



**Frank Edelblut**  
Commissioner

**Christine M. Brennan**  
Deputy Commissioner

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

**Council for Teacher Education**  
**Minutes of the December 20, 2018 Meeting**

**A meeting of the Council for Teacher Education was held at 101 Pleasant Street, Concord, NH at 12:00PM on Thursday, December 20, 2018 with the following members present:**

Frank Hoell, Co-Chair, Retired School Principal  
Suzanne Canali, Co-Chair, Director of Teacher Education Master of Arts in Teaching at New Hampshire Institute of Art  
Brian Walker, Coordinator for Clinical Experiences at Plymouth State University (sitting in for Mary Earick)  
Chris Ward, Graduate Studies Coordinator, Upper Valley Educators Institute, Lebanon  
Michael Fournier, Interim Superintendent, Bedford  
Jacqueline Kelleher, Franklin Pierce University  
Ron Pedro, Certification Manger, Southern New Hampshire University (sitting in for Mary Ford)  
Tom Schram, Director of Educator Preparation, University of New Hampshire  
Carolyn Cormier, Associate Dean for the School of Education, Granite State College  
Terri Young, Director, Antioch University New England  
Diane Monico, Program Director of Education Programs, Rivier  
Beth Buoro, Director of Educator Preparation, Keene State College  
Kelly Dunn, Director of Teacher Education, New Hampshire Technical Institute Concord  
Pat Corbett, Associate Dean, New England College  
Bonnie Painchaud, Loudon School District

**The following members were unable to attend:**

Mary Ford, Southern New Hampshire University  
Mary Earick, Plymouth State College  
Laura Wasielewski, Saint Anselm's College  
John Slater, Hellenic American University  
Paula Salvio, Chairman of the Department of Education of the UNH  
Frank Edelblut, Commissioner of NH Department of Education  
Nicole CAnney, Pinkerton Academy

**Meeting participation also included:**

Michael Seidel, Director, Division of Educator Support and Higher Education  
Ashlee Stetser, Administrator, Bureau of Educator Support and Higher Education  
Patricia Edes, Assistant to Director Michael Seidel, Department of Education  
Paul Stavenger, Criminal Records Coordinator, Southern New Hampshire University  
Donna Talbot, Assistant for Teacher Education Program and Data Manager at Saint Anselm's College  
Melissa Lear, Head Coordinator of Clinical Practice at Saint Anselm's College  
Kate O'Connor, Director of Educator Preparation Office at Keene State College  
Jeff Kellett, Head of Criminal Records Unit, Department of Safety  
Diana Fenton, Attorney for the Department of Education  
Steve Appleby, Administrator, Bureau of Credentialing, Department of Education  
Bill Ross, Bureau of Credentialing, Department of Education  
Beth McClure, Principal of Pembroke Charter School and representative from PSB

- 1. Co-Chair Hoell called the meeting to order, welcomed members, and invited all those present to introduce themselves.**

- 2. REVIEW OF NOVEMBER MINUTES**

Co-Chair Hoell asked the group to review the minutes from the November 15, 2018 meeting. Mary Earick (PSU) sent an email request the morning of today's meeting asking to amend a portion of the minutes. Chris Ward, a member of the CAEP Council, noted that all accreditation decisions are made by the CAEP Council, which meets twice a year (April and October); so any review that happens between October and April will be reviewed at the April meeting and the decision will be made there. Upon the suggestion of Mike Fournier, the group decided to table a vote on the minutes until the January 2019 meeting to determine if the suggested edits are semantics or substantive. Motion to table the minutes put forward by Suzanne Canali and seconded by Mike Fournier. Motion passed.

- a. ACTION ITEM: DOE will review the meeting minutes recorded from the November 15, 2018 CTE meeting to determine what was said and report back during the January 2019 CTE meeting.**

- 3. UPDATE ON BACKGROUND CHECKS (DIANA FENTON AND JEFF KELLETT)**

Diana Fenton alerted the group to the New Hampshire Bar's Annulment Clinics. A criminal record stays with us forever. Sometimes students forget this (in the case of motor vehicle records, for example, the record goes away after ten years). The purpose of the Annulment Clinic is to walk people through the system of getting an annulment for a particular charge. The judge will look at both sides of the argument—but essentially it's imperative upon the defense (the student) to offer a compelling reason on why the particular charge should be annulled. The clinic charges are either *pro bono* or at a lower cost than usual. Diana also noted that you only have one chance to go before a judge and ask for an annulment.

- a. **ACTION ITEM: Diana Fenton to send Ashlee Stetser the link to the New Hampshire Bar website with a listing of the annulment clinics and times to forward to the CTE (and include in the Technical Advisory).**

With regard to criminal records, there was an issue with an audit from the FBI where they were no longer allowing the release of the federal criminal record to non-governmental entities. This affected things like school bus drivers. For this particular group of people, we were able to move out of that issue through the Adam Walsh Act, which the Governor signed into action. We thought that would work until the recent FBI audit of the Department of Safety.

There are a number of statutes moving forward to amend RSA 189:13-a for a variety of reasons; Diana is working with one of the sponsors to see if we can amend some of the language as it relates to higher education; Diana is open to ideas or suggestions on what might help the IHEs: for example, changing *shall* to *may* on the admissions language is a start since this is a sticking point right now.

After speaking with the attorney for the Department of Safety, she noticed that if you look carefully at the language for running the criminal record check for the educator preparation program is different for an enrolled student and a student teacher—and that part is critical—because the statute uses different language to differentiate between an *enrolled* student and an *employee*. You're on solid footing to say we can only run the NH record. Higher Eds can also choose to ask out-of-state candidates to sign a waiver to release their criminal record from their home state. This is not going to solve all your problems, because it's not as thorough as an FBI record. But this is making the best out of the tools at your (the IHE's) disposable.

What is really comes down to is how the individual schools where IHEs place their students want to handle the issue. The liability shifts to the SAU once the student transitions from an observer to placement as a student teacher. Then, the SAU has a statutory obligation to run the criminal record in its entirety. The part that's murky is the in-between. If a student is deemed to be an observer or a "volunteer" rather than a "designated volunteer", then, under the school policy, the student doesn't have to undergo a background check. So the key is, are you a volunteer or a designated volunteer (Section VII). IHEs will need to discuss this with the schools they work with—and understandably this is a lot of work, because students have multiple placements, and every school will have their own policy. Diana would venture to guess that if a student is not left alone with a child, or having one-on-one contact a child, then that student will not be deemed a "designated volunteer."

So, just like the last time Diana reviewed individual IHE policies and how these policies coordinated with individual districts, IHEs will need to renew these conversations again to let districts know that IHEs can only run the NH record and are not entitled to the FBI record. It is the right of the district to request FBI records, since it's their liability. The reality is, if students are going to districts as a group, and are not having one-on-one contact with children, they should be just a "volunteer", not a "designated volunteer" and therefore not subject to FBI background checks. Diana Fenton realizes this is a band-aid solution, and that it will not solve all the IHEs' problems; but for now we need to limp along until this can be fixed statutorily.

Michael Fourier asked about misdemeanors—as an SAU he is privy to FBI records and is now confronting decision-making based on certain misdemeanors. Since this record is not public, the

SAU will communicate with the IHE and simply say, “in accordance with our policy we cannot let this person in.” Diana noted that some misdemeanors you’ll see might not flag the school policy; what we are really looking for are sexually-related offenses pled from felonies down to misdemeanors.

Diana Fenton asked Michael Fournier his thoughts on “volunteer” and “designated volunteer” and how those students are viewed from an SAU perspective—if students don’t have one-on-one contact they wouldn’t fall into the “designated volunteer category”—and Michael Fournier agreed; the opportunity to be left alone with a child is the trigger, in Michael Fournier’s district, that that student would be a “designated volunteer.”

The piece we need to focus on is how the districts look at students coming into their schools. Schools have a right to request FBI checks because they have the liability; but then we realize IHE’s might not be able to place them.

Kelly Moore Dunn raised a question about the wording on the Department of Safety memorandum—Diana stated that the form provided by the DOS does not trump the law. The law says “volunteer” versus “designated volunteer” so we are working to clarify the language of the memorandum; the DOS was not aware of the implications of the language used in the last paragraph. Diana thanked Keene State [NHTI] for bringing the language issue to Diana’s attention; Diana said we can work to clarify the memo’s language, but the law stands solid.

Kelly Moore Dunn raised the issue of which form to use noted on the DOS memorandum. Jeff Kellett stated that IHEs are no longer able to use the Adam Walsh Act to receive findings from an FBI records check, IHEs are regulated to NH-only—the form is the 256 Form. There are no restrictions with this form—it will reveal any criminal convictions in New Hampshire. Kelly Dunn Moore clarified with Jeff Kellett that the language in the memorandum is not really reflective, and Jeff Kellett answered that the memorandum was sent out before they had all the facts and before they had received a legal opinion to avoid prolonging agony and to serve as a stop-gap measure. However, once the student is enrolled and then gets into a school district, that student has to abide by the school’s policy of “volunteer” versus “designated volunteer.” A good benchmark is if a teaching student is left alone with a school district student then the teaching student should be deemed a “designated volunteer” and undergo an FBI background check. Jeff Kellett said to please use the 256 Form for New Hampshire background checks as they cannot process FBI background checks for IHEs; the other form is a two-part process: the NH records check and the FBI background check.

Ron Pedro asked how this directive gets out to Superintendents. Diana Fenton said that IHEs make it clear that their background check is limited to the NH background checks. Diana said she would be happy to partner with IHEs on drafting a Technical Advisory, but a conversation with the school districts is something each IHE has to do on their own; and do not forget that IHEs can ask their students to submit to their home state background checks. This is the best we can do without a legislative fix. These are schools the IHEs have relationships with; and the schools have the right to run that FBI record.

Paul Stavenger noted that most of his students are working one-on-one, or sometimes three on one with younger students. Stavenger gave the example of a student teacher in a classroom when the other teacher runs down the hallway to make copies. How is that line drawn? The problem is one student could be in one school on Monday and another school on Wednesday in

a group setting, potentially one-on-one if the teacher leaves the room. For this reason Stavenger believes all of his students fall under “designated volunteer.” Does this mean they have the FBI check or the NH check only, and if they’re a volunteer only, do they even need a check? Jeff Kellett said you will have to refer to the individual district policy. If they designate a student fulfilling the duties as Stavenger stated as “designated volunteer” and designated volunteers need FBI checks per that school district’s policy, then yes, they need an FBI background check. Diana clarified that it’s up to the individual school district to clarify their policy and how they define “volunteer” and “designated volunteer.” Stavenger reiterated that he would then need to have one FBI check done on Monday and other on Wednesday for one student placed in two separate school districts—two districts, two different superintendents ? Diana clarified yes, if that’s how they define “designated volunteer”, but that in large part you will find that group work will not fall under the “designated volunteer” policy. Stavenger asked what if a teacher leaves the room and the student teacher is left alone with a student in the classroom. Diana clarified that that is not what the policy says; the policy says if a student has a continuous one-on-one interaction; the policy doesn’t envision a teacher running down the hallway for five minutes. But again, all of this is up to districts on a district-by-district basis. Diana suspects that the term “designated volunteer” is pretty narrowly tailored to say you are having one-on-one, left alone for long periods of time, contact with children. And if it’s a situation where you don’t want a higher ed. student to have any one-on-one time, than the teacher has an obligation to be in the classroom.

Stavenger then asked if any background check was required if the district decided that his students were simply “volunteers.” Diana clarified that the IHE would have to get the NH records check upon enrollment into the IHE program. It’s interesting that the legislature chose language differentiating between entrance into a teacher preparation program and student teaching, recognizing that liability changes. Diana noted that teacher in classrooms know what they’re doing and that they’re not going to leave students alone with their kids.

Ron Pedro asked if the DOE would be comfortable drafting an opinion to superintendents about how the entire “volunteer” and “designated volunteer” works; Diana said she could craft a Technical Advisory to set out the difference between the two but that she cannot give legal advice and she certainly cannot tell the districts what to do. They have to look at their policy and their liability. The policy is a big-picture consideration of how much one-on-one time these students are spending with kids and have access to children.

Donna Talbot asked if the district will be deeming the frequency of the NH check; so if it’s the NH check will the districts be deciding if this is annual, each semester, each experience? Diana clarified that this is a conversation to have with each school district. No group has been more responsive to criminal background check law than this group and you deserve a lot of credit for having tough conversations with districts, because sometimes your policies don’t align with the school districts. And now is the time to have another conversation to say “we are limited. How often would you like us to run this check.” At 18 a person isn’t going to have a record because juvenile records are sealed—but at 20, 21 you certainly could and could be indicative of choices an individual. Though you might not have accurate records from some people out-of-state—so don’t let the NH check be a false security blanket. You really need to have an honest conversation with the districts because the liability shifts to the district.

Michael Fournier made a comment that principals and superintendents might not necessarily know what the requirements are; so when you ask the question of how many times an IHE should run a background check, they might not even know. Once they come in as a student teacher, that's when we know it's incumbent upon us to get an FBI check.

Suzanne Canali said this situation has provided a real opportunity to develop relationships with districts—it's all about the safety of students in the school. When student teachers are going to districts and getting full FBI checks, many school districts ask "have you ever committed a crime" instead of "have you ever been convicted of a felony." It's important we talk to students about this upon enrollment.

Kelly Moore Dunn appreciates the positive regard for the way IHEs have gone after this issue in the past, and hopes there is some way to communicate to schools more broadly; smaller IHEs don't necessarily have the capacity to reach out to every single school where they are placing students; there must be a way to get the word out that IHEs are doing due diligence according to the law and have them work with IHEs a little bit; some schools don't want to deal with it and shutting students out. Diana said we (DOE) can draft a Technical Advisory if the IHEs think it would be helpful—the more information we can get out here is always great. The other legislative thing we are trying to work on is designating the responsibility running and analyzing the background check to someone other than the school district superintendents. Part of the push-back you're feeling is that the superintendents are responsible for reviewing the background checks and it's overwhelming and perhaps even inappropriate.

**b. ACTION ITEM: DOE to craft a Technical Advisory on the issue of Background Checks in an informational way to touch on the interplay within the statute.**

Pat Corbett reiterated the importance of a TA to share with superintendents such that the messaging is consistent across the state. She also asked whether someone other than a superintendent could receive FBI background check results might be a law enforcement agency or sworn law enforcement officers to receive the results. Jeff Kellett said that while this sounds nice on the surface and while law enforcement officers are governmental representatives, Adam Walsh on its own does not require that the FBI search results go back to a governmental agency, it can go to a non-governmental agency. Unlike 189:13-a, Public Law 92-544 legislative action that requires any FBI results get sent back to a governmental agency; the restriction that prevents IHEs from accessing the FBI results is not based on going back to a governmental agency, it's based on the fact that Adam Walsh Act does not recognize colleges as Secondary Schools. This goes back to an obscure language in the Social Security Act of 1965 which is referenced in the Adam Walsh Act (AWA). The AWA was reviewed by the DOS, the DOE, and the Attorney General, and no one caught the definition restriction. Jeff Kellett apologized, reluctantly on behalf of the FBI for all the angst this has caused; Jeff Kellett is trying as hard as possible to give IHEs more information and access to the FBI database. From where we stand now, IHEs are only allowed to run and receive results back from the New Hampshire background check.

Jeff Kellett let the group know that each state has different criteria on how to access different states' background check. There are private background check companies that say they do national checks, but this is questionable at best because no private company has access to the FBI database; in addition, private companies routinely do not encourage purging database. So,

for example, if someone had a conviction in 1994 and subsequently had that annulled, that private company will not necessarily know that. So, if you get this information from a private company, it's inaccurate, a student is not let in as a result and finds out why, they can sue you for not doing your due diligence. So it's an internal decision on your part but wanted to make IHEs aware of some pitfalls along the way.

Ron Pedro asked whether we can contact our legislatures to fix the obscure language so this problem can go away. Jeff Kellett said the only way we can fix this is through a congressional law through Congress; the FBI will likely quash any such proposal because it goes against all rules and regulations they have in place; perhaps in the future the time will be ripe for a change.

Kelly Moore Dunn asked about the procedural process for Form 256. Jeff Kellett said the process is still the same, and the DOS is revamping the process to allow the records to be put online and you can access this online (only after legislative process and ensuring IT and funding and support is in line); Kelly Moore Dunn asked about the speed of the process to get background checks through NH; in August the process took about 5-6 weeks, but now the DOS will process the background check in 3-5 days.

#### **4. RIVIER PROGRESS REPORT – MICHAEL FOURNIER AND SUZANNE CANALI**

Suzanne and Michael circulated a memorandum of the report. On January 1 2018, Rivier received their institutional program review that occurred the prior December, and there was a recommendation for two priority progress reports. The first was due September 30, 2018, Rivier submitted the report on the 21<sup>st</sup>, prior to the deadline. The two bullet points at the top of the page indicate the two areas embedded that were supposed to be embedded in that progress report: (1) identifying key assessments for candidate assessment systems and certification programs and identifying what existing assessments they have and (2) a data collection system. On December 5, Suzanne Canali and Michael Fournier reviewed the comprehensive 23-page priority progress report provided by Diane Monico and her team which included data and appendices. Michael and Suzanne then came up with four questions on or around the 5<sup>th</sup> of December, then Diane, Michael, and Suzanne met on December 17<sup>th</sup> to walk through each of the questions that needed further clarification.

The first question to address was the benchmark assessment system and Diane took time to explain Rivier's intent; and Michael's sense is that at times you'd like your program to move in a certain direction and you don't always have 100% buy-in from all faculty. So the collective hope is that this work can act as a level to help faculties move in this direction. Rivier is continuing to work with faculty on clarifying language in the rubric. We talked about the validity and reliability of the rubric and Diane had talked about how Rivier utilized the framework provided by the DOE and will add a citation to the rubric to show where that information comes from; the validity of that work will be seen through data collection in the next year or two. There are some data from the summer, but that's only one data point.

We had a question regarding the terms "knowledge, skills, and dispositions" in the standards. Knowledge and skills are pretty clear and embedded throughout the standards, but dispositions has a smattering: sometimes it's professional responsibilities; wondering if Rivier made a distinction because those from River translated to content (knowledge), application (skill), and professional responsibilities (disposition).

Rivier went through the standards and thought there was lack of clarity within the standards and not a clear direction and the IHE understands the difference between professional responsibilities from disposition; you can have a teacher meet their professional responsibilities but not have the dispositions necessary to grow professionally. So having an IHE understand that distinction is important from a hiring perspective and for kids. Having an IHE understand that, which they do, is important.

Rivier showed the benchmark assessment rubric is deployed across all PEPPS; they're using Campus and shared some data they're working on and will continue to collect data.

Data collection does not require huge data systems. For example, the data system the Bedford School District utilizes is Excel which is about \$89. You don't need a huge system, you just need PD on how to manipulate the data.

Suzanne commented that the first progress report was well done and they did a lot of work, and that the next phase for the progress report is looking at gateway assessments and thread it through three areas. Diane Monico commented that the conversation was helpful in focusing her on the next stages; she might have questions later on the steps of the process for March, but will always have an eye on what's next.

Frank Hoell raised the issue of whether or not to take a vote on the progress report. Since this is a first priority progress report, Ashlee Stetser advocated for taking a vote based on rule 602.13(g). Suzanne agreed that the amount of work Rivier produced in the amount of time they did this was tremendous, they would really benefit from having the second progress report before this goes to the Board; Michael Fournier agreed and said the only two areas that continue to be looked at are (1) data collection continuation and (2) clinical partnership was an area for responsive action in the original report so he knows that Rivier is already beginning work on this, but it didn't make it to his progress report because this wasn't requested to be addressed on this progress report

Suzanne commented that it is interesting hearing the rules, because technically, if we are on a review, and we come to the decision that there needs to be a progress report, should there only be one? Because we cannot say everything has been met because there are two progress reports. Kelly said the benefit of two progress reports is to help the IHE get the feedback at the time that it's appropriate to move forward with the scope of what needs to be done. Suzanne questioned the position on voting—if this is going before the Board and there's a second report, do we only report out to the Board on the final one?

Ron Pedro asked whether it makes more sense to commend Rivier for the work they've done and then take a final vote on the second progress report and go to the Board. Ashlee Stetser asked whether she should then go to the SBE report that this was a successful part one of two parts of a progress report and that we're not looking for the Board to vote on anything, but we want to be as transparent as possible with the consensus of the CTE.

Michael Fourier suggested we look at the Board minutes to see what the CTE promised to do. Suzanne said we are not just smoke and mirrors by telling the SBE that Rivier completed what was expected for this first check-in and that the final progress report is scheduled in the Spring.

The reason this was set up as two progress reports is because of the amount of work that needed to be completed and to frame that first framework; it's not to avoid making a decision, it's simply to allow Rivier to complete the full report, which is not expected to be completed until March, 2019.

Diane Monico noted that Rivier is required to provide two progress reports and undergo a full review.

Kelly said that whatever we said at the meeting, whatever we said to the Board and they agreed to, we are held to. The group agreed not to take a vote.

[POST MEETING NOTE FROM SBE MEETING, MARCH 21, 2018: Ann Lane made the following motion, seconded by Kate Cassady, that the State Board of Education grant conditional program approval for two (2) years expiring on December 31, 2019, to Rivier University's Professional Preparation Programs. Within this two-year conditional approval, a full review of the institution's programs will occur prior to the December 31, 2019 expiration. Furthermore, Rivier University shall be required to submit two priority progress reports addressing findings, detailed in the January 18, 2018 report. The first progress report shall be submitted on or before September 30, 2018, the second priority progress report shall be submitted on or before March 31, 2019.]

VOTE: The motion was approved by a unanimous vote of the Board with the Chairman abstaining.]

##### **5. NEW PROGRAM REVIEW TEMPLATE – ASHLEE STETSER AND PAT CORBETT (NEW ENGLAND COLLEGE)**

Ashlee Stetser introduced a new NHDOE Request to Conduct New Program Review Template given the five upcoming New Program Reviews for the CTE approval per Ed602.08(b)(1); per the Ed600s, the DOE is responsible for providing technical assistance to IHEs and that includes drafting templates to assist the IHEs and review teams. Stetser worked with New England College (Pat Corbett and Debra Nitschke-Shaw) to revamp the current template housed online. The main edits included adding rule language, adding a clarifying paragraph under the "Next Steps" section, and removing subsections a-d under point number 9 because these sections change yearly.

Robust conversation ensued. Michael Fournier suggested a footer with CTE effective date in the new template, that way IHEs who have already submitted a new program review request form do not have to resubmit under a new form—they're grandfathered in to the older form and there's universal understanding that the new form is effective from X date moving forward.

Chris Ward originally made a motion to accept the recommended changes to the New Program Approval Template, seconded by Jacqueline Kelleher. The motion passed unanimously. HOWEVER, after much discussion both retracted their motions. Please refer to Section 6 Below.

##### **6. NEW PROGRAM REVIEW CHAIRS – ASHLEE STETSER**

Ashlee Stetser reviewed the New Program Review Request Spreadsheet before the group and requested two things: (1) First she asked that if the designated IHE Contact Person noticed a gap and or inaccuracy in the spreadsheet that they reach out to her. For example, UVEI has one program request listed, but Stetser believes there are two more UVEI would like reviewed. (2) She asked that the group help identify chairs for each Institution requesting a new program review.

Kelly Moore Dunn asked a clarifying question about the Site Visit column. She asked whether it's a brand new program review, that there is only a paper review—and CTE members responded "maybe." Stetser stated that she wasn't clear what a Paper Review meant—and that after some research, her understanding is that if the CTE unanimously agreed that in lieu of a site visit, there could be a Paper Review, meaning a review of the program without having to travel to the IHE site. It was agreed that the column would be updated to read Site Visit or Paper Review.

Chris asked whether IHEs with multiple New Program Requests would have only one chair. Michael Seidel stated that the understanding is there would be one chair per institution with multiple subject-matter experts as reviewers.

Suzanne Canali stated this is good time for someone who has never been a chair to volunteer because they would have her, Frank Hoell's and Ashlee Stetser's support, and that this is an opportunity to start taking on some of these roles and that we need to share these rolls. Suzanne also stated that taking on the role of Chair better prepared her when her institution was undergoing a review.

Michael Fournier offered to Chair Saint Anselm's. Pat Corbett offered to chair UVEI as she is a certified curriculum administrator. Beth Buoro offered to Chair the NHTI Computer Science Program even though she is not a specialist, which is not necessary for the Chair role (reviewers should be specialists in a particular field)

- a. **ACTION ITEM: DOE will need to follow up with PSU regarding their proposed new programs as there needs to be a cross-reference to one of the corresponding 600s. Mary Earick can also follow-up with Ashlee Stetser.**

Michael Seidel has a master list of potential reviewers and will work with the Chair and members of the CTE to see if we need to add or subtract from the master list.

Kelly Dunn Moore raised the question of "Date Review Scheduled" and what, for example, is happening in January 2019 with UVEI under this column. We don't necessarily know what's going to happen with a Site Visit or Paper Review until it comes before the CTE first—that's when the CTE decides if a Paper Review or a Site Visit is appropriate. Frank Hoell confirmed that the Institution would bring a paper copy of what they wanted and then the CTE would make a decision at that time whether it was a Paper Review (no visit) or an on-site review had to be rescheduled later in the year. Ashlee Stetser clarified that what would come before the CTE is the Narrative Report under Option 3 listed on the New Program Review Template.

Frank Hoell suggested that we make time on the January meeting to go through all of the New Program Review Requests, or at least the first two that are coming up (UVEI and Saint Anselm's).

Chris Ward asked what would need to be submitted before presented before the CTE; Ashlee Stetser said it would be what the group just approved—the New Program Review Template. And this, historically, would go to the CTE for review. Then a Chair would work with Ashlee to identify a reviewer to review the documents. But, per the rules, the IHE submits documents directly to the chair and reviewers and then the team would look at it before the CTE meeting and bring their request to the CTE on whether to conduct an on-site or paper review.

Lots of questions about what comes first—matrix or self-assessment report because there are contradicting rules. Suzanne noted that despite the contradiction in rules, the CTE is here to provide advisement to the School Board and to also do no harm; we have conflicting rules that could potentially be harmful if we harp on them and hold up students waiting to start programs; there are times in this process when we need to make common sense decisions. We don't want to interrupt progress.

Chris' intention in bringing this up is that we don't burden the wrong people in reviewing the report. Rather than the CTE making the decision on the self-assessment report, should it just be the chair and reviewers, then the CTE makes the decision on whether to vote on a paper review or site review? Diane asked whether there are some parts of that list in the New Program Review Template that we agreed if we have that information in front of us we could agree on a paper review or a site review. Chris said he doesn't know the difference between the self-assessment report and Matrix and Narrative Report—if everything is presented ahead of time, what else would need to be presented? Mike Fournier asked, what is the question? The question is who decides about the new program review, when they decide, and what type of review? Is the potential site visit something the review team decides on and brings to the CTE or is this something the CTE decides and brings to the review team?

Ashlee Stetser said that self-assessment report should replace “Narrative Report”, this gets rid of the confusion; then that Self-Assessment report is delivered to the chair and the reviewer(s), then this is presented before the CTE (per the rules) and the CTE decides on an initial recommendation or a request for a one day on-site visit. Kelly Dunn Moore said that this makes perfect sense, but that this puts a lot of pressure on the Chair and Reviewer to make the decision to bring this to the CTE; in addition, if the CTE hasn't seen the report yet, and it's missing critical information, we should not send out a review team. Chris agrees with Kelly. 602.08(b) says the IHE shall submit a NHCTE approved form to the department and the NHCTE.

If we want to make this a process, is what's required from the IHE too much? A self-assessment report is the whole thing, and this really isn't what the CTE should be looking at right away, it should look at something slimmer (which is where the Narrative Report came from, we believe).

Ron also stated that there should be some rubric, so that CTE decisions are not arbitrary and are guided by something.

Mike Fournier stated that an IHE, their very first step is to go to the DOE and wants to start a program. DOE then queues up a chair and a reviewer.

There's an NHCTE form, but do we want the form to look like the New Program Approval Request Form? How much is provided *before* the technical assistance is provided? Mike Fournier recommends that we look at 602.08 and that the rules sort through what we need. Chris stated

that all we really need are a few lines: Code, program name, and course of study is pretty much all that needs to be on the approved form for a program proposal, which then triggers the timeline.

Bill Ross noted that it's important to reach out to Ashlee first, because she will ensure that you're working from the currently approved Matrix.

Kelly Dunn Moore stated that we moved a little bit away from the basics of the form Chris just proposed, is that the CTE couldn't make a decision if the institution could go forward starting the program based on such little information.

So...what are we doing in January? Are we picking teams? Chairs and teams? Are we asking the IHEs to bring forward request for new program based on old format? Who already submitted the old form?

Here's what we do. Take those that have submitted new program review requests, look at them, and make a decision at the CTE meeting. We take Saint Anselm's (Computer Science) and UVEI, which have been submitted, and we start this off as the first discussion at the next meeting and start making decisions based on this. Michael Seidel asked that we have information on the other two programs from UVEI (Chris Ward) two weeks before the next CTE meeting.

- b. ACTION ITEM: Chris Ward to send Ashlee Stetser more information on the two addition program requests two weeks before the next CTE meeting (January 3, 2019).**

Chris Ward made a motion to withdrawal the original motion and Jacqueline Kelleher seconded and the group voted to withdrawal the motion to vote on the New Program Review Template.

## **7. ALTERNATIVE 4-5 PATHWAYS TO CERTIFICATION – BILL ROSS**

Bill wants to bring this forward as information purpose only; The DOE and the Credentialing office is working with White Mountains Community College and they have requested to put together a five or six course sequence specifically geared toward Alt 4 or 5 candidates in the North Country to start with. Those 5-6 courses will be cross-walked with all the professional education standards. The idea is a person can complete those courses and will have met the professional education standards. Credentialing is going to pre-approve this set of courses; they're doing a deep-dive into the courses and content and making sure the cross-walk is approvable.

The hope is that one or more of the IHEs may choose to do a similar thing.

## **8. SBE UPDATE – MICHAEL SEIDEL**

There's a video link posted to the State Board of Education (SBE) minutes for those who would like to review the detail of the meeting. We carried forward the three votes from the November CTE meeting the SBE: The two conditional approval votes for Plymouth State University (PSU) and approval of UVEI Progress Update Report. After some Q&A between SBE and PSU, the SBE agreed to the recommended two year conditional approval and the approval of UVEI's Progress

Update. The SBE did require PSU to provide additional details after the meeting regarding the information they are providing to the students about the status of PSU teacher prep programs.

- a. **ACTION ITEM: Ashlee Stetser to circulate SBE video link from December 13, 2018 meeting to full CTE members**

Meeting adjourned at 3:07PM.