**Summary of major themes in response to the public comment draft of**

**the *Regulations for Educator License Renewal (603 CMR 44.00)***

**March 5, 2017 – May 1, 2017**

Sources:

* Online public comment survey (30 full responses and 62 partial responses)
* Additional correspondences received through email and/or a letter (3)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ESE Proposed Change** | **Summary of Public Comment Received** | **ESE Response** |
| ***603 CMR 44.02 Definitions*** |  |  |
| The Department created a new definition for the term additional license, modified several definitions and eliminated definitions that are not currently components of license renewal such as low performing mathematics program and mathematics content assessment. | Overall there was support for the changes including from the Massachusetts Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (MACTE), Bridgewater State University (BSU) and the Massachusetts Teachers’ Association (MTA). While the MTA was in agreement with the proposals, they suggested an amendment to the definition for advanced academic study one definition and the creation of a new definition for guidelines. | No Change: The Department is not amending the definition of advanced academic study as it was not part of the original proposals and believes that the definition should remain as is to clarify that an educator can earn additional PDPs when an upper-level undergraduate course is substantially new to them.  When developing the license renewal guidelines, ESE has actively sought the input of MTA and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) Massachusetts and other key stakeholders as needed. The primary objective of the renewal guidelines is to lay out the various professional development activities and their related point value, much of which has been in place since license renewal began. |
| **Section 44.03: General Provisions** |  |  |
| Updated some language related to the completion of a performance assessment and eliminated activities that have not traditionally existed, such as the mathematics content assessment. | Overall there was support for the changes and generally no proposed changes were received. | No change. |
| **ESE Proposed Change** | **Summary of Public Comment Received** | **ESE Response** |
| **44.04: Options for Educators Employed in Massachusetts Public Schools.** |  |  |
| The Department was clarifying that educators do not need to maintain two separate plans – an Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP) and an Educator Plan. Educators employed in a MA public school could use an Educator Plan in lieu of an IPDP and 44.04 clarified the process for doing so. | Overall there was general support for the changes, including MACTE, BSU and the MTA who agreed to the proposal in concept. MTA proposed some specific changes including a suggestion to rename the section and that 44.03 should apply to all educators, not just those employed in a MA school. MTA also offered alternative clarifying language. | Change: The Department changed the name of this section to Individual Professional Development Plans and accepted the language that was proposed by the MTA to make this section clearer. |
| **Section 44.05: Approval of Professional Development Plans** |  |  |
| The Department is eliminating the requirements applicable to the renewal of licenses prior to July 1, 2016 and updating and revising the process of reviewing and approving an educator’s professional development plan. | General agreement with the proposals in this section including the MTA, who offered additional amendments including clarifying language, a “reasonable time period” to have a plan approved and the elimination of the mid-cycle review of the plan and a review when an educator moves to a new district. | Change: The Department agreed with and accepted some of the proposed clarifying language offered; we extended the period for plan approval from three months to six to provide educators with additional time to develop a plan and have it approved and we eliminated the requirement to have the plan reviewed every two years since the Department does not verify if this occurred and we have no evidence of its impact. Given that the educational needs and program offerings of one district can be different from another, we believe it is important to maintain the need to update an IPDP when moving to a new district. |
| **Section 44.06: Provisions applicable to licenses renewed on or after July I, 2016** |  |  |
| The Department is providing the educator and district greater input on what PD will have the most impact on that educator and/or their students. Currently 120 of the 150 required PDPs must be in predetermined areas; under the proposal, 60 of the 150 will be in the predetermined areas of content, pedagogy, SEI/ESL and special education. | There was overall support for this proposal, including the American Federation of Teachers Massachusetts. The MTA, while in agreement with the new distribution of PDPs, proposed to rename the section and simplify some language. | Change: The Department agreed with the proposed new name of this section of the regulations and the streamlined language pertaining those renewing a primary license. |
| **ESE Proposed Change** | **Summary of Public Comment Received** | **ESE Response** |
| **Section 44.07: Inactive and Invalid Licenses** |  |  |
| The Department is updating the language to clarify the employability of an educator with an inactive or invalid license. | There was overall support for these proposals with no specific recommendations for changes. | No change. |
| **Section 44.08: Application Process** |  |  |
| The Department is updating language to align to policy and clarify the requirements for renewing a Professional license. | There was overall support for these proposals with no specific recommendations for changes. | No change. |
| **Section 44.09 Documentation and Recordkeeping** |  |  |
| The Department is updating language, including the maintenance of a professional license issued by another agency, if applicable (such as a license as a registered nurse) | There was overall support for these proposals with no specific recommendations for changes. | No change. |
| **Section 44.11: Failure to Satisfy Renewal Requirements** |  |  |
| The Department is including language that alerts applicants that a license action may occur if there are intentional falsehoods or misrepresentations with their application. | There was majority approval to this proposal with opposition from the MTA. The MTA asserted that this change was unnecessary and the language is duplicative since the Department can already investigate potential fraud or misconduct per 603 CMR 7.15(8) | No change: The Department agrees that 603 CMR 7.15(8) allows us the ability to investigate accusations of fraud or misconduct; however, we think the new language in the section on failure to satisfy the renewal requirements puts applicants for renewal on notice that a license action can occur based on intentional misrepresentations in the renewal application. |