

**COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS  
BOARD OF EDUCATION  
\*\*\*REGULAR MEETING\*\*\*  
CROSBY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL  
517 WEST STREET  
PITTSFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS  
TUESDAY, APRIL 25, 2000  
9:00 a.m. - 12:00 a.m.**

**MEMBERS OF THE BOARD  
OF EDUCATION PRESENT:**

Mr. James A. Peyser, Chairman  
Dr. Roberta R. Schaefer, Vice-chairperson, Worcester  
Ms. Patricia Crutchfield, Southwick  
Dr. Judith Gill, Boston  
Mr. William K. Irwin, Wilmington  
Mr. Marcel LaFlamme, Chair, Student Advisory Council, Monson  
Dr. Abigail Thernstrom, Lexington  
Dr. David P. Driscoll, Commissioner of Education  
Mr. Charles D. Baker, Swampscott

**MEMBERS OF THE BOARD  
OF EDUCATION ABSENT:**

Dr. Edwin J. Delattre, Boston

**ALSO PRESENT:**

Nancy Catuogno Varallo, Registered Diplomat Reporter

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** Good morning, everyone. Right before we get started, I think it's appropriate for the Commissioner to introduce our hosts.

**COMMISSIONER DRISCOLL:** **Thank** you very much, Mr. Chairman. I am pleased to recognize Bill Travis, a relatively new superintendent, who has been a long contributor here in Pittsfield. Superintendent Travis.

**MR. TRAVIS:** I would like to welcome the members of the Board. This is a wonderful opportunity for Western Massachusetts to host the Board. When last I turned my back, I saw two other superintendents in Berkshire County, Mark Piechota from Mount Greylock Union, and Harvey Horwitz from Central Berkshire. We did our best to advertise your presence. I really do see this as a wonderful opportunity to observe the Board in action and to interact with members. I put a brochure at everyone's table about the Parent-Child Home Program. It happens to be that the home office of that program is in Crosby Elementary School where you are today, located downstairs, and if anyone does have the time at the end of the meeting, we'd be glad to show you that program.

Just as an overview, Pittsfield is a real beneficiary of the Ed Reform law and the School Building Assistance Bureau. We have a total of seven school projects that have been approved with a total cost for construction and bonding of \$60 million. I was a little concerned about hosting this meeting because our two middle schools are under construction right now and they are both physically closed, and we have relocated 1,500 students and in excess of 200 staff, including custodians, cafeteria people, clerical staff, and teachers. This building in fact is a K-5 elementary school that is hosting sixth grade students who would have gone to one of the two middle schools. We have leased a former middle school in a nearby community for our seventh graders, and our eighth graders are in our 9-12 high school where we have constructed about 13 different classroom spaces to accommodate the students. So when we heard that you were coming, we weren't quite sure we would find parking spaces and be able to get you in here. But we really thought this was a unique opportunity and are glad to be able to find the space. So if you hear some noise in a little while it's because our elementary students will be coming in. Because of our transportation out of town, we've delayed the start of elementary school until 9:30. So we have tried to backfill for parents with daycare programs in schools starting as early as 8:00 so parents can get to work and have a safe place to leave their young children.

So while we have benefited greatly from the Ed Reform dollar increases and the School Building Assistance Bureau, you have also put a few kinks in my plans. Next year we hope to have three elementary schools under construction and they will be closed completely and those students will be relocated. So I have my puzzle map in my office and that planning will begin very shortly. So, welcome to all of you. I'd like to introduce the principal of Crosby Elementary School, Mr. Robert Colantuono.

**MR. COLANTUONO:** Good morning. Welcome to Crosby. That thing out in the sky is the sun, which we haven't seen here in quite a while. It is nice to have you here. It's nice to put faces and names to people that have made the decisions that affect my livelihood and the education balance of students. So it is nice to get a look at you. You're in Crosby Elementary School and, as Dr. Travis has said, we are normally K-5. We have six grades here. We also start with students as young as three-year-olds here. We have a three- and four-year-old special needs program. And we have many other special needs students in this school, children with all sorts of disabilities. Right now, we are home to over 600 students and you're sitting in the least-used room in the entire building. When the meeting is over, if you want to get a real look at education, I suggest you take a walk around Crosby, visit some of the classrooms and see what's going on. Other than that, welcome to Pittsfield and welcome to Crosby.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** Thank you both very much. Glad to be here. Since we are already running a little bit behind schedule, I will forego any comments. We do also have eight people scheduled to testify, so in light of that, I will simply pass it on to the Commissioner for opening remarks.

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSIONER**

**COMMISSIONER DRISCOLL:** There are a number of very important issues that are going on in the Department and across school districts, and many of them are listed in the packet. There are a couple things I want to up-to-date you on. First, there is the mathematics curriculum framework. Sandra Stotsky and I met yesterday with Department staff and the steering committee made up of ATMIM, Association of Teachers of Mathematics in Massachusetts; MASS, Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents; MathWest; and the Mathematics and Science Advisory Council, which is at the direction of this Board. The Assessment Development Committee has also met and given us recommendations. Jeff Nellhaus and I are going over these recommendations as we speak. They did an outstanding job. The Assessment Development Committee is looking at strands of the new framework as it compares to the former framework and as it compares to the MCAS test. We are very pleased with that progress. Two members of that Assessment Development Committee were on the original panel that submitted a math framework. We've sent the latest version of our framework to a number of mathematicians throughout the country, some of whom were recommended by Board members. We are pleased with the process.

Today, at my request, Bill Kendall of Braintree, who testified before this Board on the mathematics framework, has assembled a subgroup of math coordinators to go over the frameworks. I'm going to meet with them later this afternoon. Jackie Rivers, who was on the original panel, is assembling a group of educators who will also review the frameworks. So all in all, the steering committee has established grade level groups and they are to get their work back to us by Friday, May 5. An awful lot of progress has been made.

As you may know, the new NCTM standards have come out, NCTM 2000. If anything, our new framework is more in concert with NCTM 2000 because, as has been reported, they have recommended more specific standards, and we're going through that match-up now. The president of NCTM will be here this week. They were kind enough to send us an advanced copy. I believe that we'll be presenting to the Board what can only be described as a superior document. I have been out in the field, as I said I would do. I have been all around the state talking to teachers and administrators. It's clear that there is unanimous agreement that what we need to have is a framework with strong expectations of what standards are and what kids ought to know and be able to do. Equally strong is the underlying understanding of concepts as well. I think that makes sense. It's always made sense to me. A balanced approach is what we need and I believe we can get it.

I also want to update you on the Lawrence Public Schools. The Lawrence school committee did appoint a former superintendent as acting superintendent. He is retired and is now serving as acting superintendent. Things have calmed down tremendously in Lawrence. It seems an awful lot of progress is being made around the issues of teaching and learning. The legal agreement that this Board has with the Lawrence School Committee now kicks in. It's a two-part agreement. The first part is the selection of a superintendent. The second part is what happens after a superintendent is selected by the Lawrence

School Committee and this Board. Both bodies must agree on the selection of the superintendent. Once that's done, we are in a different mode of monitoring. The agreement requires that we establish a nine-member screening committee, five appointed by the Mayor, or chairman of the School Committee, and four appointed by me. I've been in constant contact with the Mayor and we have essentially agreed on all nine. We chose several local people, but I wanted to have some from outside Lawrence, as well. Matt George, former superintendent of schools in Brockton Public Schools, is going to chair that group. Hopefully, we'll begin the process and have a superintendent in place by the beginning of June.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

*Judith Nordacci, Governor's Commission on Gay and Lesbian Youth.*

**MS. NORDACCI:** Members of the Board, I'd like to thank you and the Department of Education for this opportunity to speak to you. The Governor's Commission on Gay and Lesbian Youth certainly supports the new regulations, but the Commission asked me to tell you what they mean to me and the families and young people I know. I'm here as a former teacher, past Northeast Regional Director of Parents, Families and Friends of Lesbians and Gays, and a participant in that organization's seven years of work under the Safe Schools Program. As a teacher, I know that every child deserves safety, respect and affirmation in school. As Regional Director, I traveled all over the country and heard that Massachusetts is a beacon of hope for many people trying to make their schools welcoming and secure for gay and lesbian students. As a participant in the Safe Schools Program, I know that our law has brought positive changes to many schools. But most of all, I'm here as a parent. Both of my children and my family were deeply hurt by the climate of intolerance, discrimination, and harassment toward gay and lesbian people in our society and, I would add, in schools. My daughter, who is lesbian, spent her entire school life in hiding. My son was unable for years to get beyond the stereotypes of gay people to begin to accept her, and we were ashamed and silent despite her need for our support. We are not alone. So I'm here today for all the other families with a gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered member whose stories echo ours and who are afraid for their children. I've spoken in many schools where the faculty and administrators are committed to providing a safe climate for every student, but do not have a clear idea how to do that. I know there are others who do not even begin to recognize the depth of the problem, or the dread with which many of their students face every day. How can we expect our children to survive that fear and isolation, much less to learn and participate in the life of the school? My dream is that the identity and gifts of my children -- and all children -- are welcomed and celebrated in their schools. The new regulations will provide the guidance and specificity schools are looking for to make that happen. They will assure that no young person suffers in silence, unprotected and at risk. That is their right, and our responsibility.

*Scott Whiteman, Parents' Rights Coalition*

**MR. WHITEMAN:** The Parents' Rights Coalition is here today to ask you not to update the Administrative Code while only considering the points made by the homosexual lobby. The Food and Drug Administration versus Brown and Williamson Corporation in a recent Supreme Court decision states: "Regardless of how serious the problem an administrative agency seeks to address, it may not exercise its authority in a manner that is inconsistent with administrative structure that Congress has enacted into law." Therefore, whatever you seek to do today regarding homosexuality in public schools may go no further than what General Laws Chapter 76, Section 5 states, which is, simply, that children cannot be discriminated against in the admission or obtaining of advantages and privileges of a public school based on their orientation. Furthermore, the Gay Students Civil Rights Law expressly relates only to students. Therefore, the 603 CMR 26.07.3 does not fall into an administration action that would allow the teacher to submit to training under General Law 76.5. Additionally, 603 CMR 26.07 Section 6, which would require the hiring of gay teachers, is outside of the parameter of the Gay Students Civil Rights Law, and anything that you determine to mandate again must fall expressly inside that provision. 603 26.05.2 may fall within the statutory requirements as it would require teachers to open up curriculum to homosexual issues, but General Laws 71.32A precludes that as it would be an unfair and unjust and illegal infringement on a parents' rights to not have opt-out power in the human sexuality education of their child. The idea that the teaching of homosexuality is not a parents' rights issue and does not fall within MGL 71.32A is, frankly, quite confusing to me. How we can say that homosexuality has nothing to do with human sexuality? Many of the comments that I have already submitted to you are related to the actual teaching of homosexual conduct in the schools. When I spoke before you in December I expressed that concern and I was basically told without proof, I hadn't demonstrated that homosexual teaching is actually going on. Last month I attended a Listen Teach Out Conference where Department of Education employees Margot Abels and Julie Neverland taught 14-year-old children how to stick their hands inside each other's rectums. I have it on tape. This is verifiable. It was a conference supported by the Department of Education funded in part by the Governor's Commission. I

have tape of 14-year-old children being asked whether it was rude to spit after oral sex. These are gross concerns that parents have about the sexual education of their children. Rather than run over time, I simply ask that you refrain from stepping further than the statute allows. Thank you.

*Denise Broszonos, from Lynn, Massachusetts*

**MS. BROSZONOS:** Hi, Commissioner. I have recently sent a letter to you. Basically, I have a lot of stuff written down here, but I'm just going to speak with my heart. Basically what Scott just said, I'm in agreement with everything he has said. I found it very upsetting that I called the Department of Education's office to find out what was really going on as far as sexual orientation being defined because I couldn't understand why the statute would be changed after all this time. And when I asked what this means, I couldn't get an answer. When I said, "Could you define it for me?" I still couldn't get an answer. When in history has a child or a student ever been discriminated against in a public school? I don't know about it. I have never heard of anything like that. So from what I see now and from what I hear, updating the code is opening doors, like Scott has just said. My child has never been in a public school, this is her first year of being in a public school, and this is the reason why I decided to home-school my child and raise her in a Christian school. First of all, I'm not going to come here to judge anybody and I'm not going to judge a homosexual for their sin because I have sin in my life too, but I will say one thing: I do not want my child being taught any type of sexual issue in school. That is my God-given right as a parent to nurture my child at home the way I see fit and to explain to her sexual preference. Nobody has the right. And let me say one thing: Most people that are gay, do they have children? Do they have children? Do you people know what's best for my child?

And what hurts the most is that we are being deceived. Parents aren't even being told that their kids are taken off campus to engage in sexual rallies. The Gay/Straight Alliance has these clubs in schools. I always thought it was a law that if a student wanted to have a club, that it was at the will of the student to take ownership of that club. I always thought there were no funds for any type of club in a school, and yet our state and our legislature is providing money for our children to be taught about homosexuality and sexual issues? I don't want my child being taught anything sexual, not at all. I don't want to have to worry about my daughter going to school and what she's going to learn. As her mother, I have the authority and God-given right to raise my child the way that I see fit. That's all I have to say.

*Jennifer Levi, Gay and Lesbian Advocates and Defenders.*

**MS. LEVI:** Good morning. I appreciate the opportunity to address the Board today. I'm particularly pleased that the Board has the opportunity to see the type of bias and bigotry that our gay and lesbian students face in school. The same sort of messages that you just heard previously reflected about her confusion between sexuality and the existence of gay and lesbian people as well as the negative messages that really are pervasive in our culture are just the kinds of messages that our students face on a daily basis and the reason why these regulations are so important.

My name is Jennifer Levi and I'm a staff attorney with Gay and Lesbian Advocates and Defenders, one of America's leading rights organizations for lesbians, gay men, and people with AIDS and HIV. In this capacity I have significant opportunity to work with and hear from youth, including youth who identify as gay, those who are questioning their sexual orientation, and those who may not be gay but are perceived to be so by their peers, teachers, or administrators. The consistent messages I hear both from our youth and their parents are two: First, that it is of critical importance to ensure positive portrayals of gay people in the classroom and in other school programs; and second, that the Commonwealth must do all it can to continue the very important work that has already begun in earnest to ensure the physical and emotional safety of all our students, regardless of sexual orientation, which is the purpose of General Laws Chapter 76, Section 5.

Despite the tremendous efforts already undertaken in Massachusetts, many of our youth remain at real risk due to the continued anti-gay harassment and violence targeted against them in schools and because of persistent anti-gay messages they continue to hear throughout the culture. I speak today in strong support of the proposed language of the regulations on Access to Equal Educational Opportunity. The proposed changes to the existing regulations are sorely needed and are a critical step towards ensuring the effectiveness of our Safe Schools Law. Since our Safe Schools Law was passed in December 1993, the omission in the proposed references to sexual orientation in the regulations has sent mixed signals and created confusion regarding the full inclusion of all our students of the Commonwealth in our law. In addition to my endorsement, I'd like to make a few brief comments with respect to the proposed regulations.

The first regards the curriculum. Given that up to 97 percent of students hear homophobic comments in school, with about 50 percent of students hearing anti-gay remarks on a regular basis, our schools must take an affirmative step to combat this climate of prejudice and bigotry through positive portrayal and messages regarding sexual orientation in the curriculum. Including fair perspectives about different groups helps build the self-esteem necessary for students targeted for harassment and gives gay and non-gay students ways to respond to the onslaught of negative messages they hear regarding gay people outside the classroom. Simply adding sexual orientation to existing regulation 26.05 will not achieve this goal. We also recommend that the Board include an affirmative obligation on school personnel to actively seek to prevent peer harassment. Finally, we recommend the Board put some teeth behind regulation 26.05(2) and designate who within schools is responsible for ensuring that educational materials containing stereotypes based on sexual orientation are appropriately counteracted in activities, discussions, and supplementary materials. I urge the Board to keep in mind that this regulation ensuring review for stereotypes and supplementing the curriculum when stereotypes are used pedagogically provides for the richest marketplace of ideas resulting ultimately in the incorporation of diverse ideas and not censorship. In closing, as an attorney working to defend the civil rights of gay people, few calls are as painful for me to hear as those I receive from students who are facing harassment, violence, or discrimination in schools. I must say I continue to receive those calls frequently. When I get a call from a student who's been the target of anti-gay harassment or violence in schools, I can sometimes help them because we do have such a powerful tool in our Safe Schools Law. But, quite honestly, by the time I get that call, it is in many ways too late. Damage has already been done to that student's mental and physical health. The first line of defense in protecting our students is the teachers and administrators who interact with them on a daily basis providing clear guidance.

In conclusion, nondiscrimination is the only way to ensure that our students remain safe in our schools. I commend the Department's efforts with regard to these proposed regulations.

*William Gillmeister, Brookfield, Massachusetts*

**MR. GILLMEISTER:** Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board, Commissioner Driscoll. My name is William J. Gillmeister. Professionally I'm a Ph.D. agricultural economist. I'm also a husband to my beautiful wife Susan, and together we have been blessed by God with five wonderful children ranging in ages from eight years down to 17 months. We are currently in the process of adopting two Chinese children. Most fundamentally, however, I am a Christian who believes in the absolute and infallible truth of God's word as it's revealed in the Bible. I'm here to state my opposition to the proposed changes to the Access to Equal Educational Opportunity at 603 CMR 26, which would allow homosexual activists unlimited access to helpless school children.

At the most fundamental level, homosexuality should be discouraged and not encouraged. From a biblical standpoint, homosexuality, homosexual activity is a sin, just as so many other human activities, such as lying, stealing, adultery, et cetera. So you know that I'm not simply picking on homosexuals, all of us have fallen short with the glory of God. As the woman spoke earlier, she has sinned in her life as well, but He has made provision for our forgiveness through Jesus Christ. So that no one misunderstands me, I strongly oppose and condemn the harassment and physical violence against homosexuals and anyone else for that matter. Homosexual acts are still wrong and public schools should not be a place where such activities are encouraged, as these proposed regulations would allow. On a more worldly level, part of Chapter 5, Section 2 of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in part states, "Wisdom and knowledge as well as virtue diffused generally among the body of the people being necessary for the preservation of their rights and liberties; and as these depend on spreading the opportunities and advantages of education in the various parts of the country and among the different orders of the people, it shall be the duties of legislatures and magistrates in all future periods of this Commonwealth to cherish the interests of literature and sciences and all seminaries of them." The object of this section is the diffusion of wisdom and knowledge as well as virtue through public education. I wonder if John Adams, who is widely attributed with having written this section, would have considered these proposed regulations virtuous. Indeed, the definition of virtue as it would have been known at that time is as follows: Moral goodness; a particular moral excellence. That's from Noah Webster - A Compendious Dictionary of the English Language 1826, facsimile edition 1970. No doubt, the morals spoken of here are biblical, more or less. John Adams would undoubtedly find these proposed regulations to be quite the opposite of promoting virtue. These proposed regulations would appear to be in conflict with the state Constitution. Finally, on a human level, encouraging children to engage in homosexual lifestyle at such formative ages seems abusive. This lifestyle is clearly hazardous to one's health. The statistics are clear and widely known. Many questions come to mind. I wonder how many lawsuits will arrive by encouraging and promoting such an unhealthy lifestyle? Five or ten years from now public school promotion of homosexuality will be the inevitable class action suit of the future similar to the lawsuits being filed against the tobacco industry today.

I strongly urge you to reject these proposed regulations. Further, I strongly urge you to eliminate the exposure of our children to the sinful, unconstitutional, and unhealthy homosexual lifestyle. Please, for the health, safety, and welfare of the Commonwealth's most precious gift, our children, reject these proposed regulations. Thank you very much.

*Michael O'Neil, Walpole, Massachusetts*

**MR. O'NEIL:** Good morning. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today. As a parent with children in Walpole's Public Schools, I have a vested stake in the rules being developed here for Equal Educational Opportunity. Based on my experience, I would like to offer suggestions on three areas of importance: the roles of the parents, the role of the schools, and how schools can deal compassionately with the behavioral problems associated with homosexuality. One role of the parents should be to "opt in" their children for all extracurricular activities. Like most parents in Walpole, I was unaware that the high school was offering school activities utilizing state funding from a homosexual organization. I only discovered this when I read a short blurb in the local paper about a \$2,500 being spent for Safe Schools for Gay Students. Then I was amazed to find out that my older daughter had attended one of these after-school events. The good news is that although they were promoting the homosexual agenda, there were no horror stories involving condoms or raunchy speakers to report this time. The bad news is that the stealthy nature of this program almost guarantees we'll soon be hearing such horror stories. The lack of parental involvement inherent in this program insures that impressionable kids will be having their lifespans shortened as they are lured into homosexual activity.

One role of the schools should be to inform parents about activities taking place on school grounds. It is the role of parents to understand and approve their children's activity. It is clear that your regulations should mandate that all students be required to obtain parental permission to participate in any extracurricular activity, especially activity as controversial as these so-called "gay-straight alliances". Other roles of the schools could probably be debated endlessly. It is arguable that our schools shouldn't be attempting to change public mores to resemble those of Ancient Rome. School districts, which feel this way, should not be forced to sponsor clubs which promote sexual agendas. Schools which do not want to accept grant money for diversity clubs or "gay-straight alliances" should not be forced to do so. The regulations being considered today should reflect this diversity of opinion. Finally, how do we deal compassionately with those drawn to the behavioral problems of homosexuality? Problems such as "a much-higher-than-usual incidence of suicide", a "thirty-year decrease in life expectancy". Problems similar to, or even worse than, those resulting from the abuse of alcohol, tobacco or drugs. No one who truly cares about the health and future of our youth would consider steering troubled children into the gay lifestyle. Yet you are considering provisions to "counter" stereotyping, to provide "in-service" training for teachers, and to allow the hiring of people with these behavioral problems -- all of which would help to lure at-risk children into this dangerous activity. These provisions should be stricken from the proposed rules. In summary, it is the role of the parents to "opt in" their children for acceptable after-school activities. It is the role of the schools to notify parents of these activities and to decline to participate in controversial or objectionable programs. And it is all of our obligation to start dealing compassionately with a serious behavioral problem facing some of the most vulnerable children in our schools. Thank you.

*Robert Klein, Western New England College.*

**MR. KLEIN:** Good morning, Chairman, Commissioner Driscoll, and Board members. I'm here to speak about a different topic. I'm Associate Professor of Education from Western New England College in Springfield, Massachusetts. I want to speak to you about the fact that in the proposed revisions for the Massachusetts teacher certification, though I learned there are new revisions, psychology and sociology will be eliminated as potential majors for the initial elementary license. I understand the desire to have students major in one of the content areas directly connected to the elementary curriculum frameworks -- English, mathematics, social studies, et cetera -- but I think that the total elimination of the psychology and sociology options is a mistake. My experience over the last 13 years in training Massachusetts teachers has shown me that many excellent elementary teachers came through the psychology and sociology tracts. Indeed, some of our finest young teachers, with great intellectual rigor, have had these majors. What I would like to propose is a compromise. What I suggest is that the new regulations allow for two other interdisciplinary elementary majors which could include psychology and sociology. The design for these would include a strong core group of courses, from either psychology or sociology, which would be assigned with additional coursework from history, mathematics, et cetera, that would further strengthen the elementary content preparation. These content courses would be in addition to the other English, math, history courses that are already required in our elementary program. Essentially, it would allow the core elements of psychology and sociology majors to be combined with a further layer of course work in the main elementary content areas. This design would allow a

student to have some psychology or sociology option while still getting very strong content preparation. The design would be innovative and effective. Let me add that in looking at my college's current psychology and sociology majors, there are core requirements in statistics, minority experiences and other coursework, that give an elementary teacher excellent content background. I hope we can avoid throwing the baby out with the bath water. An innovative design could preserve the psychology and sociology options while still giving strong content preparation. At the April 5 meeting in Worcester, held by the Department of Education, this matter was discussed with representatives from the college teacher programs. When I got up and spoke in defense of the psychology and sociology majors, my colleagues supported me with a round of applause. I know I do not stand alone on this issue. And I'd like to say as a graduate of Yale and Harvard, I know what it means to be committed to intellectual rigor and excellence, which is what I'm supporting here. In the philosophical tradition of George Hegel, I'm hoping we can find a strong middle ground here, a synthesis, which will bring together the best of the opposing sides. I'd be personally willing to work with you on the specifics for such a model and I urge you to strongly consider this option and include it in new regulations. Thank you.

*Pat Evans, Western Mass. CARE*

**MS. EVANS:** Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, Commissioner Driscoll. At your meeting yesterday, I was struck by the multilayers in the proposal for setting district performance standards. As Mr. Peyser so rightly noted, schools are complex organizations. But two points kept intruding on my thoughts. The first is that you're basing our system of evaluation on MCAS test scores. Though I won't address the MCAS in any depth here, it is to say at least controversial. You yourselves can't seem to decide if it's meant to raise standards for students or just a minimal competency test. One test can't serve both purposes. It would seem prudent to work out more of the problems with the MCAS and make sure you develop a strong consensus of support for it, both citizen support and expert support, before barreling ahead spending an enormous amount of money and building even more layers of accountability in that unique base. Miss Schaefer yesterday stated, "This is an experiment." Shouldn't you try to get the MCAS beyond the stage of an experiment before launching even more experiments that are based on it? If the current MCAS proves to be as flawed as critics maintain, and an ever growing number of citizens believe it is, your multilayered system could prove to be like a very expensive house of cards is.

My second troubling thought is the unilateral role this Board of Education has taken in evaluating our students, our schools, and our districts. When did the citizens of Massachusetts forfeit local control to state control, to distant bureaucrats who don't seem to understand that there are many different ways to be excellent? My local school committee members are intelligent, highly educated, as all of you are, but they have two other factors in their favor. They were elected to their positions and they know our community and our children. They are accountable to us; you are not. They should be making these decisions. I'm a member of the growing statewide movement known as CARE, the Coalition for Ending Reform in Education. Regarding alternatives for the MCAS, you have already seen and dismissed our four-point proposal for a statewide accountability system. But I wish to bring it to your attention again today because it also contains provisions for school and district assessment and oversight and accountability. It balances local measures with state oversight. I hope that you will keep the CARE proposal in mind should your house of cards start to crumble. Thank you.

## **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**COMMISSIONER DRISCOLL:** In Dr. Delattre's absence, I need to make sure somebody makes a correction, so on page 14 where I'm quoted as saying "anecdotally you could go back". I think it should be "anecdotally you could go back," so you need to take the "T" out.

**On a motion duly made and seconded, it was:**

**VOTED:**           **that the Board of Education approve the minutes of the March 27, 2000 Special meeting and of the March 28, 2000 Regular meeting as amended.**

The motion was made by Mr. Irwin and seconded by Ms. Crutchfield. The vote was unanimous.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** I should note, for the record, that Dr. Delattre is not here because of surgery he had yesterday. We hope that he has recovered well. He probably wouldn't appreciate our talking about it, but I wanted it noted that he is not here because of slothfulness.

**PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE REGULATIONS ON EDUCATION CERTIFICATION (603 CMR 7.00) - Discussion and Vote**

**COMMISSIONER DRISCOLL:** I hope everyone understands what an enormous and complicated task this is, and how important it is for the future of Massachusetts. We clearly face serious shortages of teachers. We have to find ways to attract competent people into the field of education and I think this will go a long way. When the law was amended in January of 1994, it was anticipated that in addition to a master's degree program, there would be alternative ways for people to receive licensure and standard licenses. Sandra Stotsky, many of the staff members at the Department, educators, and higher education representatives throughout the Commonwealth, were very active in providing us feedback. The idea of having the concept paper go out in advance turned out to be very helpful. We anticipate, after the discussion today, that there will be a period, in the event that there are still things that we want to amend, before they go out for public comment. There's going to be a long time for people to react to these proposed regulations. I'm very proud of them, I think people have done enormous work. I'm pleased to have this before you.

**MS. STOTSKY:** Thank you very much, Commissioner Driscoll. Thank you for the opportunity to present the document that has been long underway. I would like to acknowledge the work of the committee that worked with me, because without their work, this never could have taken place. Carol Gilbert who is here, Peg Wood, Margaret Reagan, Margaret Cassidy, Melanie Wincloosky, Georgia Parafestas, and many others. I would like to begin by making a few comments on the review process itself, just to let you know how valuable the public comment period was. We got an enormous amount of feedback from so many people. If you will take just a quick look at the pages that have just been sent around to you. We have outlined on two pages what we have done to respond to all of the many kinds of comments we received. I certainly want to thank all of those people, groups, and anyone who has sent in a comment in some form, e-mail, regular mail and fax. They have all been acknowledged and, to my knowledge, I have read all of them. This is something I took upon myself just to make sure that I really had a good sense of what was being suggested or commented upon. Over 800, as you can see here.

In the first section, I highlight the major areas of concern in these public comments, but you will see from the second page that there were many, many areas covered by the public comments. Some we dealt with by having members of the Department look at the comments in various areas and give us their summary and recommendations based upon what they saw coming through. There were others in the very last group that the committee itself looked at because we had no particular staff person who could look at those. Then we tried to address what we saw as a comment or a suggestion that was reasonable for us to consider or was a fact that needed to be incorporated. We have certainly tried to respond as much as we could and produce a coherent document that incorporates what we felt was the direction the Department has been seeking to go in.

**FROM THE FLOOR:** Point of order. I hear reading and I don't have a copy of it. What are we talking about?

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** There are some copies of materials on the table. Please, this is a meeting of the Board of Education; it is out of order for audience members to speak up. There's a time for public comment. That point is over. If there are additional materials, they would be outside in the hallway.

**MS. STOTSKY:** So you can see that we have tried to respond as we could to produce a document that reflected the goals of the Department, a philosophy of trying to strengthen and upgrade teacher knowledge of subject matter which we know is the most important element relating to improved student learning. That is the basic philosophy underlying all of the changes that have been made in this document from previous drafts and from previous documents. You'll also see in the revision process the groups that we have spoken to, and then those that we still plan to continue speaking to after this document is released for public comment. Now I would like to have some pages passed out.

These are the changes that we made this past week that did not get into the draft of the document that was mailed to you. And these editorial changes on these pages are the ones that I want to make sure that we are all together with because these pages do reflect the major changes that have been made from the document you saw in December and the one you will be reading today. You have in your packet the document that has been evolving from the December document. What I want to do now is simply run through what are the major changes from the document that I presented to you at the end of November last year, and explain why we have made those changes. They have been made in response to the field or to other kind of considerations, often people in the scholarly world who have given us some valuable input on many of the specific knowledge requirements for many of the licenses. They are the ones that will be incorporated into the document that goes out



for public comment. Let me comment on several different areas. I will talk about changes that were made to routes, changes in grade levels, changes in the majors, changes in license placement in this document, changes in new licenses, changes that dealt with reading requirements, and a few other smaller items. Let's begin with routes and I'd like you to turn to the page that is number 9 and number 10.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** This is the document you just provided us.

**MS. STOTSKY:** Let's use these pages because I have them all set up here for commenting.

**DR. THERNSTROM:** I'm sorry, use the one you just handed out.

**MS. STOTSKY:** Yes. These pages contain what I want to discuss in terms of major changes from December to April. The major changes will be on these pages, that's why it will be easier in looking at these pages. Page 8, the page after the cover page. Here I want to show you the first major change that we made. It is in the top half of the page. We are now requiring at least three full years of employment in order to achieve a professional license. You will see that in (c) on the top of that page.

**COMMISSIONER DRISCOLL:** (c) 3.

**MS. STOTSKY:** The change has been from one year to three full years of employment before the teacher is eligible to go for a professional license, or standard certification as the older terminology had it. This has been to strengthen the teacher's opportunity to learn how to teach well before they go for professional license. The current regulations, those in effect right now, do not require any years of employment before a teacher can go for a professional license, necessarily. A teaching certificate could go to someone who passes through a preparation program who does not necessarily have to teach at all before going for a professional license. We are now changing that to three years. We are now showing on this page, as you can see it, 4(a) and (b) in the middle of the page, a clear alternative to the requirement of the master's degree for achieving a professional license. We are now, sending out an RFR in order to obtain a comprehensive body of information on the performance assessment. The performance assessment will be the critical --

**COMMISSIONER DRISCOLL:** Excuse me, Sandy. I'm afraid members aren't exactly where you are. We were talking about part (c), sub-section 3, and now you're talking about sub-section 4 parts (a) and (b) on page 8.

**MS. STOTSKY:** We're talking about sub-section 4 under (c). These are all parts of the routes. It is the overview where it's all succinct.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** This is page 8 of the handout.

**MS. STOTSKY:** Page 8, the very first page after your cover page. This reflects a major change. 4(a) is, "Recommendation for licensure based on a satisfactory Performance Assessment by trained evaluators using Department guidelines within three years." The three years I just explained. The Performance Assessment is what will be fleshed out in the next year, or sooner, as we get information and lay out what we think are the appropriate alternatives for the Commissioner and the Board to consider. What are the components of a good performance assessment? Where should it take place? Who should the evaluators be? Where should they come from? How many of them should there be. You will notice another change we have made.

We are specifying "trained evaluators", but we are in no way saying whether they should be inside or outside the district or how many there should be. We think we'll want to work that out after more thought, after we gain enough information about the costs, the benefits, and the limitations. By then we'll also understand more from the schools themselves about their own capacity to do any kind of evaluation that would allow them to make recommendations for professional licensure. This was an area of concern that we got a great deal of feedback on. So we are simply saying "by trained evaluators" and we will leave it until later how the evaluators will be trained, where they are, how many, and so on. This is information that we would hope to report to the Board, possibly by September, as far as having more clear information on that available for you. We have already made it clear elsewhere in the document that what we are dealing with in these licensing regulations are three levels of performance assessment. There will be a performance assessment at the end of the practicum that will be for any educator preparation program. There will be a performance assessment for the professional license; and then there will

be an option of performance assessment for the relicense. There are three different levels of performance assessment that we are gathering information on. They will not all be the same because they come at different levels of preparation for teachers. So this is why we are trying to get information on how to weigh these elements and what the right elements would be at different levels of using a performance assessment.

**MR. LaFLAMME:** The RFR for the performance assessment for the attainment of a professional license, is that one that might also be used for recertification or no?

**MS. STOTSKY: Yes.** We would get information on these components and see how we would then use them for the practicum performance assessment and the option at recertification. Our main goal is to work out the performance assessment for the professional license because that's where the clear alternative to the master's degree is.

**COMMISSIONER DRISCOLL:** I want to mention that this is consistent with what the Board adopted in terms of the recertification regulations, that we would also offer an option for recertification.

**MS. STOTSKY:** The notion of performance assessment at the practicum level has grown, as well as at recertification, since the original Board's decision to have it at the professional level. In other words, to try to kill three birds, in a sense, with one stone. But they won't be quite all the same. Now I'd like to move on to grade levels, and you will see these at the bottom of this page, the licenses together with their grade levels. These have changed considerably as far as the grade levels that are covered by licenses. For the early childhood, we have now worked out preK-2. The reason for this was that many of our standards documents have a division in their gradespans between preK-2 or 3-4 or 4-5, so it seemed reasonable to have preK-2 for early childhood to coincide with the knowledge requirements that we now have in most of our standards documents. For middle school, you will see that we have 5-8 almost consistently specified rather than 5-9. This is because middle schools, we have been told, are the mode. No longer do we have junior highs, and 5-8 directly covers middle school certification in the state.

Then for the high school, we have moved that down one grade, so it is now 8-12 as opposed to 9-12. This is to allow the year of overlap to be grade 8. It means that the most skilled and knowledgeable teacher will be eligible to teach in grade 8, particularly for those areas like math. If there is to be an Algebra I course in grade 8, and if the middle school teacher is not certified in math to teach that course, the high school teacher with a grade 8 through 12 certification could then be used for the grade 8 Algebra I course. This is to make sure that the most knowledgeable teachers in science and math, in particular, can dip down to grade 8. That becomes the turning year as opposed to grade 9. I would also like to call your attention, by the way, to the very excellent report at the back of your document on the sequence in math that leads to AP Calculus. In case some of you didn't notice it, it is under Section 5, and that was done by Lori Wright and the Department. I'd like to give her credit. This is a very nice piece of research based on what is out there in the field. It's very clear that in order to reach AP Calculus, you usually have to begin in grade 8 with an Algebra I course. Here we have a follow-up to the Board's request several months ago for that kind of information.

I'd like to then move on to the question of majors, which you will then see laid out on the next two pages a little bit more. For the majors, we have reworded the elementary license a little more flexibly for what we are suggesting for the elementary major. Any combination of these courses, this is at the bottom of the document at (1), and we are suggesting, of course, that a major in any one of these areas would be fine, too.

**MS. CRUTCHFIELD:** What page are you on?

**MS. STOTSKY:** We have moved on from page 8 to page 9. You will see at the bottom of that page where we laid out the various elementary majors as possibilities. The basic rationale, as has been said before, is that the major subjects of the elementary school curriculum are those specified here. There is no other person in the elementary school who will teach these subjects except the elementary school teacher. Music can be taught by a music teacher, art can be taught by an art teacher, but there is no other teacher who will teach English, math, geography, civics, which is what political science would be, and whatever science has to be taught, in the elementary school except the elementary school teacher.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** There are a couple things about this that are confusing to me. One is under (1)(a) on page 9. It says, "Bachelor's degree from an accredited college or university, with an arts or sciences major, or a major appropriate to the license sought." What's the distinction between those two?

**MS. STOTSKY:** That is for people who have majored in business or physical education. There are some licenses that have a very appropriate major which are not typically included in a liberal arts and science major, and we wanted to make sure that those could be included.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** For clarity, you might need to say that if a specific major is identified in the regulations some other major in the arts and sciences is not applicable because this would suggest that any major in the arts and sciences, or one of the appropriate majors would fit. Do you see what I'm saying? It's more open-ended.

**MS. STOTSKY:** Number 1 is the qualification to little (a). Little (a) is the general.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** I understand. I'm saying it's a little ambiguous.

**MS. STOTSKY:** Maybe the wording should be clarified there.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** The other thing is, in number 1 it says that any major for elementary science must include two college-level science lab courses, and I'm not sure I understand that. It implies that an English major would have two science lab courses as part of her major.

**MS. STOTSKY:** No, any major for the elementary license must include it.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** But you can have a major in English and have an appropriate degree for elementary license, is that correct?

**MS. STOTSKY:** If you are working for an elementary license and you are majoring in English, then there should be two college-level science lab courses in your preparation.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** But the point I'm making is that it won't be part of your major. It's implied here that your English major has to include two science labs.

**MS. STOTSKY:** Then that little wording needs to be changed more.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** Also, could you give me some justification for why two college-level lab courses?

**MS. STOTSKY:** This was highly recommended by people in science.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** I'm not surprised. I would hope so.

**MS. STOTSKY:** As well as those concerned about the general preparation of the elementary school teacher who must now teach a lot more science than they ever have. It was not just those people in science at the college level. Many people who have been involved in our science frameworks believe that the elementary teacher needs much more preparation in science. The best way to begin that is not through in-service courses afterwards, it would be through their regular undergraduate program. Many colleges have told us that they already require two courses in science as part of their general education requirements.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** Are they both lab courses?

**MS. STOTSKY:** Two lab courses in science. We are told that many do, so for them it isn't a problem.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** It seems like a high hurdle. My other concern is about mid-career people who did not structure their college experience in order to prepare for teaching. They are now willing to go back and would be confronted with some very significant hurdles in trying to enter the field. I wonder if you've given that some thought.

**MS. STOTSKY:** This is the undergraduate route. We are not in any way suggesting that anyone who goes into teaching later on would have to repeat his or her undergraduate program. They would have to meet our teacher tests and pass the

teacher tests in addition to having a BA or a BS degree, but in no way are we suggesting that these apply to any of the other routes. This only applies to the traditional undergraduate preparation program.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** Let's see, here. I'm just reading ahead now in the original document at page 8 of the original where it talks about temporary license.

**MS. STOTSKY:** That would be applicable to routes 3 and 4.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** It does say, "Possession of a bachelor's degree in the arts or sciences, or in a major appropriate to the license sought." When you say arts or sciences in that context, especially with regards to an elementary school teacher, is it with the understanding that the major must be limited to those specified in the regulations, or is it open?

**MS. STOTSKY:** If we are dealing with people who come back to teaching two years later or 20 years later, in no way can we specify that they redo their undergraduate training program. All we can do at that point is to make sure that they pass the test which will have all of these areas covered. What we are saying for routes 3 and 4 is that if they do want to go into elementary school teaching, they would need to have coursework in the teaching of reading and mathematics. They may have missed it if they had a different major in their undergraduate years.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** I guess my only comment is that it might be helpful to make that a little clearer, because it wasn't clear to me.

**MS. STOTSKY:** We can clarify that.

**DR. THERNSTROM:** I still find the two lab sciences to be an awfully high hurdle. One of our ultimate goals here is to draw students into teaching from the highly selective colleges, even if they come in for only a five-year period and go on to other things in life. And the colleges, the highly selective colleges I know do not require two lab sciences for an English major. I wonder also about teachers going into a charter school that is organized to have in the elementary school years a math teacher who teaches nothing but math, no other teachers teach math, whether this sort of mandate really makes a great deal of sense.

**MS. STOTSKY:** The charter teachers don't need a license.

**DR. THERNSTROM:** They don't need a license at all?

**MS. STOTSKY:** That's been one of the supposed advantages of charter schools.

**DR. THERNSTROM:** I thought there was some licensure requirements for charter schools.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** No, they are not subject to the licensing requirement and they are not also subject to the protections under the Tenure of Professional Teachers Act.

**DR. THERNSTROM:** I understand the latter. I did not realize they were not subject at all to licensure. Well, the point then extends to any elementary school that decides that more effective education would consist of organizing their teaching staff such as to have specialists in math and science as they try to raise the competency.

**MS. STOTSKY:** We don't have a supply of those specialists available yet. While it would be desirable, most elementary school teachers still are required and still have to teach the science frameworks as well as the math and the other two.

**DR. THERNSTROM:** Right. In theory, could there not be elementary schools that would say they do not expect a teacher to be able to teach math and science?

**MS. STOTSKY:** They could do that, Abby, but right now what the schools do or could do is independent of what we have to do for licensing purposes. They are apt to be going into schools where they are going to be required to prepare students for all of the four major subjects that we now have testing for. This is the reality that we now have to face, even though your idea certainly could be a valuable one for considering school restructuring.

**DR. THERNSTROM:** Take an Ivy League college English major or history major. It's very unlikely that student will have even math or science.

**MS. STOTSKY:** That isn't for any English major. These are for those going for an elementary license. Remember, we are keeping to a particular group of teachers. We can certainly consider this as an area.

**COMMISSIONER DRISCOLL:** Can I try it this way, Abby? If you're in a traditional undergraduate program for prospective teachers, then this is the requirement. If you're not, if you're an English major at an Ivy League school and then decide to come into teaching, then it's the other way; you have to pass the test, et cetera.

**DR. THERNSTROM:** Then you could do it by just passing the test.

**COMMISSIONER DRISCOLL:** We are saying so.

**DR. THERNSTROM:** So you're saying you would take another route.

**MS. STOTSKY:** Route 2. There are master's programs for going into education.

**DR. THERNSTROM:** I apologize for not paying sufficient attention here.

**DR. SCHAEFER:** I also think that most selective colleges require science. It's not necessarily lab science, but there will be two semesters of science and of math. I think that's become pretty standard now back into the curriculum, but not necessarily a lab. There will be science courses for liberal arts majors.

**MS. STOTSKY:** I think we should get some more information. I will be happy to get some information on what the general education requirements actually are across a number of schools and I think that would be helpful. We just need to get some data from the real context out there. Shall I go on or --

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** I'm not sure. I know I have a number of questions. I want to make sure we have enough time for Board members to raise their questions as well.

**MS. STOTSKY:** I just wanted to make a few comments about the majors.

**COMMISSIONER DRISCOLL:** Just quickly highlight the routes and the majors.

**MS. STOTSKY:** I'd like to finish. We are suggesting majors for the middle school teachers in the same way. We have eliminated the middle school license, which has been very content-deprived, and we are trying to upgrade and strengthen middle school teachers. "Appropriate majors for levels 5-8 are those designed for the elementary license." In other words, if there is an interdisciplinary combination that a college has worked out that might consist of English and history, the middle school teacher who wants to teach middle school could take that major. He or she would do the practicum at that right level, and then take the tests in both of those subject areas and be qualified for teaching with the appropriate knowledge base at the middle school level. But there would not be a general middle school license like the elementary school license. That is what we have removed. The middle school teacher will have to have done more content preparation in an academic discipline, whether it's English and history or math and science or any one of them individually. This is what we are trying to achieve through this specification.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** But does the certification then limit the teacher's ability to teach across other subjects in middle school?

**MS. STOTSKY:** That would be the nature of the interdisciplinary major that is offered for prospective middle school teachers by a college or university. If they want to offer an interdisciplinary major that consists of three of those subjects or four, then that person would be able to deal with all of them. We have been told by middle school principals and teachers that most middle school teachers usually teach no more than two different subjects. They teach in clusters or teams. It may be English and reading or English and history. They typically don't teach math and science in addition. And it's the math or

science person who's apt to teach those two together or individually. So that there are clusters. And they tried to at least limit the number of different subjects so that they have more expertise for those they have been teaching. This is a difficult problem for the middle school.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** I guess my concern is that while it may be true of most middle schools, it may not be true of all middle schools, especially not for all fifth grades or sixth grades, for that matter. And what effect is this likely to have on those school teachers?

**MS. STOTSKY:** We hope this would enable middle school teachers in grades 7 and 8 to be much better qualified for the subject they are teaching than they are now. But we do have to remember, for grades 5 and 6 there would still be an elementary school license available that goes up to grade 6.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** If you have a middle school that does contain grades 5 and 6 and if you have a middle school model with a single teacher teaching everything, then that person would have an elementary school license even though they are in middle school.

**MS. STOTSKY:** The license for elementary covers through grade 6. They can teach grades 5 and 6, which still may be a self-contained classroom, but grades 7 and 8 is typically not a self-contained classroom anymore.

**COMMISSIONER DRISCOLL:** We need to be sure if someone is licensed in English and history, and that's all, they cannot teach mathematics unless they do something else.

**MS. STOTSKY:** They would only be able to teach it 20 percent of the time that's legal under the law.

**COMMISSIONER DRISCOLL:** Which is different than today. If you have a generic middle school certificate, you can teach across the board.

**MS. STOTSKY:** We have added general science back to allow for a science teacher for the middle grades. So now, we have science covered by the person who is adequately trained for middle grades without a major in science necessarily. They would work for a high school certification and not teach at the middle school level. We have also done this for the special needs. This is part of a whole series of changes that we have made over the past eight months as to how to deal with special needs.

We have moved the special needs certificate from where it was placed in December. It is now where you see all of the major licenses on the previous page. It is a first license; it can be part of an undergraduate program as well as a graduate program. What we are suggesting and strongly recommending is that the special needs teacher also have a major that is similar to what we would expect of the elementary teacher. And part of the reason is because they do end up teaching subject matter content that comes from any one of our content areas when they deal with special needs students.

Secondly, and this is, again, part of the information base we are developing, there are career changes that take place within a few years for many special needs teachers. Some of them do go into the elementary school classroom from special needs. We are trying to make sure that their initial training is focused on the four major areas of the curriculum that they are going to be teaching special needs kids. If they then go into the elementary school classroom because they add a new license, then they are well prepared. We have increased their practicum hours from 100 to 150 for that undergraduate or graduate program. We wanted you to see that the teacher of the severely disabled and the teacher of students with moderate special needs are now placed together with the teacher of the visually impaired, the teacher of the deaf and hard of hearing, because these are all very specialized certificates that deal with special groups of youngsters. We are trying to strengthen the training of these prospective teachers and anticipate whatever moves they may make in their careers.

The other change is that we have added dance as a certificate. We felt we should be consistent across all the performing arts. We now have separate certificates for theater, dance, visual arts, music, and speech. We would consider those all having a strong performance component to it. What we are also doing, at the request of so many people in the field of music is splitting the music license into two different kinds of music licenses. We are hoping to get much more feedback from the field on the value of this, especially from other program directors in the field of music. We have already made library

science an initial license. That can be done as an initial license even though it's at the post-baccalaureate level. This came at the request of all five library program directors that we met with.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** I appreciate the feedback and the desire on the part of people in these professions to upgrade the quality of the profession and in some ways increase the professionalization of these fields. I get a little nervous about breaking general disciplines down into subgroups. It seems to be more of a barrier to getting people than it is a guarantee of improved quality. I haven't looked at those particular sections and I don't pass any judgment on them, but just because those in the profession suggested there should be further requirements for further professionalism --

**MS. STOTSKY:** That is not the case with library. We are opening it up more and reducing the requirements, as it turns out. At present, most of the people who get a master's degree in library also have to get a master's degree in education. This has been the double burden of having to get the first certificate as we placed it. It's now available to any liberal arts graduate who wants to go in and get just this program, which would still be a master's degree in library. They do not have to concurrently get an education degree at the same time. So we have actually lessened the requirement and made it more available. This was exactly part of the thinking behind that whole series of changes.

Regarding the temporary license, you do need to know that we have suggested a two-year limit for the temporary license, and that will need a statutory change because right now it can stay on in effect for five years. If we are to offer further protection through route 4, in particular, it would be advisable to have a statutory change that makes anyone working in route 4 for two years compelled to go for initial license. This could be under a waiver, by the way. They can teach for five years without having to go for license.

**DR. SCHAEFER:** Which page is route 4?

**COMMISSIONER DRISCOLL:** It's on page 10 and 11.

**MS. STOTSKY:** That's in the definitional section and you will see temporary license on page 5. It is indicated with a star that it is subject to statutory amendments. Right now, it's for five years; we are asking that it be reduced to two years.

**COMMISSIONER DRISCOLL:** Roberta asked about 4, and I pointed out that the routes are on pages 10 and 11. She was asking about route 4.

**MS. STOTSKY:** That's where it would be applicable to route 4. The definitions contain important information that applies to other pages. That's why I was trying to have certain pages in front of you because you do have to go back and forth in the regulations to find all the information you need.

The purpose of the statutory change is to make route 4 a more protected route for those who go into it. The other thing we are requiring, by the way, is under Induction Standards, at the back of your whole packet. We are suggesting that all new teachers, including route 4 and 3, be assigned to a mentor within two weeks of becoming a new teacher. It would be a great help for those entering through route 4. I don't think that there are any other major things that I should mention.

We did take out the material on master teacher because we were advised that these were not regulatory kinds of materials. The document deals strictly with licensing. It also does not include the material that was in the December document on principles of evaluation, which is not a licensing issue, so that page has been removed. The document, now, very clearly deals with licensing issues.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** Thank you. Let me ask a couple of quick questions and then go to the Board members for further comment and question. In the regulations referenced here, there is reference to requiring a master's degree as an alternative method of achieving professional licensure. But it says it's a master's degree from an "approved master's degree program", which implies to me that it is limited only to education degrees. Those are the only ones that are approved by the Department. What was the intention and what does it mean?

**MS. STOTSKY:** For our own guidelines, which we will be issuing, an approved master's degree program for our licensing purposes can be an MA, an MS, an MFA, any master's degree that we want to approve for licensing purposes. What we have suggested, if you look in the definitional section --

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** It doesn't say "approved degree", it says, "approved program", which implies that you have to approve the master's math program of every university.

**MS. STOTSKY:** If it is an approved master's degree program, what we have suggested is that it would have to contain at least half the credits in the academic disciplines that are relevant to that license. That's the master's degree program that we are approving.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** My only point is that it appears, based on the language used in this document, that the only kinds of master's degrees that qualify are those that are in education, because those are the only kind that are approved by the Department. I'm just raising the question.

**MS. STOTSKY:** You raised an important point and we might just take out the word "program" and make it approved master's degree and then we will be actually consistent with what's in the definition here.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** Yes. That may solve some of the problem.

**MS. STOTSKY:** So this is just a wording change.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** Another question concerns engineering majors. Did you explicitly consider engineering majors as not being appropriate for a general science license?

**MS. STOTSKY:** We did not exclude it in any way.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** It says, "Appropriate majors for general science, chemistry and physics."

**MS. STOTSKY:** For the undergraduate program. That could be included. There was no intention to exclude the engineering major or the person in an engineering school. We can work with that wording to make sure that that's clear.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** Finally, and I have other comments which I will send to you by mail in writing, there is an alternative path to become a superintendent which essentially allows mid-career people in other professions to come in as superintendents. There don't seem to be similar alternative paths for other administrators, assistant superintendents, principals, and assistant principals. There are paths but they are more onerous than that for superintendent. I was wondering why that was. We may encourage you to try to adopt the alternative you have for superintendents for the other administrative positions, including the business administrator position.

**MS. STOTSKY:** We did offer two alternatives for business administrator. There are options for superintendent and for business administrator. The reasoning for the others was that these positions require a lot of knowledge of the education system. It would be desirable to make sure that there is a knowledge base. What we have tried to indicate and, I'm sorry, it's not in the current document, though it will be in part of the guidelines we issue, is that there can be a number of different providers of these programs. What we are trying to say in the regulations is that there should be a knowledge base appropriate to education for these other positions: a curriculum supervisor, a special education administrator, and a principal of an elementary school. We see more flexibility being reasonable for the superintendent and for the business administrator but less flexibility for the principal of an elementary school, although where that person gets trained should be a range of possibilities.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** I guess my own observation is, looking at some of the charter schools, that there are some excellent principals that come out of untraditional paths. Part of it is dependent on school design and the kind of job description the principal or the assistant principal actually has. I throw this on the table as something to consider in looking at business administrators. The option is not the same as the option for superintendents. The option for the superintendents is that you need a bachelor's degree, three or five years -- I can't remember what it says exactly-- in a managerial capacity in some other field, and you need to pass a communication and literacy test. But for a business administrator, you have to complete an approved program of studies based on the regulations, two others requirements, as I recall, and a practicum. It seems to me that the alternative path into school business administrator is higher than for superintendent. Again, I throw that out as another thing to look at.



**DR. THERNSTROM:** I do want to second Jim's thought that there are principals that come to the position by a variety of routes. Three members of the Department and I have recently visited schools where the principals had nothing but a Teach For America training before they came to the position of running excellent schools.

On the question of dance, does this imply that a school, let's say a New York school, could not have somebody from the Alvin Alley Troupe come in for a couple of hours a week? He or she may lack the particular education but knows how to teach a dance class. Or what about a creative writer who hasn't gone through one of these Master's in Fine Arts creative writing programs. If you're a writer, you're a writer.

**MS. STOTSKY:** No, they could.

**DR. THERNSTROM:** -- with a small number of students a couple of times a week.

**MS. STOTSKY:** These programs always have taken place and could always take place. What the certificate or the license does is enable the person, who then becomes hired on a full-time basis, to be part of the collective bargaining arrangements and the salary schedule. This is part of what we have heard as a major concern. Having the license availability makes it possible for these people to be considered part of the entire teaching core.

**DR. THERNSTROM:** Okay. But that is not a license.

**MS. STOTSKY:** It doesn't exclude individual people being hired part time. There would be a condition attached.

**MR. LaFLAMME:** Is that specified anywhere? Not necessarily in this document, but is that specified anywhere?

**COMMISSIONER DRISCOLL:** I would say that that most likely would be covered locally.

**DR. THERNSTROM:** What was the question?

**MR. LaFLAMME:** I was just wondering whether scenarios like the ones you've posed are addressed in any other regulations. Is this something that we know in the back of our minds or is it explicitly identified anywhere?

**COMMISSIONER DRISCOLL:** It does happen throughout the Commonwealth but it's typically subject to collective bargaining. Schools often benefit from the expertise of various artists and specialists. If, however, you were bringing someone in to replace another, then you'd be getting into licensing issues. It is really governed by the collective bargaining agreement.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** Is this effectively a de minimus standard, in terms of the time spent in the classroom, below which the certifications would not apply?

**COMMISSIONER DRISCOLL:** I'll answer it a couple of ways. First of all, anybody who is licensed currently and who's licensed in the future can teach up to 20 percent outside of their area. So that gives schools flexibility. Beyond that, you're really talking about whether or not the amount of time spent is, by definition, part of the recognition of the collective bargaining agreement. It is very individualized and I don't think we're going to solve it today. It could run the gamut from someone who comes in as a poet-in-residence once a week to people that the local collective bargaining unit would challenge coming in to a school district that should be part of the bargaining unit.

**DR. SCHAEFER:** I don't mean to complicate things, but let me raise another scenario. I think there are districts that contract with a community performing arts school for music teachers and so on. That would still be allowed, correct? Or what about students who go to a local college for an advanced math course? Will that still be permitted?

**COMMISSIONER DRISCOLL:** To the best of your knowledge, there are no violations by any school districts with the collective bargaining agreement, so all of those must be fine. I think we're getting off course here. Those things are done all across the Commonwealth in different iterations of subject matter, et cetera. People take advantage of retired teachers. There are all kinds of ways it's done. It's distinct from the license. It's not limited by any of these recommendations.

**DR. THERNSTROM:** We are not getting off course in the sense that it seems to me we want to allow schools maximum flexibility to improve their instruction in any way that seems appropriate.

**COMMISSIONER DRISCOLL:** So this does not interfere with that.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** Perhaps for clarification, we could get a memo from the Department explaining exactly what the threshold is for certification and the extent to which the certification rules prevent or enable outsiders from coming in and providing additional enriched services to superintendents.

**DR. THERNSTROM:** I would actually like that. I think some of the schools I have visited could benefit.

**On a motion duly made and seconded, it was;**

**VOTED:**           **that the Board of Education, in accordance with G.L. C69, § 1B and c. 71, § 38G, hereby authorize the Commissioner to proceed in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act, G.L. c. 30A, § 3, to solicit public comment on Proposed Regulations for Educator Licensure and Preparation Program Approved in Massachusetts, which would amend and replace the Regulations on Educator Certification, 603 CMR 7.00**

The motion was made by Ms. Crutchfield and seconded by Mr. LaFlamme. The vote was unanimous.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** Thank you, Sandy, for terrific work on this.

**DR. SCHAEFER:** Could I ask if you could do a survey of let's say 25 top colleges to determine the science requirements?

**MS. STOTSKY:** Yes, we will. There are a number of areas we need to get information on.

**DR. THERNSTROM:** We just had an argument on the college program our kids went to.

**COMMISSIONER DRISCOLL:** But, again, were they part of the traditional teacher preparation program? If not, they are not covered. You have to understand that distinction. If Harvard wants to run an undergraduate teacher preparation program, we're going to insist -- at least under the current regulations before they are finalized -- two lab courses for those people. If someone graduates from Harvard University and then wants to come into elementary teaching, that's a different situation. We are not going to make them relive their undergraduate program. It really is limited to those that offer traditional undergraduate education preparation programs.

**MS. STOTSKY:** Which is what we understand about 50 percent of our elementary school teachers come from, roughly. This is what we've been told.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** Thank you very much. The only other thing I want to know is that there are no more recommendations in here concerning approved programs. That led to some of the work from the Joint Commission on Educator Preparation, particularly around the 80 percent threshold for improving programs and institutions, an 80 percent pass rate, in particular, on the teacher's test. We should seek further comment from the Commission on this, but I believe the recommendations here reflect the feedback and the input from the Joint Commission on Teacher Preparation.

#### **ADOPTION OF AMENDMENTS TO THE REGULATIONS ON EQUAL OPPORTUNITY (603 CMR 26.00)** **Discussion an Vote**

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** We are ready to move on to the next item which is the Access to Equal Educational Opportunity regulations which have been out for public comment and are before us today for a final vote. Before beginning the discussion on this issue, I would like to put forward an amendment in block form, and it's to the draft you have before you. I think Board members have a copy of these amendments.

The first one relates specifically to Section 26.05.2 which concerned educational instructional materials, and the proposed language for this section would read as follows: "Teachers shall review all instructional and educational materials for

simplistic and demeaning generalizations, lacking intellectual merit on the basis of race, color, sex, religion, national origin or sexual orientation. Appropriate activities, discussions and/or supplementary materials shall be used to provide balance and context for any such stereotypes depicted in such materials."

The next amendment concerns 26.07 number 1, specifically the clause that relates to removing obstacles to equal access no matter how subtle or unintended. Under the amendment, that clause or those words would be deleted.

Number 3 concerns in-service training. The proposed language would now read, "The school committee and the superintendent shall provide in-service training for all school personnel at least annually regarding the prevention of discrimination and harassment based upon race, color, sex, religion, natural origin and sexual orientation, and the appropriate methods for responding to such discrimination and harassment in the school setting."

The fourth amendment relates to number 5 in this section, which regards employers on school campuses. The new section 5 would read, "The superintendent in each school system shall make certain that employers who recruit new employees in and through the schools of that district do not discriminate on account of race, color, sex, religion, national origin or sexual orientation in their hiring and recruitment practices with the schools. Before any employer is allowed to recruit at or through any school, the employer shall be required to sign a statement that the employer complies with applicable federal and state laws prohibiting discrimination in hiring or employment practices." Again, before beginning a discussion, I would move the amendment and ask for a second.

If we begin a discussion now, then we'll vote on the amendment, a block of amendments, and then vote on the final recommendations. Are there any introductory comments?

**COMMISSIONER DRISCOLL:** I would like to make a few brief comments if I may. Mr. Chairman, I think we have to put this discussion in context. It's very important because there are a number of ways to drag it out of context.

These are regulations by the Board of Education that have been around a long, long time. We were under Executive Order, by previous Governor Weld, to review, update, otherwise condense, and look at the language of all regulations. This is long overdue. This is before the Board, rightfully, because it should be done. This is about protection. Someone is not living in the real world if they question whether there is discrimination against gay and lesbian students. There is discrimination and harassment, in various forms, that has been very well documented throughout this Commonwealth. I've not seen, from my anecdotal position, any lessening of that harassment or discrimination. That's what these regulations are about, and I strongly support them. By the way, Mr. Chairman, I would support the amendments as well.

There are two other issues, quite separate and distinct, that need to be addressed at another time by this Board. The first is that of parental rights and notification. Second is the Safe Schools Program funded under the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. A number of charges have been raised today including the allegation that students are forced to join, which is totally untrue. But there are other charges that are of concern to the Board members and to me. I would say that under a separate time and in other ways I want to address these issues because they should be addressed. There may very well be clear issues around violations of people's rights but we will leave that for another day.

I want to focus the Board on the set of regulations put before you, today. I strongly defend them because they are the right things to do for students. They are to be taken as they are written and not extended into other areas that are not germane. I want to thank not only Rhoda, as always, for her tremendous work, but Liz Kelliher, as well. You'll see a very careful response to every comment that was made, and there was considerable comment on both sides. Commentary seemed to break down into people that support the regulations and those that don't. I strongly urge the Board to adopt these regulations and approve them, and I pledge that I will address the other issues at a later time.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** I would simply endorse the Commissioner's comments and repeat what I said several months ago when this first came up. This needs to be viewed in a larger context of trying to encourage the development of civil, respectful environments in our schools that will foster learning and high achievement. That's what these regulations are narrowly crafted to do. I would add that the amendments that have been offered are intended to try to ensure that we balance the interests of academic freedom and focus on the core academic mission of schools with the requirement that schools encourage respect for people and civil rights in and throughout school programs. Again, I endorse the Commissioner's comments and also endorse the regulations as amended.

**On a motion duly made and seconded, it was:**

**VOTED:** that the Board of Education, in accordance with G.L. c. 69, § 1B and G.L. c. 76, § 5, and having solicited and reviewed public comment in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act, G.L. c. 30A, §3, hereby adopt the amendments to the Access to Equal Opportunity Regulations, 603 CMR 26.00 as presented.

The motion was made by Mr. Irwin and seconded by Ms. Crutchfield. The vote was unanimous.

**PROPOSED DISTRICT PERFORMANCE STANDARDS - Discussion and Vote to Seek Public Comment**

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** Abstentions? It passes unanimously.

Yesterday, we had a discussion concerning district performance standards. We went over the draft document in great detail. The purpose today is to tie off on any open issues that may be on members' minds in the aftermath of that discussion and then to authorize the Department to send out the draft for public comment.

**FROM THE FLOOR:** To your discredit and shame you have instituted the generosity of the state of Massachusetts. To your tremendous shame. You have systematically abused us for years to come. What a shame. What a shameful thing you've done to your children in this state.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** Please, this is not a public comment period. If you have comments, feel free to come back at another time in the public comment period. This is time for Board consideration of a different matter.

Going back to the district performance standards. One thing the Commissioner and I discussed is that we will provide Board members with additional time to provide written comment to Julianne and the Department so that editorial modifications could be made before these go out for public comment. The purpose of our discussion and action today is to get these into the public domain where we'll receive more formal and complete comment to improve the quality of evaluation criteria and, therefore, the quality evaluations to come on school district performance. Are there any additional comments that people have or observations in the aftermath of yesterday's discussion?

**COMMISSIONER DRISCOLL:** I want to thank Board members for raising several important issues around the language of the standards, last night. I would urge members to get any modification recommendations to us in the next week; I will then provide an updated version. Our intention is to get it out for public comment. We'll have time, even then, to continue to talk about it. As we discussed last night, part of it will be in the doing. We all understand that this is going to be a learning process for everyone, but we have to jump in the water at some point. I look forward to working with Board members to get this in even better form before it goes out for public comment.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** As a result of our conversation yesterday, we will provide Board members with more information about the kinds of data and evidence that will be collected in order to form the judgments made by the evaluators. This may include real-life examples of the kinds of evidence and materials that evaluators would look at and the judgments they would draw. Are there any further comments or questions concerning the district performance criteria?

**On a motion duly made and seconded, it was:**

**VOTED:** that the Board of Education, in accordance with G.L. c. 69, §§ 1B, 1J and 1K and 603 CMR 2.04 (3) (b), authorize the Commissioner to seek public comment on the proposed District Performance Standards, as presented.

The motion was made by Ms. Crutchfield and seconded by Mr. Irwin. The vote was unanimous.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** Commissioner, when do you expect this to come back?

**COMMISSIONER DRISCOLL:** For the June meeting.

**CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPATIONAL PROFICIENCY - PROGRESS REPORT - Discussion**

**COMMISSIONER DRISCOLL:** I'm very pleased to have this item before the Board. As I've pointed out, there are a number of activities that are going on in School to Career. There are changes at the federal and state levels, all of which are going to strengthen the relationship between business and education and the value of work-based learning for all kids.

**MR. KANE:** I very much appreciate the opportunity to be here. The background on this goes back to last October when we had a two-day symposium with 50 different representatives from the unions, post-secondary and secondary education, and business on what the COP was all about. Following that, we had another meeting and a continuation of that discussion. One of the interesting things that came out of it followed a discussion over concerns that students would not be able to do this or that. A student on the committee stood up and said, "Why don't you give us a little bit of credit? We think we can pass whatever you put before us." The final result of that was to appoint a subcommittee that would start to work on the formation of what you're going to see today. We hope to continue with this over the summer and into the fall. But I think we have made a lot of strides.

We have the Work-Based Learning Plan and the state plan, the nine competencies, of which you have an enlarged copy. The Work-Based Learning Plan includes those nine competencies, which are really the SCAN skills. That has become one of the focal group processes in our Perkins Plan this year, under the new Perkins Act of 1998, which is a heavy requirement for accountability. We feel that this becomes a very vital part in that makeup with our real connection with business, and we are seeing more and more of that in the career and technical schools.

**COMMISSIONER DRISCOLL:** Fran, of course, you might want to explain SCAN, but that's all right. The real issue for me for Work-Based Learning is its connection to our academic standards, as well.

**MR. KANE:** Right. What we did was take the standards in the curriculum frameworks and crosswalk it with our nine competencies here.

**COMMISSIONER DRISCOLL:** We do have the slides in our books. Why don't we just open it up.

**MR. KANE:** What I tried to do here is give you just a quick brush stroke of what we looked at as a student in 1995, in the year 2000, in the year 2005. The overall goal in the preparation was to really have students with local input and local standards from local business people. The problem with that is that the standards varied from community to community, from school to school. Our students are currently being prepared according to locally developed standards, but they now include the work-based competencies, the national program standards, that are in existence in any certificates and licensing that are available.

The result of that is that there is better alignment of the program standards focused on employer needs and student success. This year, the overall goal is to prepare students for entry-level employment as well as post-secondary education. What's different is that they will be prepared according to locally developed standards which will continue to include work-based competencies, national program standards, certification standards, but will also be aligned to statewide competency descriptions that will be validated through the COP.

The result of that will be a full alignment of program standards focused on employer needs and student success with students able to obtain a validation of their skills that is valued by stakeholders. In the beginning when we looked at this, and we looked at all of the different programs that we currently have in our career and technical schools, we decided that it would be wise to form clusters to give us a road map or a pathway for what we were doing. You have in your packet the list of the seven pathways that were created for that. The alignment was important due to the fact that each certificate will include specialization, not only on the cluster, but also on the core skills, and the occupations would be aligned with those clusters according to common tasks and interests.

Each occupation taught in Massachusetts is represented under one of those seven clusters. What I also included in your packet was the complete list of the CIP codes. This is the information here. The CIP code is the Classification of Instructional Programs according to the federal government. We have about 78 different programs. But as we went through

all of this, in looking at the report that we submit to the federal government in October, we noticed that we have a number of these so-called CIP codes that have absolutely no students in it. Before you become alarmed and think we have teachers in classrooms with no students, that is not the case. But what we are seeing here and what we are starting to refine is, according to all these CIP codes here, we do not have that many courses being taught. A lot of them have been combined and a lot of them over the years may have been assigned the wrong CIP code. So it is also giving us an opportunity to clean up that part of the organizational structure as well. What we decided to do was take four of the clusters that we presently have and pick an area in each of those clusters to start with the development.

The priority for development was based upon areas where we could achieve the greatest success: critical success factors and current enrollments. The critical success factors include clusters, occupations where industry standards exist, licenses that are necessary, program certificates that are available, and a solid base of industry experts that exist as a resource. The four areas that we have chosen are under Health and Human Services, Technology, Hospitality and Environmental. The first one that we are going to develop will be the Automotive Technology under Technology and Engineering. We do that because we have the national standards from what we call NATEP, of which those standards are already available. We have a professional staff that have been trained in that during summer programs in Detroit. So those schools are all in session. All of the activities are there and all of our career and technical schools are now certified in that. We want to do that with each of the four areas. Now, as far as the elements of an assessment system, we feel that there are three basic elements: the technical, the employability, and then the assessment itself.

The technical is the written assessment, the employability is the written employability assessment, and the authentic assessment, which is really the key to the career and technical education part of this, is really the hands-on technical assessment-- the competency profile validation and the student portfolios. The student portfolios will become a vital part of this entire process. In the final analysis, I suspect and I would hope that we will have a senior project as a final analysis for that. But that is the area in which we are heading.

In the Certificate of Occupational Proficiency, we took those areas and outlined them for your approval so that you could see where the nine competencies in the Work-Based Learning plan cross with the four areas where the concentration is now. Probably the most important thing that we need to talk about are the steps for future development. I outlined this as spring and summer of 2000 to organize the initial four-cluster content committees and develop the basic statewide competency descriptions for each of these. That would be based on critical success factors and current enrollments.

The interesting thing in choosing these four things is that the most recent publication by the Department of Employment and Training lists, through the year 2006, the occupations and the jobs that would be increasing. The four that we have chosen so far will be in that area. That's something that we will continue to look at and upgrade. One of the things under our accountability issue with the new Perkins Law is that we have to be accountable for these. We have to show growth in all of these areas, we need to back up everything that we do. In the fall of 2000 we plan to organize the Portfolios and Employability Skills Committees to develop these portions of the assessment, identify and select a potential vendor or vendors to work on this, and to organize the remaining three clusters.

The plan, in the beginning, was not only to take a look at the seven broad clusters and hope there are core competencies and skills that will span across those clusters, but we wanted to develop the individual standards and competencies for each of the areas that we plan to develop now without looking at off-the-shelf tests. There are two or three companies out there that do have off-the-shelf tests and they will customize a test for you. I don't want us to have go through the process that we did with MCAS. I do believe once we establish the competencies and the standards for each of these areas, both in the written and the hands-on area, we will be able to find that written test that will be able to come off the shelf with a few modifications. The actual hands-on skills testing will be done in the schools, not by the teachers of those schools, but teachers trained in other school districts. They will come over to the shop areas where they are familiar with the equipment that's there and go through the process the same as we go through with Skills USA, which is the new name for VICA. We will train faculty who will go from school to school. They will be trained by an outside source, and then all of the validations will be done from there. The most important thing in the development of this COP is that we cannot allow it to become suspect. When a student walks into an employer and hands him/her a certificate that says the student has completed all of the requirements to receive this COP, an employer has to know that it has validity.

In the winter of 2000-2001 we will finalize the process for the administration and the assessment. We will recruit and train the assessment teams and initiate the professional development process. One of the things that we must do once we clean up

all of these CIP codes is to start looking at the development of new programs. Believe me, having come from a family of contractors, I do not in any way belittle the plumbers, the electricians and the carpenters, but there are other areas that we must expand now because of the need for computer technicians and that whole area. We are in a fast-paced society and we need to look at the new technologies that are out there. At the same time, we must utilize the businesses as our laboratories because, even though we have a grant pack request in for money from the federal government, we will never be able to keep up with the equipment that will be needed in these schools. We will have to utilize those facilities within the business community itself to continually train our students. So that's where we are. We'll continue to move on with this process, and continue to hopefully refine what we are doing in career and technical education. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** Thank you. I have a couple of questions. One is just to make sure I understand. When you are talking about expectations by 2005, will we have all the standards assessments in place for all of the seven disciplines?

**MR. KANE:** That is our goal for the subsets themselves. We'll have the general overall cluster goals, all seven clusters, then we will have the competencies. We'll have the standards for, hopefully, each of the areas that we presently teach and any new ones that are added.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** With that being the class of 2005 would be eligible across all of the trades.

**MR. KANE:** I wouldn't say all of them, not the class of 2005. We have a very close connection now with the post-secondary, because some people are under the impression that if I pass the MCAS and graduate, I'm going to receive this COP. Not every senior that will graduate from a career or technical school will receive this COP at that point. If there are, for instance, 50 competencies, they may accomplish 40 of those, but we need to have that transition to continue in the post-secondary for them to continue to get those additional 10 competencies to secure that COP.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** What is your expectation for the percentage of voc-tech students who, on completion of senior year, would actually be eligible for this?

**MR. KANE:** I don't know, but off the top of my head, I'd say ten percent.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** So it is pointed at the high end of the spectrum.

**MR. KANE:** Yes.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** Now, next question. Given the framework that we are establishing for assessing skills in identifying competencies, is it practical for some kind of state endorsement of a locally granted certificate of vocational-technical certificate that is below the threshold at the top to exist?

**MR. KANE:** The Commissioner and I met with the superintendents for the vocational schools, and it was agreed that they would take their existing standards, as they call them, for each of the areas that they are teaching and to try to unify them. They are not unified for the so-called student of 1995. I may have more expectations and more standards than you may have in your school. That's what we were talking about -- without coming up with a name like the minor COP, whatever it might be -- could be given, but have the Certificate of Occupational Proficiency be the master of it all in the development of that standard.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** Actually, we had this conversation earlier, this is somewhat more akin to the Certificate of Mastery on the general high school side.

**MR. KANE:** Correct, but it's important that those who complete those at another level get some kind of basic certificate of completion.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** This is not something we need to discuss now, but I'd be interested in understanding the extent to which a state endorsement of that other certificate is possible, because I think that would be an interesting path to pursue.

**MR. KANE:** I don't have to tell you there's certainly been a lot of discussion about changing the competency requirements. I'm very set on setting those high standards for academics as well, because I may be a great plumber but if I can't add and subtract and write my bill out, it's not going to do me any good.

**COMMISSIONER DRISCOLL:** Fran and the people on his staff have done a tremendous job. It must be a bit amusing to Bill Irwin as well, because we spent an awful lot of time, since 1993, continuing to talk about the inputs and processes. This Board has been saying all along that the key is outputs, the key is standards, the key is setting high standards, et cetera.

For the first time, we have a system that puts the Perkins Plan together with our Work-Based Learning plan with the competencies. This is not only for the Certificate of Occupational Proficiency, which under our law is really at a higher level, it's after the competency determination. It really has kicked off this very useful discussion about a state-endorsed certificate at the entry-level competencies, so that the student can earn those certificates while in high school. Maybe more than one, depending on the competencies and the standards, which would be uniform and relatively industry driven. The whole system is now moving in the right direction and it will make a tremendous beginning for our kids. I was very impressed. Our vocational schools, in many ways, are not as understood and valued, as they should be.

I happen to know a reading teacher at a vocational school who did an analysis of all the vocational schools who failed MCAS at the 10th grade level. I know her pretty well; I have been married to her for 29 years. Her cross-referencing was that every child that did not pass the 10th grade MCAS was reading at the 4th grade level or below, and remember they have a high percentage of special needs kids. The vocational schools take these kids in, many of who have not experienced academic success, and do wonders for their skills and self esteem. The Chairman, Roberta Schaefer, and I were at the recent awards banquet. You hear tremendous stories throughout. These schools are doing a great job across the board. These certificates and competencies allow for opportunity and growth. Vocational schools do a tremendous job of improvement for kids after the 10th grade into the 11th grade. I'm very heartened that we are finally getting there and that it's becoming a strong system across the state.

**MR. KANE:** There are a great number of programs going out there, and what we have to do is highlight those and use those as our examples for setting the standards for the other schools. I think once we pull all of that together and start that movement, I think you will really see some different expectations on the part of people that think 80 percent are going to fail.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** One quick question before you go. On 2001 certificates, Automotive Technology, Culinary Arts, Horticulturist and Cosmetology, do you have some sense of what percentage of the vocational-technical student body those compose?

**MR. KANE:** Those are the four highest areas. I would say over 50 percent. And it's so interesting because the report from DET through the year 2006 really hits on three or four of those areas.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** And it is the plan to begin issuing Certificate of Occupational Proficiency as the standards assessments are available rather than wait until they are all done.

**MR. KANE:** That's right.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** That would mean in 2001, maybe the class of 2002 would actually be issuing some certificates in other areas.

**MR. IRWIN:** They'll have to pass the MCAS first. 2003 maybe.

**COMMISSIONER DRISCOLL:** We have the opportunity beginning in 2001 if they have passed it. We don't have to wait until 2003.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** They do have to graduate from high school.

**COMMISSIONER DRISCOLL:** Yes, definitely.

**MR. IRWIN:** That would be a first.



**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** But for these students then, hopefully, four more would be synchronized with the 2003 graduation class.

**MR. KANE:** Right.

**CHAIRMAN PEYSER:** Thank you very much.

The meeting adjourn at 12:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

David P. Driscoll  
Secretary to the Board.