



Frank Edulblut
Commissioner

Christine M. Brennan
Deputy Commissioner

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Bureau Educator Preparation & Higher Education
101 Pleasant Street
Concord, NH 03301
TEL. (603) 271-3495
FAX (603) 271-1953

Council for Teacher Education
Minutes of the March 19, 2020 Meeting

A meeting of the Council for Teacher Education was held at 12:00 PM on Thursday, March 19, 2020. Due to the COVID-19 state of emergency, the meeting was held telephonically:

Chris Ward, Co-Chair, Graduate Studies Coordinator, Upper Valley Educators Institute
Kelly Moore Dunn, Co-Chair, Director of Teacher Education, NHTI Concord
Laura Stoneking, Administrator, Bureau of Educator Support and Higher Education
Tom Schram, University of New Hampshire
Steve Bigaj, Keene State College
Brian Walker, Coordinator for Clinical Experiences at Plymouth State University
Bryan Belanger, Southern New Hampshire University
Cindy Gallagher, Franklin Pierce University
Nick Marks, Granite State College
Diane Monico, Program Director of Education Programs, Rivier University
Kenneth Darsney, Franklin Middle School
Laura Wasielewski, Saint Anselm College
Suzanne Canali-Woodcock, New England College (NEC)
Laura Thomas, Antioch University New England

The following were unable to attend:

Michael Fournier, Superintendent, Bedford School District
Nicole Lemire, Pinkerton Academy
Bonnie Painchaud, Merrimack, Reeds Ferry Elementary School
Nicole Heimarck, NH Alliance for College and Career Readiness

Meeting participation also included:

Kimberly Wilson, Bureau of Credentialing, Department of Education
Steve Appleby, Director, Bureau of Educator Support and Higher Education
Bill Ross, Bureau of Credentialing, Department of Education
Pat Corbett, Interim Dean of Undergrad Programs, New England College (NEC)

Wayne Lesperance, VP of Academic Affairs, New England College (NEC)

Co-chair Chris Ward called the meeting to order at 12:07 PM and welcomed members.

1. WELCOME

Co-chair Chris Ward welcomed the attendees and explained that as this was an emergency meeting, all votes would be roll call votes. He then asked the attendees to introduce themselves.

2. DISCUSSION ON FRAMING SUGGESTIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS ON A PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT

Chris Ward led a discussion on the difference between suggestions and recommendations on a Program Review Report. Kelly Moore Dunn set up the topic with the history of why suggestions were initially introduced, namely that they help guide an institution toward continuous improvement, whereas recommendations are only allowed to restate mandated standards.

Suzanne Canali-Woodcock noted that the State Board of Education holds institutions accountable for every suggestion that goes into a report.

Tom Schram suggested that unless the CTE can guarantee that members of the Board of Education do not treat suggestions as equal to recommendations in addressing standards, he would argue for having the suggestions be separate. Diane Monico agreed, based on her experiences with the board.

Steve Appleby reported that members of the State Board of Education have expressed their desire to see the suggestions.

Laura Stoneking stated that if the suggestions stay in the report, it is important to clearly clarify how they differ from recommendations in that they are focused on advice for improvement to the institution.

Wayne Lesperance suggested the CTE consider any unintended consequences that might arise from changes, especially with respect to an institution's transparency. He also expressed apprehension if NEC were to be the first institution in this process if the decision to change how suggestions are handled were to go forward.

If suggestions remain a part of the reports, Kelly believes that CTE should always have the opportunity to decide if the suggestions are misleading or unhelpful to the institution. She likes the idea of placing the suggestions in an appendix. Laura Stoneking suggested keeping the current report structure, but placing the recommendations in an executive summary.

A consensus emerged behind moving the suggestions to an appendix. Kelly suggested she and Chris review the suggestions in the NEC report and move them to an appendix.

Diane Monico noted that for Rivier University's last Program Approval Report, the majority of their reviewers were K-12 and not experienced. They needed education on what is a suggestion and what is a recommendation.

Chris said that because they were not removing suggestions from the report, he did not believe a vote was needed. Nobody challenged this.

Kelly asked whether the CTE was okay with she, Chris, and Laura Stoneking making changes to NEC's report after reviewing it (in terms of some suggestions becoming recommendations or vice versa) without bringing the report back to CTE? Nobody objected.

In summary, Chris said they will move suggestions to the appendix in the template and clarify that unlike recommendations, suggestions are not tied to specific standards. Chris and Kelly will finalize NEC's report and check in with NEC about whether there have been any substantive changes. If there are, they will bring the report back to the CTE. Otherwise, they will go forward with the CTE's recommendation out of this meeting.

3. NEC: FINAL PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT

Brian Walker facilitated this discussion.

To begin, Chris and Kelly, as review team chairs, summarized the findings of the report. The onsite visit took place at the Henniker Campus from November 4-6. The team reviewed 10 program areas and Chris and Kelly reviewed the clinical practice and partnerships and the candidate and program assessments. Kelly reviewed some commendations from the report on NEC's thorough self-study, the support and interest of the administration for these education programs, and their advising model. The report's areas in need of improvement included more consistency in clinical practice and partnerships, better links between clinical field experiences and content areas, and consistency in the structures for analyzing data with regard to clinical field experiences.

Chris listed some areas in need of improvement around candidate and program assessment, including clear rubrics for key assessments across courses to specific program and state standards; management of data on candidate performance; and continuation of improvements in continuity in gathering and monitoring program data.

Chris and Kelly recommended two-year conditional approval per the rules, with a progress report in six months from the time of the approval by the Board.

The reactors Tom Schram and Bryan Belanger then had the opportunity to ask questions.

There was discussion on reactors' questions around:

- The phrase "not consistently content-specific" and giving candidates in the field a stronger link with their content.
- Whether there is a process in place regarding moving forward with collecting data relative to candidate assessment, for both the undergraduate and graduate programs.
- What NEC saw as the two or three most significant factors in their overall program improvement.

Tom concluded the reactor segment by stating that nothing in the report led him to question or request more information on the recommendations and commendations in the report.

MOTION: Chris Ward made a motion that the Council for Teacher Education (CTE) recommend to the New Hampshire State Board of Education that all 10 New England College programs up for review receive two-year conditional approval. Diane Monico seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, with Suzanne Canali-Woodcock abstaining and Laura Wasielewski not voting because she had left the meeting.

4. NHDOE UPDATES

Laura Stoneking and Steve Appleby provided updates from the New Hampshire DOE.

Steve began by fielding questions on testing and testing requirements. Graduating students will be issued a one-year In Process of Licensure Authorization [IPLA] if they have completed their program but are unable to take their Praxis exam due to testing sites being closed. Laura requested that the members send a list of their candidates who will need an IPLA, if possible with their names and the assessment they are missing.

The DOE is monitoring flexibility in the required hours for school psych [phonetic] and school counseling from the two national organizations that oversee those areas. With respect to changing the hours requirement, Steve cautioned that under a newly enacted statute, the Board of Psychology will license school psychologists so schools can seek Medicaid reimbursement and those rules are predicated on the existing hours requirements. Laura requested exact numbers from the members on their school psychologists and counselors graduating this year who are in danger of not hitting their hours. Ideally, she would like the candidate's name, how many hours short they are, and any restrictions on hours at the institution level. Members should assume a worst-case scenario that the candidates will not go back to their assigned K-12 school this academic year.

Laura noted that she is continuing with the EIS online test evaluation requests and asked for feedback on how it is working.

Laura noted that the Bureau of Credentialing has moved to an all online help desk ticket, so going forward all licensing and credentialing issues have to go through them. There was discussion about how the system works.

Laura announced that payment issues through EIS were discovered the day prior to the meeting, so there is a temporary hold on being able to apply for or renew licenses.

Laura noted that they will have to delay Granite State's onsite review. The best-case scenario would be to aim for this spring. The worst-case scenario is to move it to the fall and ask for an extension from the state board, which should not be an issue given the current state of affairs.

5. ADJOURN

Bryan Belanger made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 2:09 PM. The motion was seconded by Brian Walker. The motion was passed without objection.