

## CTC Meeting Minutes - June 11-12, 2007

### Ontario

The panel continued discussion on credential requirements by reviewing the minutes of the previous meeting. The initial credential requirements were further defined. A number of questions were raised related to initial requirements:

*How is the level of certification related to 1 unit defined?* It should be analyzed and determined locally based upon the assignment. For instance, a class in food service might only require a ServeSafe Certificate, but a class in restaurant management would require a higher level of certification in food service. Local authority should decide if what might count for a unit. Some certifications can be earned in a few hours, while others may take months. *Should a unit (which represents a minimum full-time year of experience) be counted for a low, entry level certification?*

*Is it appropriate for a regular teaching credential (MS/SS) to count for one unit?*

As fully prepare teachers, they will already get to opt out of the credential preparation program because they have already completed coursework in order to obtain their existing credential.

*What additional preparation do they need?* Methods/foundations of CTE seems essential and different from regular education preparation. Regular education teachers should complete that part of the CTE program.

*Should they also have verified successful teaching experience?* Holding a credential does not insure good teaching, but CTE teachers have no preparation. *Is teaching experience the same as occupational experience if it is not in a related area (e.g., science and engineering)? If not, can it be counted for occupational experience?*

*Where should health/CPR be required?* CPR should be in the initial credential and safety should be covered in "pre-service."

*How long should an initial credential be valid?* Five years is too long; it sends a message that preparation is not important and sets teachers up for failure. Two or three makes more sense (one year with a one year renewal?).

The panel then discussed professional level requirements. At this point they decided that the present ones contained some important requirements that should be retained but also thought that the US Constitution requirements should be moved from the initial to the professional requirements which would remove an entry barrier.

The panel also discussed completion of an induction program after the initial preparation program that could extend the professional development of CTE teachers by providing funded mentorship without adding teachers' preparation burden. Using intern and induction models, teacher incentives, success, and retention might be improved. Funded induction might require some change to BTSA regulations for CTE teachers.

*What might induction entail?*

- a. *Mentor teacher works with candidate on multiple occasions to ensure that they meet the competencies to clear their credential*
- b. *Year 1 is intern and year 2 is induction (or maybe 2 and 2?)*
- c. *Formalized program (i.e., BTSA)?*
- d. *funding*

The panel had a great deal of concerns about how to provide new CTE teachers with the necessary skills for success that result in retention. They discussed whether ESDs could be

responsible for providing “just in time” basic teaching skills. CTC has little authority over that, but the CDE representative thought that could be something that CDE could promote with greater leverage. An orientation is provided by most employers but the depth, breadth and focus varies dramatically. Some panel members wanted to insure that all candidates have some preparation upon taking over a class by including it in program standards and holding the programs responsible for it. Some suggested that such an orientation could be done in as little as 20 hours, online, and/or during weekends and evenings but that the critical issue to that it must be done early. Several panel members worked on identifying what should be in an orientation to increase a new teacher’s success and in the process developed a possible standard for it. The funded intern model was discussed as a way to provide incentives and retention but would require some changes to intern regulations which presently require recipients to hold a bachelor’s degree. Panel members agreed that programs would be better equipped to provide higher quality preparation with funded support.

English learners were another issue of early orientation that was discussed. The panel is in unified agreement that if new teachers must complete 45 hours of EL training (SB 1292) and are limited to only 90 hours of preparation (SB 52), it will not be possible to address teaching English learners in the preparation program. In addition, EL would be the only thing that these teachers would have time to address in as “preservice.” The panel believes based on education research that both teachers and students will be better served by infusing EL pedagogy throughout a program in which it can be contextualized and situated. For instance, as lesson planning is learned, teachers would learn how to construct lessons for English learners as well as other special needs students.

Panel members worked on a draft standard for early orientation that could address some of the concerns raised and talked about delivery models that would make such preparation possible and timely. Other draft standards were also begun by panel members first identifying which of the old standards should be retained, with or without revision. They also began to compare that analysis with the 2042 multiple and single subject standards to determine where the gaps presently exist and whether they should be more aligned.