

Minutes of the Meeting

STATE OF NEVADA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

COMMISSION ON PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS IN EDUCATION

March 14, 2012

Call to Order; Roll Call; Pledge of Allegiance

President Thoreson called the meeting of the Commission on Professional Standards in Education to order at 9:09 A.M. via video conference in the Board Conference Room of the Nevada Department of Education Offices in Carson City and Las Vegas, Nevada.

Roll call showed the following Commissioners present:

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT IN CARSON CITY:

Brianne Thoreson, President
Mary Keith, Commissioner
Dr. Cheryl Lau, Commissioner
Wendy Zastawniak, Commissioner

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT IN LAS VEGAS:

Dr. Nancy Sileo, Vice President
Brian Boothe, Commissioner

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:

Elissa Couch, Commissioner - excused
Bonnie Townsend, Commissioner – excused

STAFF PRESENT:

Christina Harper, Commission Administrative Assistant
Dr. Jerry Barbee, Director of Teacher Licensure
Jeanette Calkins, Teacher Licensure

LEGAL COUNSEL:

Dr. James E. Irvin, Senior Deputy Attorney General
Carrie Parker, Deputy Attorney General

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE IN CARSON CITY:

Thomas Harrison, University of Nevada, Reno
Kimberly Smerkes-Bass, Phoenix University-Northern Nevada
Jerry Deluca, Educational Testing Service
Terry Owens, Educational Testing Service

Nancy Kuhles, NSHA Coalition to Address Personnel Shortages
Steve-Hay Chapman, Washoe County School District
Lauren Young, Washoe County School District
Les McCullen, Pearson Group

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE IN LAS VEGAS:

Esther Kassouf, University of Phoenix
Andre Yates, Clark County School District
Jan Yates, NOVA Southeastern University
Peter Yeager, Educational Testing Service
David Perlman, Commission on Postsecondary Education
Mark Kezys, University of Phoenix
Val Weber, University of Phoenix
Dr. Emily Lin, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Dena Durish, Clark County School District
Jim LaBuda, Nevada State College

It was determined that a quorum of the Commission was present. Commissioner Zastawniak led the pledge of allegiance.

Approval of Agenda

MOTION: Commissioner Lau moved to approve the agenda as amended, to allow Item #12 to be moved up to an earlier time, seconded by Commissioner Zastawniak. The motion passed unanimously.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Approval of Minutes: a) January 18, 2012 and b) February 14, 2012

MOTION: Commissioner Zastawniak moved to approve the January 18 and February 14, 2012 minutes as submitted, seconded by Commissioner Lau. The motion passed unanimously.

Discussion of Open Meeting Law Compliance Issues

Senior Deputy Attorney General Irvin advised that members of the Commission have a constitutional right to respond to public comment if they wish to respond, however it is a bad idea to engage in a conversation during 'Public Comments' as it may result in an action which is not allowable.

Fiscal Report – Review of Current Budget Account Balance

Dr. Jerry Barbee, Director of Teacher Licensure, reviewed the budget status report dated February 24, 2012 for Fiscal Year 2012 with revenue received to date of

\$1,104,452; expenditures to date of \$753,398, for an available balance of \$351,053. The Commission's expenditures to date total \$5,201 with funds available of \$2,825 for the remainder of the fiscal year. Dr. Barbee stated that the current funding is on target for the end of the fiscal year; except for In-State Travel, with a current balance of \$11, and making adjustments to this budget account for the remainder of the fiscal year. Within the Information Technology Services budget adjustments have been made to correct coding on charges inappropriately charged to this budget.

Update of Nevada Department of Education Activities

Dr. Barbee reported that on March 12, 2012, Governor Sandoval announced Dr. James Guthrie as the new Superintendent of Public Instruction for Nevada effective April 1, 2012. Dr. Guthrie is currently the Senior Fellow and Director of the Education Policy Studies at the George W. Bush Institute, has been a professor of Education Policy Studies at the George W. Bush Institute, and has been a professor of Education Policy and Leadership at the Annette Caldwell Simmons School of Education at Southern Methodist University. He has a B.A. from Stanford University in Physical Anthropology, a M.A. and Ph.D. from Stanford in Educational Administration. Dr. Guthrie has one postdoctoral fellowship from Harvard and another postdoctoral fellowship from Oxford Brooks College. After serving as a professor in the graduate school of education at the University of California, Berkeley; Dr. Guthrie was an Education Specialist in the United States Senate. In addition to his many professional activities, Dr. Guthrie has served at least 25 state governments and worked with international organizations such as The World Bank and the Organization of American States.

Dr. Barbee reported that over the past several months, the Department has been coordinating the activities of the Teachers and Leaders Council. The Council has met on several occasions in both Las Vegas and Reno. The Council has drafted and adopted a Systems Guideline White Paper, and developed taskforce committees in areas of Communications, Performance Indicators, and Measures and Models; taskforce chairs have been appointed for each taskforce. The Council has discussed basic standards for teacher and administrator effectiveness and has reviewed existing profession standards for alignment. Standards have been reviewed for those such as, but not limited to, INTASC, State of Colorado, National Board of Professional Teaching Standards for Teachers, Iowa Principal Performance System, and the National Board Certification for Education Leaders for Administrators. At the last Council meeting there was a discussion around the development of stakeholder involvement and a communication plan. There was also discussion around the aspect of local control vs. statewide uniformity/flexibility in the system. Additional meetings will continue to be scheduled until the topic at hand has been addressed.

Update and Submission of Report and Recommendations from Appointed Task Forces

- Standing Task Force on Review of Regulations Task Force

Dr. Barbee stated that there has been a delay in the appointment and meeting of this task force due to legislative mandates and the work of the Commission on the legislative mandates.

Dr. Barbee noted that the Licensure Office does have amended regulation drafts for the task force to review and anticipates the task force meeting within the next couple of months.

Presentation and Discussion with the Commission on Post Secondary Education And Their Role with the Approval of Providers/Institutions Who Would Provide An Alternative Route to Licensure Program

Dr. Perlman, Administrator for the Commission on Postsecondary Commission, reviewed the role and responsibility of the Postsecondary Commission. The Commission on Postsecondary Education is the predominant licensing authority charged for the oversight of private postsecondary educational institutions operating in Nevada. The Commission meets its oversight obligations through a rigorous licensure process and periodic reviews.

The Commission is comprised of seven Governor-appointed commissioners with the following experience: 1) two must represent private schools; 2) two must represent the general public; 3) two must be knowledgeable of education; and 4) one must be a representative of the Nevada State Board of Education. The Commission meets four times a year to hear licensure applications and conduct other business related to their mission. An application for licensure must be submitted sixty days prior to the Commission meeting and the institution must fulfill any contingencies within six months of the application review; if this is not met the institution must reapply to the Commission for licensure. The Commission employees a full-time staff of four individuals who serve as the intake for all Commission business.

Schools obtain licensure by submitting an application and obtaining approval from the Commission on Postsecondary Education for a provisional period. During that period, staff will conduct a full review to ensure compliance with state standards; schools are then subject to periodic review. Oversight authority can be found in Nevada Revised Statutes and Nevada Administrative Code 394. Schools licensed must maintain student progress records and must be bonded. A public institution in another state is considered a private institution in Nevada.

Dr. Barbee informed the Commission that he and Mrs. Harper will be meeting, next week, with Legislative Counsel Bureau regarding the R115-11; the Alternative Route to Licensure proposed regulations.

Discussion Regarding a Request for Proposal (RFP) For Teacher Licensure Testing

Dr. Barbee read Dr. Rheault's letter into the record:

"First of all, let me apologize for not being at your meeting in person. I had fully intended to be present; however, a conflict with another meeting today requires that I put my request in writing to you.

As you are aware, there have been numerous changes that have taken place over the past several years, primarily Legislative changes that have directly affected the Commission and licensure requirements for school personnel. With the continued push for education reform, both nationally and within state, such as implementing the common core standards and measuring teacher/school administrator effectiveness, there will be continued emphasis placed on the Commission to address these reform initiatives in the future.

My interest in bringing forth this item on the agenda is twofold. First, it has been 25 years since the Legislature passed the law (NRS 391.021) that required the Commission to adopt regulations that govern examinations for initial licensure for teachers and other educational personnel within the state. Since that time, there have been a lot of innovations in testing programs that have taken place with new offerings available from multiple vendors throughout the country. Second, the 2011 Legislature passed NRS 391.009 that now identifies the Superintendent of Public Instruction as being responsible for ensuring the responsibilities of the Commission are carried out successfully. I would like the Superintendent's office to be able to report to the Legislature that the testing program is meeting all expectations of the state.

Although I believe the Commission has done an excellent job with overseeing and implementing the testing program, I also believe there are a number of reasons why it would be beneficial for the state to ask that specific information be addressed in an RFP regarding the testing program. The main reason would be to confirm the fact that the program has been recently reviewed by the Commission and that the state is using the best available tests, at the best available costs, with easy access to testing sites as well as the best available support materials for program participants, and that the required tests are aligned, as applicable, with the reform efforts that have been implemented within the state such as the Common Core curriculum in English Language Arts and mathematics.

Specifically I am requesting that the Commission consider moving forward with a Request for Proposal regarding the testing program for licensed educational personnel within the state that would include, but not be limited to, information from potential vendors on: availability of tests for all licenses and specialty testing areas identified by the Commission; test alignment with common core standards, if applicable; availability of tests to be delivered via computer testing to include proposed testing sites in Nevada; practice tests and feedback

available to test takers to improve candidate pass rates or remediation efforts; availability of specific reports provided to the State and the Commission to analyze effectiveness of the testing program; and proposed costs to provide the specific program identified in the RFP with the vendor expected to recover costs through fees assessed to program participants (“no-cost” to the state). In addition, there are a number of other specific areas that could be addressed through a Request for Proposal that the Commission may be interested in, such as the turn-around time for test reporting, types of test questions, etc.

As mentioned previously, NRS 391.021 gives the Commission full authority and responsibility to regulate the testing program for licensed personnel within the state. If the request is something the Commission would consider moving forward with, Department staff would be available to assist with the development of the RFP document so that it meets the expectations of the Commission. I thank you in advance for your consideration of this request.”

President Thoreson disclosed that she has been contacted by representatives of the Pearson Group, Educational Testing Service and was requested to meet with them; which she did not meet with either representative. President Thoreson disclosed that she was contacted by a Department of Education staff member with regard to the increased workload that a change in testing vendor may cause.

Vice President Sileo disclosed that she has met with representatives from the Pearson Group and Educational Testing Service on multiple occasions and discussed testing issues in both her role as a Commissioner and as her role as Director of Teacher Education at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

Commissioner Boothe disclosed that he has been contacted by a staff member of the Nevada Department of Education with regard to the workload increase that this change may cause.

Upon questioning by President Thoreson, Dr. Barbee responded that when the testing services requirement was placed into statute in the mid-1980s the statute granted the Commission authority to determine the status of testing in the State of Nevada from the standpoint of educators; an RFP is not required. Dr. Barbee stated that he is only aware of two vendors that would participate in the RFP, which include the Educational Testing Service and the Pearson Group.

Upon questioning by President Thoreson, Dr. Barbee responded that a change in the vendor of teacher licensure testing would create a large workload and currently the licensure staff is working on addressing legislative mandates. An RFP will take staff and Commission time. Dr. Barbee reviewed the mandates that the licensure staff is currently working on.

The following concerns and issues were expressed:

- Various testing issues which impacts teacher licensure to include a no-fault testing period for all tests for one year; adopting new cut scores.

Senior Deputy Attorney General Irvin suggested that Commission consider the RFP process, with no mandated timeline, and consider this as an invitation to improve education in the State of Nevada.

President Thoreson outlined the RFP process and questioned the fiscal impact. President Thoreson suggested that during the 2012-2013 fiscal year, the Commission appoint a taskforce to help staff develop an RFP.

Upon questioning by Vice President Sileo, Dr. Barbee responded that there is no statutory requirement for a contract with a vendor supplying the testing and there is no statutory requirement for a periodic review of the current vendor.

Commissioner Keith expressed that she feels that the Commission owes individuals taking the teacher licensure exams a review of the testing program to ensure that the current testing program is an effective measure of an individual's skills and knowledge.

MOTION: Commissioner Lau moved to create a taskforce, within the 2012-2013 fiscal year timeframe, to investigate issues outlined in Dr. Rheault's letter, to review the possibility of the RFP, and related procedures regarding specific information on the testing program in Nevada, seconded by Commissioner Zastawniak.

Vice President Sileo suggested an amendment to the motion, as she feels that it is essential for the Commission to perform a review, analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of the current testing vendor and recommended that review to determine if an RFP is warranted based upon the performance of the current vendor; and survey school districts and test takers to find out what they think of the current testing vendor.

Deputy Attorney General Irvin disclosed that he received his doctoral degree from the University of Nevada, Reno and this relationship does not have an impact on the legal advice he provides to the Commission on Professional Standards in Education.

Following discussion, Commissioner Lau accepted the amendment to the motion.

MOTION: Commissioner Lau moved to convene a taskforce in the 2012-2013 fiscal year to investigate issues outlined in Dr. Rheault's letter, to review the possibility of drafting an RFP, and related procedures regarding specific information on the testing program in Nevada; and review, analyze and evaluate the effectiveness of the current testing vendor to determine if an RFP is needed and survey school districts and test takers to find out what they think of the current testing vendor, seconded by Commissioner Zastawniak. The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING

Public Hearing and Possible Adoption to Consider Comments for LCB File No. R114-11; NAC 391.070 – Renewal of Licenses: General Requirements; Delay of Expiration Date by Superintendent of Public Instruction

President Thoreson opened the public hearing at 11:00 A.M. There were eighteen individuals present. There being no public comments, President Thoreson closed the public comment section of the public hearing at 11:01 A.M.

MOTION: Commissioner Lau moved to adopt R114-11 as presented, seconded by Vice President Sileo. The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING

Public Hearing and Possible Adoption to Consider Comments for LCB File No. R131-11; NAC 391.185 – Qualifications for Endorsement as School Counselor and NAC 391.187 – Authorization to Serve as School Counselor Without Endorsement

President Thoreson opened the public hearing at 11:02 A.M. There were eighteen individuals present.

Dr. Tom Harrison, Associate Dean for the College of Education at the University of Nevada, Reno, expressed strong support for the proposed amendments. The proposed amendments will provide higher educational requirements for a school counselor and will not adversely affect students and will further improve this profession.

There being no further public comments, President Thoreson closed the public comment section of the public hearing at 11:03 A.M.

MOTION: Commissioner Lau moved to adopt R131-11 as presented, seconded by Vice President Sileo. The motion passed unanimously.

WORKSHOP

Workshop to Solicit Comments to LCB File No. R115-11; NAC 391.057 – Conditional Licensure: Categories, Qualifications; Validity; Permission by the Department for School District, Charter School, or Private School to Hire Licensee; Requirements of Licensee Following Issuance; NAC 391.058 – Conditional Licensure: Application to Department for Permission of School District, Charter School or Private School to Hire Licensee; Duties of Employing School District, Charter School or Private School; Requirements of Licensee Following Issuance; Cooperation with Commission and Department; NAC 391.042 – Initial License Requiring Student Teaching Experience; Conditions for Substitution of Teaching Experience; NAC 391.171- Conditional Endorsement as Professional Administrator of School; Authorized Employment; Validity; NAC 391.470 – Qualifications for Issuance of Renewable Teaching License to Persons Who Complete Nontraditional Training Program; and Delete NAC 391.172-Employment of Person Who Hold Conditional Endorsement as Professional Administrator of a School; Approval by Department Required; Duties of Employing School District, Charter School or Private School; Requirements of Licensee Following Employment; NAC 391.173 –

Qualifications for Issuance of Unconditional Endorsement as Professional Administrator of School to Person Who Holds Conditional Endorsement; and NAC 391.475 – Qualifications for Issuance of Conditional Special Qualifications License to Persons Who Complete Nontraditional Training Program; Validity; Duties of Employing School District, Charter School or Private School; Application for Renewable Special Qualifications License; Circumstances Under Which License Deemed Immediately Revoked

President Thoreson opened the workshop at 11:05 A.M. There were eighteen individuals present. There was public comment.

President Thoreson noted that at 11:05 A.M. there was a loss of quorum; as such President Thoreson granted a recess.

A break was granted at 11:05 A.M.
The meeting reconvened at 11:17 A.M.

President Thoreson reopened the workshop at 11:17 A.M. for public comment.

Deena Durish, Alternative Route to Licensure Coordinator for the Clark County School District, offered the following comments:

1. With regard to NAC 391.057 - 2(a), the legislative intent was to bring qualified candidates into the State of Nevada who can demonstrate competency to teach in our schools. Competency can be demonstrated in several ways.
2. With regard to NAC 391.465 and 391.470 – sections (iv) and (v) expressed concern with the requirement that an individual coming from out-of-state does not have to have a major and would only have to complete an alternative route to licensure program in another state approved by the Commission, while an individual in-state would have to have a major in the area. Ms. Durish stated that in Clark County a mentor would have to be an administrator in order to perform the evaluation of the ARL teacher. Clark County does not allow a teacher to evaluate another licensed teacher.

Andre Yates, Clark County School District, echoed Ms. Durish's concerns and further expressed concern regarding the evaluation of the ARL teacher that teachers should not be evaluating teachers and that the evaluation process may become too finite and cumbersome. Mr. Yates questioned if the Nevada Department of Education has the staff to oversee those assessments and determinations; and what mechanisms will be used to report such determinations. Mr. Yates felt that it is the District's responsibility to determine whether or not these teachers are effective based on the evaluations in the classroom. Mr. Yates additionally stated that he would like to see language included for an ARL candidate to be allowed to place multiple endorsements on their license.

There were no comments in the north.

President Thoreson closed the workshop at 11:29 A.M.

Following discussion, the following amendments were made R115-11:

- Section 1. 1. An institution of higher education or any other provider that operates independently of an institution of higher education that wishes to offer a program for an alternative route for the licensure of teachers and administrators in this State must be approved to offer a program of study by the Commission on Post Secondary Education. Providers approved by the Commission on Post Secondary Education wishing to provide an ARL program must also apply to the Commission on a form prescribed by the Department for approval to become a qualified provider of such a program.
- 1. (c) [If the applicant is accredited, the name of the regional accrediting body and the accreditation status of the applicant;] The name of the regional accrediting body and the accreditation status of the applicant;
 1. If you are non-accredited you must provide detailed description with evidence of the following:
 - (a) The structure of the organization including professional qualifications and a positional flow chart;
 - (b) Financial management and planning of the organization to provide a viable and sustainable institution for applicants;
 - (c) A curriculum structure and support; and
 - (d) Curriculum evaluation and improvement.
- (d)[If the applicant is not accredited, three letters of reference;] A description of the budget for the program as well as a profit loss statement and financial stability;
 - (e)[A description of the budget for the program;] The areas of licensure for which the applicant will offer the program;
 - (f)[The areas of licensure for which the applicant will offer the program;] A description of the program, which must include, without limitation:
 - (1) How the elements of the program comply with the requirements of this chapter and chapter 391 of NRS;
 - (2) The application and review process for enrollment in the program, including, without limitation, a copy of all forms that will be used in the process; and
 - (3) The supervised, school-based experiences the applicant will provide as required by NRS 391.019, which must include:
 - a. The name of each school and school district that will participate;
 - b. The manner by which a student will be required to participate and complete a minimum of 40 hours of pre-service clinical observation prior to the beginning of the classroom experience.
 - c. The length of time a student will be required to participate in the supervised, school-based experience;
 - d. The manner by which students will be mentored and evaluated, by a post-probationary, certified teacher, during supervised, school-based experience each year of the ARL including a minimum of nine observations and three evaluations by an on-site administrator;
 - e. How the supervised, school-based experience will promote the effectiveness of teachers in the ARL program; and

f. A copy of all forms that will be used for the supervised, pre-service clinical observations and school-based experience process with a post-probationary teacher, mentor, or unconditionally licensed teacher;

[(g) A description of the program, which must include, without limitation:

(1) The way in which the elements of the program will comply with the requirements of this chapter and chapter 391 of NRS;

(2) The application and review process for enrollment in the program, including, without limitation, a copy of all forms that will be used in the process; and

(3) The supervised, school-based experiences the applicant will provide as required by NRS 391.019, including, without limitation:

(I) The name of each school and school district that will participate;

(II) The length of time a student will be required to participate in the supervised, school-based experience;

(III) The manner by which students will be mentored and evaluated during the supervised, school-based experience;

(IV) How the supervised, school-based experience will promote the effectiveness of teachers; and

(V) A copy of all forms that will be used for the supervised, school-based experience process;

- Section 1. 3. The Commission will review the recommendation from the review team submitted pursuant to subsection 2 and provide to the applicant written notice of its approval or denial of the application. [If the Commission denies an application, the applicant may correct any deficiencies identified in the notice of denial and resubmit the application to the Commission.] If the Commission approves an application, with conditions or revisions the applicant may correct any deficiencies identified in the approval with conditions or revisions and resubmit the application to the Commission for consideration within the same review period or the original year in which the application was submitted. If the application is denied, the applicant may resubmit an application during the next application year/period.
 - (a) Approval will grant the ARL provider two years with the annual review process detailed in subsections 4 through 8; and
 - (b) At the end of two years, the ARL provider must complete either a new application or a modified renewal application depending on the results of the annual evaluation detailed in subsection 4 through 8.
- Section 1. 5. Each qualified provider shall cooperate with the Commission and the Department in the evaluation of the effectiveness of this section and NAC 391.057. The evaluation will include, but not limited to, the following:
 - (a) Each qualified provider shall provide a separate annual evaluation for each program that the provider delivers. The annual report/evaluation to be completed by the Department of Education and staff shall include, but not limited to the following:
 - (1) A successful annual evaluation is required for the institution to continue providing ARL and that evaluation would need to contain a report on all graduates including:
 - a. In which Districts they hold positions;

- b. The successful transition to licensure and the number of individuals who obtained full licensure;
- c. The number of successful evaluations vs. unsatisfactory; and
- d. The number to be re-hired and if not re-hired how many did they report to the State Department of Education of not continuing in their ARL program.

(b) A summary from the Districts with the teachers reporting their successes and weaknesses.

(c) A report on all applicants to the program to include demographics of:

(1) How many individuals are enrolled;

(2) Who is enrolled;

(3) End of year financial report; and

(4) An update on faculty and staff demographics, qualifications, new employees, and professional development provided.

6. The recommendation from the annual evaluation will be submitted to the Commission on Professional Standards in Education for review and approval.

7. Successful annual evaluations are required for the institution to continue providing Alternative Route to Licensure programs.

(a) If the provider receives an unsatisfactory annual review, they will have one year in which to make the necessary changes to receive a satisfactory review and provide a detailed improvement plan in a six month or mid-year report to update the Department of Education on the progress made in accomplishing those recommendations that come forward from the evaluation.

(b) If two unsatisfactory evaluations are received or if a participant who is on an improvement plan chooses not to participate in that improvement plan, the provider must provide an Exit Plan, inclusive of a description of how the provider will assist existing participants in

(1) Completing the program with said provider; or

(2) Transferring cost free, to the participant, to the participant, to a program run by another approved provider.

- Section 4. NAC 391.057 2(a) Hold a major in the applicant's desired area of licensure and pass the State required competency area test; or
(b) [Pass each competency test required] If a major is not held but a minor is held pass each competency test or tests required by the Commission in the subject matter of the area for which the applicant [will be employed to teach] is seeking a conditional license [or provide to the Department proof that he or she is eligible for an exemption from that test and...]
- 7. A conditional license issued pursuant to this section is automatically revoked if the holder of the conditional license withdraws from or is no longer enrolled in a program for an alternative route to licensure, or is deemed unfit by the Superintendent of Public Instruction upon proof satisfactory to the Superintendent.
- Section 7 NAC 391.171 4. A conditional endorsement as a professional administrator issued pursuant to this section is automatically revoked if the holder of the conditional endorsement withdraws from or is no longer enrolled in program for an alternative route to licensure, or is deemed unfit by the Superintendent of Public Instruction upon proof satisfactory to the Superintendent.

MOTION: Following discussion and a review of the proposed amendments, Commissioner Lau moved to post R115-11 with amendments for a public hearing, seconded by Commissioner Keith. The motion passed unanimously.

Future Agenda Items

The following items were noted to be on the May 2, 2012 agenda:

- Department of Education Update – Dr. Barbee;
- Possible public hearing for R115-11 – Alternative Route to Licensure Regulation;
- Discussion regarding a possible classroom experience requirement for school counselors; and
- Update from Task Forces: Standing Task Force on Review of Regulations.

The following items were noted to be on the June 13, 2012 agenda:

- Public hearing for the Parental Involvement Licensure requirements; and
- Approval of 2012-2013 Meeting schedule.

Public Comments

Vice President Sileo stated that Andre Yates, had to leave the meeting but, expressed an interest on serving on the 2012-2013 Teacher Licensure Testing Provider RFP Taskforce.

Les McCullen, Evaluation Systems - Pearson Group, expressed appreciation to the Commission for placing the Request for a Testing Vendor RFP on the agenda for discussion; and thanked Dr. Rheault for his letter. Mr. McCullen stated that an RFP is good business and good public policy; it provides a comparison of the vendors and usually is required every five years. Mr. McCullen stated that Pearson would like the Commission to review their product. Mr. McCullen suggested that the Commission review the present vendor, hear presentations from vendors, and then develop an RPF from the information received.

Adjournment of Commission Meeting

President Thoreson adjourned the meeting at 12:08 P.M.