjunction with salary model now? How many will get paid less than what they are paid now? IF a big chunk will get paid less, no teacher will support this plan.

Ve-lecia- step increase is good, some mentors currently don't get paid more, so I like that you have increase mandated here.

Shirley- advanced roles helps principals build leadership teams in schools. Entry-level: why do we have to call them teachers? Why can't they be teacher assistants or para-professionals?

Marion- we have a group of teacher assistants doing the job of teachers. When we bring them in and they have associate's degree, we look at how fast we can move them to a bachelor's. This group battles work and school timelines and it takes them long to finish 4-yr degree. Says allow pathways to allow going to CC first and begin teaching (? or residency? - not sure how far her point went).

Julie- talked to a teacher's asst last night. She's been working on her degree for several years and working full-time hours in the school. She said I've run out of time and money but she is great. So initial salary and PD dollars could really help her.

Tom T- This model could change how DPI interacts with schools - they get to move away from compliance monitoring and more too a consumer reports for teachers who are seeking progress on this continuum. Like, where can I go to get the best mentor? Training? I'm in Lumberton, what is the cheapest, most effective path to teaching? We can say Fayetteville state, here is the

data on what you will pay, take, etc. I would love to see DPI and State Board help our schools than be highway patrol.

Mariah- awesome idea. To make that happen, there has to be intentional funding provided. Bigger districts have funds to help teachers, but smaller don't. This will hurt teachers in lower-funded districts if not state mandate.

Marion- Some school districts have developed their own PD. Others can't.

Tom- clarification - PD dollars are attached to the teacher, not the district. Each teacher gets a pot of \$ and DPI can have a list of what teachers can get for that \$ around the state to get from level 1 to level 2.

Jill- opens up for all types of providers and for traditional to innovate.

Tony - at district level, I'm responsible for outcomes. If everyone comes from different pathways, how do operationalize that?

Freebird- Improvements?

Hank- take a look again at the jumps. Let's say I've got bachelors in psychology, come in with license 1, I pass pedagogy tests and reading and math tests and show effectiveness so can I get to license 4 in one year? (NO License 3.) I want to see someone come in straight at Stage 4. I can sell that.

Mariah- look at this from perspectives of different teacher entry points, look at how principals collect the different data, look at HR perspective and district data collection, how DPI is overarching umbrella. *****

Matt- would love to get a room of HR/licensure directors and get them to look at this and talk about how to operationalize it and improve it.

Ve-Lecia- yes.

Shirley- Rename license #1 and don't call them teachers. Mentioned mentor sounding role (She doesn't see that requirement and no one covered it*****)

Ann- Vet this with CAEP and others and how does this line up with what we have to do. There is not one mention of master's degrees (that is on purpose). ***** RT needs to be prepared for this argument - research that SREB just conducted shows Master's degrees do not increase effectiveness or retention, except a masters in your content area for secondary teachers.

Tom T- masters is an input not an output.

Shirley- NBCT - have a group to make a decision on whether teacher passes or demonstrates the performance needed.

Julie-What is the evidence in License 4? This needs to be well thought out.

Matt- agree. Early college had PD dollars years ago and PD trainers sprang up and as a principal I struggled to figure out which was reliable or not. The type of PD is very important and it has to be aligned with instructional practice. (Tom I think would say DPI can help with this in the future*****)

Julie- with masters degree, tie it back to student outcomes and it can then be piece of evidence.

Follow-up note from Aaron Greene- "Themes for work: Flexibility. Clarity. Common Sense."

1:15 PM Roundtable Debrief.

Highlights/Takeaways from RT-

-There may have been a high level of consternation with how quickly a prospective teacher can accelerate from level one to level four. Is there a way to explicitly explain what is delineated in these sections and moreover, what components of the requirements in these levels are for career & technical education teachers? There seems to be a fear of teacher candidates being able to quickly accelerate to full licensure/level four within a short period of time.

-If a teacher candidate can accelerate to level one to level four, what would be the incentive for a prospective teacher of entering the profession through an EPP?

-A great way to exemplify the acceleration from level one to level four would be selecting four different pathways to becoming a fully licensed teacher and indicate their respective pathways to full licensure. (Perhaps SREB can work to draft a booklet that tells the story about how people can take multiple pathways to teacher licensure).

-The complexity, proxy for identifying different levels of teacher licensure, and the ability for key stakeholders to trust the frame of the document. There may be a problem with identifying the differences between the current model and the new model, so that the new document can be more discernable to external audiences.

-Thoroughly explain to external stakeholders what paradigms or paradoxes the roundtable is working to combat.

-The greatest optimism seemed to come from those that were closest to the classroom and instruction and the greatest amount of opposition came from those that were outside of the classroom (This may be positive).

- The concept of embedded professional development continued to be a part of the conversation. However, the conversation around embedded professional development seemed to be multi-layered. Teacher compensation and advanced teacher roles are important things to take in consideration and how they intersect with embedded professional development.

-Who should be involved in the conversations around policy development? There are professionals at certain levels who can inform the decision makers about what perspective the policies should be from and what their implications would be.

-We have thoroughly identified the problem and providing some ways to create a solution. With that, there is an increased need for data. More specifically, the data should explain how many teachers are in the pipeline, what point that they might be in the pipeline and what are the implications for licensure reform as it relates to these data points.

Additional Data Points:

- How many teachers or percentage falls into licensure levels 1-4? Is 39% of teachers without a CPL true?

- How does the way teachers are prepared impact teacher performance? From gathering this type of data, what promising practices in teacher preparation might be implemented to realize greater change in the teacher workforce?
- Gathering data from teachers who are in the licensure process now, or who have recently completed the process would help provide a better understanding of the challenges with the current licensure framework.

Communications and Outreach Plan:

The Roundtable wishes to engage a group of teachers early on, and not just the high flyers.

The Roundtable must quickly address how to keep the State Board engaged since they were not here today.

Geoff Coltrane is the ambassador for the Roundtable to the Governor's Commission for Sound, Basic Education and the LeAndro plan writing team. The Roundtable gives him permission to suspend the Vegas rules in order to share all the relevant ideas in order to incorporate the Roundtable's work with the state's 60-day plan and subsequent plans. The Roundtable does not wish for the plan to incorporate strategies or funding proposals that will work in contrast to the ideas in the licensure reform plan, nor the pathways and accountability discussions.

Next Steps:

SREB will share additional research analysis on preparation comparisons, impact of master's degrees and NBCT, pay scales in the region.

The Roundtable will meet on March 10th. Agenda items should include:

- robust update time to share updates on all the goals and other items like LeAndro
- Quick round of tweaks to the licensure reform plan
- Outreach planning, including additional educator vetting, strategies to engage and inform key policymakers
- Communications strategies, following up on GMMB work, story-telling and/or mapping the new license scenarios, revising talking points, revising visuals, etc.

Additional Notes Submitted by Brenda Berg:

MISC NOTES – grouped, but in no particular order

Candidate Types:

As promised, these are the eight candidate types we used to create 'profiles' of the various entry points into the current licensure process.

- 1) No College
- 2) Some College

- 3) In College (EPP)
- 4) Career Changer (w/degree, non-EPP)
- 5) Returning NC Teacher
- 6) Teaching Area Change
- 7) Out of State Teachers
- 8) Others (CTE, etc)

*Consider adding “First Generation College Goer” and/or “Non-Traditional Candidate”

Potential Overlap with Leandro:

*See specific items from WestEd and the Commission, further down.

Advanced Teaching Roles – e.g., the last two columns of the HCRT chart are consistent, as long as not guaranteed employment at those levels (the model can’t work if a school is forced to hire the wrong fit for their teachers/student needs)

Weighted Student Funding Formula – if it is designed without the HCRT model in mind, it could derail this initiative

TeachNC

The Teacher Preparation recommendations from the Commission are highly inputs-driven and perhaps not consistent with the HCRT approach.

Residency Models (WestEd recommends a ‘5th year’ residency model that is very expensive and perhaps inconsistent with the HCRT recommendations)

Increased Professional Development (\$80M at \$5k x 16k)

Professional pay (+\$650M, by my count), plus \$350M more for advanced roles – if \$1B is put into teacher pay without factoring in the HCRT model, we will miss an opportunity

Teacher Pipeline:

- o Teaching Fellows
- o 2+2 Programs
- o Cadet Programs
- o TA to Teachers program

Do either (WestEd or Commission) recommend licensure changes, EPP changes,

Communication Notes:

Map the existing workforce to determine where existing teachers will be on the schedule both in terms of licensure and pay, this will help determine the communication strategy with educators. (Are 39% really not licensed? Versus 16k provisional?)

Emphasize that this does not mean that teachers ‘tap out’ of their professional growth after 5 years (Matt Smith)

Map out the system for various candidate types (see eight, above) and compare with the existing process to highlight the differences

Is it true that an effective undergrad/traditional EPP could matriculate some or most students directly into Level 3? If so, this should be marketed heavily to the EPPs because they would have a great selling point if more of their grads are getting hired at \$5k higher than entry level.

Answer focus group concerns about “unchanged” and “complex”

Be clear that his model has professional growth as a key value embedded at every step
Tie to diversity, e.g., identify the leakiest parts of the pipeline for minority candidates and how this will help, same with the barriers to entry before they even enter, e.g., misinformation because it is so confusing.

Be very clear that this is an outcomes/outputs focused model. It is VERY hard to shake traditional thinking, e.g., master's pay. IF something does have a positive effect, then that effect should be the basis, not that input.

For internal conversations, I like the term 'poor proxies.' For example, principals are required to conduct three evaluations per year per teacher. This is a (very) poor proxy for good management, which would give professional feedback on an on-going basis but since the average principal has 50 direct reports, this 'poor proxy' has been created. Same with years of experience, degrees, etc. These are poor proxies for teacher quality.

Someone made the important point that (good teachers) want to be surrounded by good teachers. This is important to emphasize.

I don't love the word 'stage.' Maybe it is my age, but "Stage 4" makes me think of cancer.

"Empowering the teacher" is a great angle but it can't be used flippantly. You must have precise examples.

Refining the Model

I like the idea of mapping the process for all eight candidate types (see above), then looking at each of them through the lens of the candidate, HR staff, principal, and student success lenses (Supt? DPI? EPP?). Use this approach to look for unintended consequences or improvements.

How do you balance the idea of teachers as the best consumers of professional education versus embedded professional development? What type of 'consumer reports' would be needed to provide adequate information? How is PD being defined (see the TNTP 'Mirage' study)?

If we have no good predictors of what makes a good teacher using the old inputs of SATs, GPAs, EPP coursework, etc., then shouldn't we look at professional aptitudes like other professions do? If CTE career counseling assessments can point students toward teaching as a career, what metrics are they using?

Consider a "Teacher in Training" step on the pathway that requires a minimum 2 years postsecondary (either Associates or EPP in progress?), with NO direct student assignment. The compensation should be higher than a traditional TA position and should be temporary in nature – a 'try it on' experience without an obligation to teach if it doesn't work out for them. This should be aligned with the "TA to Teacher" program. Some college graduates may be willing to take a (somewhat) lower salary for a low-risk 'try it on' experience, particularly if there is an upside in terms of being ready to get on the official licensure path.

Considering adding some general direction of how much 'authority' one might have at each level, e.g., I would hope the # of students assigned to a Level 1 teacher would be smaller than a Level 4.

Consider pay as a 'minimum' level from all sources, so it is consistent with the goal of funding autonomy. Not just 'this is what you get from the state, then layer local money on top.'

Consider whether the last two columns are guaranteed or if they are a designation that makes them eligible for a finite number of positions (IMHO, if we care about quality and equity, it should be the latter).

Another incentive for EPPs is that if they have a certain percentage move quickly to a more advanced level, e.g., straight to level 3, they could qualify to be a “Teaching Fellows” institution.

Does anything about this model help alleviate ‘teacher sorting’ and encouraging effective teachers to work in hard to staff schools (other than increasing the pool of candidates)?

Are you still assuming a 12% bump for NBCT or is that one of many menu items that can qualify someone for Level 4 or 4+?

As you look at teacher pay, consider the Leandro recommendations which are based on averages, pay in surrounding states, and pay for other college degrees.

All of these major transformations really need to happen in a coordinated manner for this to work:

PLUS: Teaching Fellows expansion, EPP Dashboard, PEPSC, PD “Consumer Reports”

Teacher Effectiveness Measures Menu:

“Menu” items must be considered fair and consistent

Are there items that if ‘poorly’ rated, would be deal breakers? E.g., you have two from the menu but your EVAAS scores are very low? Similarly, what if one was fired or suspended?

Should there / does there have to be a distinction between effectiveness measures that can be used as evidence versus for professional growth?

Menu Items To Consider...

- NBCT status (existing)
- EVAAS (existing but limited)
- Student Surveys (to be developed)
- Peer Reviews (to be developed) – must be current educators who are not in your building or reporting chain, consider a process like the NBCT review process

SPECIFIC WestEd and Commission Notes for Leandro:

Here is the Leandro Phase I crosswalk between the WestEd and Commission recommendations: https://files.nc.gov/governor/Phase_I_planning.pdf

Licensure

Expand the role of the Professional Educator Preparation and Standards Commission, which was established by the North Carolina legislature in 2017 to involve stakeholders in establishing high standards for North Carolina educators and to make recommendations regarding all aspects of preparation, licensure, continuing education, and standards of conduct

of public-school educators. This commission can play a valuable role in making specific recommendations about strengthening and diversifying North Carolina's teacher workforce. (p63)

Teaching Fellows

WestEd - Increase the number of eligible teacher preparation programs from the current five to include programs that serve the different regions of the state and to include minority-serving universities in order to help increase the diversity of the teaching workforce. (p64)

Commission – Over the next four years, increase the NC Teaching Fellows Program funding annually from the current 200 slots per year to 1,000 per year. If there are more applicants than available slots, priority should be given to students who agree to teach in content areas with the most severe shortages and students who agree to teach in low wealth school districts or high poverty schools² for the payback period³.

Teacher Residency.

WestEd - Support high-quality teacher residency programs in high-need rural and urban districts through a state-matching grant program that leverages ESSA Title II funding. (p141 and p64 for background detail)

Commission – Develop, fund, and evaluate a pilot program that provides teachers with education degrees a high-quality post-BA residency in low wealth districts or high poverty schools. Teachers would receive a stipend, additional mentoring support, and complete their master's degree in exchange for 3 additional years of service in a low wealth school district or a high poverty school.

Teacher Preparation

Commission –

1. Adopt and follow a strategic, long-term plan for preparing highly qualified teachers that relies on available empirical evidence. The plan should prioritize direct investments in teacher education programs at IHEs across the state that are fully accredited, or to institutions that are partnering with those IHEs, and should hold those IHEs accountable for preparing teachers that are ready to teach a broad array of students. The state should move away from short-term, "put warm bodies in schools at any costs" approach. The State should:

- a. Increase the percentage of the teacher workforce produced by public and private North Carolina IHEs to 70 percent within 6-8 years;
- b. Provide adequate funding to IHEs to increase the number of NC prepared teachers committed to teaching in NC;
- c. Work with IHEs to right-size their teacher education faculty to accommodate increased enrollments in teacher education programs following a decade of severe declines in enrollments, and provide resources needed to enable IHEs and their LEA partners to improve the quality of their teacher preparation programs;

d. Define the necessary characteristics and support for high quality programming delivered in cooperation between bachelor degree granting IHEs and community colleges.

2. State-funded or approved preparation programs should prepare all their teacher-graduates to be able to effectively deliver differentiated, culturally relevant instruction within their certification areas to all students. Coordinate an effort to develop common guidelines for preparing teachers, especially at the elementary level, to be able to teach reading and mathematics effectively to a broad array of students.

3. Develop, fund, and evaluate a pilot program that provides teachers with education degrees a high-quality post-BA residency in low wealth districts or high poverty schools. Teachers would receive a stipend, additional mentoring support, and complete their master's degree in exchange for 3 additional years of service in a low wealth school district or a high poverty school.