

## Meeting minutes

1. Roll call
  - a. Present: Colleen, Sunny, Shane, Elizabeth, Malia, Brad, Cassie, Shavon is on her way, Carissa.
2. Overview of the agenda
  - a. Leadership elections
    - i. Will be sending around a Microsoft form for voting
    - ii. Doesn't ask for names, so vote will be anonymous
  - b. Jimmy: Discussion of the data system
    - i. Where we currently are and where we hope to be before licenses start being issued under the permissions of the compact
  - c. Darren and Samantha: Discussion of future rules for consideration
    - i. Early rulemaking for licensure compacts
  - d. Needs in state agencies
    - i. Anticipating needs for issuing licenses under the compact
  - e. Lunch
  - f. Brief meeting summary
  - g. Next steps
  - h. Any deliverables
    - i. don't anticipate there being any at this time
  - i. Next meeting date
    - i. looking for a date in June
    - ii. how we'll go about scheduling meetings moving forward.
    - iii. Expect to have at least one virtual meeting of the executive committee between now and this summer.
      - Generally shorter, a couple of hours in an afternoon virtually.
  - j. Questions
  - k. Public comment
    - i. Couple of non-delegate attendees, but mostly familiar folks.
  - l. Adjourn
  - m. Motion to adopt the agenda, so moved, and seconded
3. Vote on leadership positions
  - a. Additional nominations for leadership positions:
    - i. Colleen would like to be nominated for executive committee
  - b. Voting for people who nominated either themselves or were nominated by somebody else.
    - i. Eight total nominations. Chair, Vice Chair, Treasurer being elected today.
    - ii. The remaining folks that receive nominations will fill up the rest of the executive committee.
    - iii. Elizabeth was not interested in a nomination.
  - c. Results
    - i. Chair: Malia
    - ii. Vice Chair: Cassie

- iii. Treasurer: Shane Carter
  - iv. Executive committee: Sunny, Jeff, Shavon, Brad, and Colleen
4. Discussion of the data system
- a. There will be a data exchange system, not a database, in which all licenses are held.
    - i. Pilot: exchange data back and forth so that if you're trying to get somebody transferring a license or want to figure out somebody's information, you can do that.
    - ii. Looking at a couple of possibilities conceptually:
      - Once we know all the licenses, each state would say, "These are our licenses."
      - A computer could go into that system and say, "I need to move from Kentucky to Utah. And so I want to know if I'm available for the compact." The system will be able to look at their Kentucky system and say, "Based on the license you have today, yes, you are eligible."
      - Ultimately, we have to figure out if there would be some application process to say, "I'm applying for a license in Utah." The system would say, "Okay, I'm gonna go over into Kentucky," through a secure link, pull that information for that teacher and send it to Utah. Then, it will be deposited, and the notification will go to Utah; you can get that new information with someone applying for a license through the compact.
      - Someone would have to go in there and look at that information and say, "Yeah, we've got all this," and then make sure they get supported in your system. Don't want to be invasive. Don't want to go in and put things automatically in your system. Want to pull it over, so you can see what's available and then you can actually run a script to import into our system.
      - Let's assume that the teacher in Utah has a license but doesn't qualify for the compact. In most cases, you'll still figure out how to get that person licensed. Would like to make it available to go in and transfer that information. To say, "Yeah, based on this information, we can take you through the same pathway, but you gotta go through that pathway. But you've got the information necessary. So I have to wait for the US local service [?] to send all of this to you."
    - iii. Two reasons: It is very quick and might be an incentive for state licensing agencies to join the Compact
    - iv. Programmer has already started the preliminary work.
  - b. Feedback on the model
    - i. For educators requesting reciprocity: some disclosure/acknowledgment so that the educator knows that the files are being transferred
      - Response: That will be there. They'll have to acknowledge with a checkbox that their information is being checked and transferred from one state to another.

- ii. Disclaimer about disciplinary action
  - The clearinghouse only has final actions. So the sending state would have to go in and say, "There is a case like that." Something that would have to do manually because I don't think your system because we don't want to send a pending case to the clearing house. And so somebody, you know, look at it, say, do you have a disciplinary action? Then they say yes or no.
- iii. Confidentiality rules
  - Don't think that you have an issue with confidentiality because all you're saying is yes or no
- iv. Should also ask the educator when to join an application to check off if there's any pending investigation.
- v. The other compacts have addressed this with the presence of significant investigative information But we do not have that language. But that applies to all the various states' concerns over sharing of information – the actual sharing of that data: the investigative reports or pending actions or anything like that. Of course, that's not ever shared through the system.
  - Private versus accessible is going to differ across states.
  - Bit more manual system where you check the flag ("yes"/ "no"), pick up the phone and navigate the requirements to say, "Looking at what we have here, but there's something else hanging out there. Can you share anything with me?"
- vi. Sometimes there's a gap between being reported and an action being taken in the clearing house. If I were a state, I would advise my state to check online or something if they were teaching in another state. Maybe some states are supposed to do it, but it takes them 60 days, maybe 30 days. But what if, on day 15, you go in?
  - When drafting this, I went back and disciplinary piece. This is a sticking point for many states so pretty sure the compact language is silent. That passes the smell test in other contexts, at least concerning states' confidentiality. And that would cover you because the state could check that.
- vii. So, wouldn't that fall under each individual's receiving state? To include it as part of the background check? That is what is done in UT.
  - Response: You would check anyway in the clearing house.
  - Right, we do that. We also ask the educators as part of their application.
- viii. Adam: As much as we can preserve existing state practice for receiving teachers while simultaneously ensuring the physical and procedural aspects of getting information between, both are high priority. We would like to maintain standing practice while making our standing practice an easier and more seamless practice for the educator and the agency

- Recommends that everyone go back and review that section of the legislation. It's relatively broad with the intention that this group will make around what is highest priority. There's flexibility to change that as more states come onto the compact.
  - Financial piece: Department of Defense has expanded the cooperative agreement with CSG to help support the funding of expanding the clearing house to meet the needs of the Teacher Compact Commission. So that will be covered by the cooperative agreement, and none of that will fall on states to develop.
- ix. And since it will be along states within the compact, maybe part of the
- x. Adam: Jimmy, from your discussions with the programmer, are there any estimates on the time it would take to build out this part of the system?
- Response: did not ask that question recently, but want to say it would be easy. But setting up the API strip in the system could be more complicated.
  - Adam: What we can do, and I believe other compacts handle it this way, is link to each state's compact application through the teacher compact website. So there is a landing page there, but it all goes through state agency webpages rather than the compact web page, which I think would be appropriate here. Where we currently have the map on the website for states that have joined, replace the link to the activating legislation on the application page.
  - Response: As someone who has done a lot of programming in the past, a timeline is no good. This will take twice as long as we expect. But I always throw that out there as a caveat.
- xi. Question to Jimmy: what specifically are the sending states going to have to provide, and what might we receive?
- Response: the script would be set up so that you wouldn't have to do a whole flag or notice that says, "This person is applying for a license in another state. And we're going to pull the data from your database" and send it to as another state. As a body, you all have to determine what data you want to get transferred. The receiving state would get that in the form of the file that needs to be uploaded into their system.
  - Adam: The only legislatively required data to be shared is the license and the disciplinary information. This body could decide that preparation program information is submitted as long as that doesn't provide additional barriers to the individual educator.
  - Cassie: In the discussions, it was described as "turning on the license". I'm sending in a teacher from Kentucky to Alabama. Alabama is looking at the license. They're not looking at the transcripts, degrees, and all that. They only send transcripts if you have a state that also ranks at the license level. And so you need to say, okay, I need to see

these 30 hours to know you're at a rank 2 or 1. But that's separate and incumbent on the applicant to provide that. The contact was supposed to be the license piece.

- Jimmy: As a board, if you decide you want them to send additional information, then it could be set up to do that. But again, it's about the license and not about preparation.
- xii. How would that look, though? If something else would have to be received. Because, for us, our pay is tied to our certificate level.
- Jimmy: There's a carveout that says you can request a little less information if you have a fixed salary schedule. But also you can request it from the teacher.
  - You'll be at that level if you know your state with the rank and tell an applicant that we can issue you a license through the compact. If you want to prove that you're ranked 2 or rank 1, then you submit those documents.
  - Adam: Through rulemaking, it would be possible to build the data system to include that for states with a salary schedule. It would be up to you all, and it's not legislatively required, so it's not something that we have to tackle now. It was a place where we had folks on the drafting team in states with that type of salary building or salary schedule.
  - So we have the salary schedules based on that from the state level, but with more requirements put on the professional license dictated by education history – so with the bachelor's degrees, they're more than a master's degree. So we would capture that as well. If there's verification from education history in your system and that's part of the file, I'm willing to accept that. If not, we'll just have to plug it into our application system, and they'll have to upload transcripts. But we have to have that to issue the license.
  - One of the challenges with one of some of the states that haven't joined is that – is the degree from an institution that's accredited that is accepted by the state? Because every state has its own goals. And so just because the degree counts in your state doesn't mean it counts in my state. It's tough. I would say to educators, "It is your responsibility to provide to the state you're going to."
- xiii. That's a good question because if Florida accepts or does not accept a degree, the teacher doesn't get this certification (only referring to accredited programs). Say, Arizona online, let's use that as an example. Say we don't accept it, but Utah does. Then vice versa, if Florida accepts it but Utah doesn't. Then, would the certificate be null and void through the compact?
- Response: The license accepts it. The license and discipline are the things that are required. Everything else is ancillary. You could add.

- So that gives me comfort because you may not have accepted that, but we did. Since they're now moving to your state, would that ever come up for a point of contention or conversation when Utah does go back and look at transcripts during renewal?
  - a. We are cross-walking licenses; we are not duplicating primary source information. With this idea of full faith and credit, my sister state has granted the license.
  - b. Now, as a state, I have the full autonomy to decide which licenses I grant that are eligible through the compact. And that's where that state maintains that measure of control. But once we have a list of guidelines, I won't dig in the weeds about what FL did to issue a license – I'm not issuing it. And then, essentially, you don't have to issue a license on renewal.
  - c. You have to give the closest equivalent license if there are different levels. So, if you have a K-6, and another state has a K-5, you would issue a K-6. It is not required for your state to create a new license.
  - d. So if somebody has a preschool license, not special ed, that doesn't exist in Utah. Then I'm so sorry you don't get the license in Utah. That would be the prime example of an applicant that does not match.
- xiv. Adam: We don't need to take a vote on this now. This will be business taken up by the executive committee to bring a recommendation to the commission as a whole, as different as those bodies are now. However, it's important for this whole group to start thinking about and potentially having conversations with the technical folks in your agencies about the best ways to approach implementation if this is the path that we decide to go down.
  - Building a standalone data exchange system separate from the clearing house is possible.
  - It is likely to be much more expensive by an order of magnitude and requires new implementation in the states rather than expanding implementation of the clearinghouse in the states. However, there are other pathways that the commission could go down. And so, if you would like to have conversations about other approaches to data exchange systems, we can do that.
- xv. So, in Kansas, I'm already applying for the commission. So we can use our application system to do a check, and if we have a question about what license they have, if it's uncovered, we can go to the website and look it up. If we want to make this the least complicated system, it would be an exact cross-walk of licenses, and then we can keep our internal information.
  - That sets us up with our professional conduct questions with our application, and we will take care of those pending actions. If we need that specific additional information, issue a license for one or more clients, and it's all taken care of.

- We considered putting in a check mark, “I am a commission state,” and we also decided to go against that.
    - xvi. [Cross-talk] Whenever we do an application, we have three areas to look at based on real changes. And that's the driver whenever we do an application because we have three areas to look at based on some real changes we can add. And then pick the best. Nine times out of 10, it's the license.
      - Adam: I think I'm following you. So you don't see inherent value in having something outside the public look-up? Okay, so currently, it's educators themselves who submit their licenses. That could be an added value if the system can transfer the license without the educator.
      - Adam: So I think the question here is more about the crosswalk than it is about the submission of documents
        - a. Well, they're about customer service. We could look up the state and pull that information if the person did not upload that.
      - Adam: This is a valuable conversation. This is something that we handle in rules. Let's table this for now and move forward since we're going to be discussing cross-walking the rules for consideration in the future.
    - c. There is a legislative requirement that the data is protected up to the standard that you protect the data for your practitioners.
      - i. It flows directly from state policy around bringing in new teachers from other states, regardless of whether it is through the compact or not.
      - ii. The data information exchange system will be built up to meet that standard in terms of security for transferring data.
      - iii. Will provide to the executive committee a full breakdown of the DoD available funds for expanding the system if this is the direction that the Commission chooses to go.
5. Darren and Samantha: Future rules for consideration
- a. Data system submission
    - i. Bare minimums that must be transferred: licensure information and FINAL disciplinary action.
      - If we keep it to these, we're not in a spot where rulemaking is a pressing need.
    - ii. Anything beyond that, we would want some expectations set in some form of codification by a commission. That is optional and not required.
    - iii. The statute gives us the broad latitude to add more items. Still, additional items would be subject to the majority agreement of all the states that we will create a role and mutual obligation for sharing information.
    - iv. One of the things to think about with that is whether or not there's ever a scenario where the data system cannot properly share nonfinal adverse action or even the presence of any investigation. Whether or not that's something that we want to grapple with through the data system, etc.

- b. With respect to the licensure exchange – it is the state’s submission of eligible licenses.
  - i. A ton of autonomy is built into the compact for states to say which licenses they will designate as eligible under the compact.
  - ii. The compact commission has no say in making a state have an eligible license.
  - iii. Suggest future discussion around our appropriate or objective timeline for somebody getting into the system about identifying multiple licenses.
    - At this juncture, I don't know that we will have time delays, but the more we can put expectations and rules, the better.
- c. Another thing that could be a subject of rulemaking is leadership nominations.
  - i. It could be a procedure that's nothing formal in rule
  - ii. Helpful to delineate as commissions get larger
  - iii. Some areas are just on the corporate governance that could help with future elections and streamline that process. I identify that as a period that is certainly not needed right now but bear that in mind.
- d. Feedback
  - i. Finance dues and handling that as a future role.
    - Response: Counsel of a Commission that assesses dues against the state. Not tied to fees as a licensure applicant. They set the fee via roll.
    - Somewhat of a topic of contention about raising the dues.
    - It would be helpful to build in some plan, revision for increased costs associated with that, etc.
  - ii. Two ways that income can be derived from compact participation
    - States pay a due for their participation in the compact
    - A licensure fee for applicants that are accessing it through the compact
      - a. Retained by member states or some which can be kicked back up by the commission
  - iii. I thought fees were specifically not allowed for educators in the law
    - Adam: It's left to the states, so it is possible. It would be difficult within the commission's legislation to set a percentage of the fee that gets kicked back to the commission. There's some fee on top of licenses granted under the compact, so states can raise revenue.
  - iv. Adam: Many of us have been discussing state-specific requirements as required for renewal. That's not legislatively required to be the way that it's operationalized.
    - You wouldn't even need to attend to it in rule-making. It is a state-by-state issue.
    - This becomes an issue in existing reciprocity processes that they set at renewal. We've discussed that as one way to operationalize the state-specific requirements that are not explicit within the legislation. That



could be that the states' requirements drop off completely. It's not required for teachers coming through the contact. I think most states wouldn't.

- So, we have interpreted that it can happen at any point up to the first renewal cycle so whether or not that's at the point of renewal or sometime within the first renewal cycle or the first license cycle.
  - Sam: There's no authority to say that you won't grant local license in the receiving state until you complete the state-specific requirements. There's a lot of ambiguity about whether they could set a renewal at a state-specific requirement within a year. There's a lot of space for it to be argued otherwise. I probably would not recommend disciplinary proceedings for this, whatever it is (given the ambiguity)
  - Article 4B suggests that they can have state-specific requirements.
    - a. It changed.
    - b. It was California that was very adamant in the beginning. That we need to have them do that within one year. But then, going back to "if you're complying with the contract, then you are issuing a license the same that you would issue somebody else."
      - i. Well, it prompts the question: Okay, so you grant the license and decide that it's happened within a year, and that teacher does not do the state-specific requirement within that time. Do you have any grounds to revoke the license? I don't know if you do. And so if you can find, you can require it, but it's very good because right here.
- v. "Not related question about a potential rule" that may be causing some states hesitation to join the program: could we further define, by rule, what qualifies as a qualifying license?
- Right now, it just says bachelor's degree, but it doesn't say it has to be from an accredited institution.
  - Are we limited in further defining that by rule?
  - Sam: If you're asking me if we could clarify the definition of an "eligible license" – generally, yes. The rubber may meet the road when we actually try to do that because then we would have to define what "accredited" means statutorily. But generally, we could adopt a rule that could provide more clarity.
    - a. It was a conscious choice not to go into much detail when drafting. Not to leave it to rule necessarily, but because we recognize those variations across state laws. If we are trying to seek a standard of uniformity, then that is frankly not there.
  - Gets candidates that attend tiny unaccredited religious schools that would qualify for a license in a different state but not theirs.

- a. Response: but the certificate is what “triggers” the license
- Maybe this is where we say, “We’ll take the license and stay silent on the degrees.”
- Sam: Compact seeks to compare licenses like apples to apples. But it will not take a step back and say, “You have an apple. I have an orange. How do we make it an apple or an orange?”
- Adam: Because of this compact's model, disqualifying programs wouldn't disqualify an individual practitioner who attended those programs. It would disqualify the entire license and any practitioner that holds that license where that program might be considered eligible. So that's the real caution.
  - a. In the example of a small religious school, if any state accepts that degree for its professional K-8 license – the license itself would be deemed ineligible.
  - b. The only way to operationalize it at the state level to limit it by programs is to put the onus on the educator to provide the documentation.
  - c. And so, in drafting, we decided this defeated a lot of the compact's purpose– tying it to the license, not to the individual practitioner.
- vi. The thing I talked with other states that are looking at compact – we (TX) have higher standards than all 49 other states – when I ask them, “How many learning certificates did you issue this year?” they'll say, “Well, we issued a thousand, or we issued 900 or something like that.” And I say, “So you're saying you're willing to put someone in the process who has no training whatsoever, understands maybe the content, but does not understand pedagogy, as opposed to someone who must’ve gone through some type of training and probably has some type of experience.” And at that point, their conversation changes to, “Okay, that's a valid point. What do we need to do to proceed with the compact?”
  - And so that's what it comes down to. You're putting more people in the classroom now with less experience than the compact will provide.
- vii. Adam: The other thing we have found in our conversations with the states (CA) is that in 99% of cases, they're issuing that license regardless of the degree program. Then they're working with the teacher after the license has been granted anyway. They're just putting all these barriers in front first.
  - Our understanding from our conversations with most licensing agencies is that these licenses are being issued anyway.
  - There's a much harder process for the educator and, by extension, a much harder review process by the agencies.
  - It becomes risky territory if this body starts to look back at degree programs rather than keeping them tied to the license and trusting

that states are preparing their teachers well. At least as well as we all are.

- viii. Our union also had these questions when we were talking about these things. “How are we holding everybody to the same accountable standard versus being different in our state and expectations for our state authorizations vs. everybody else?”
- That is an undergird we want to discuss as we get closer to those rules. What is that happy medium? I’m not too sure.
  - But I know my union will return to me and say, “What are you doing? We want more teachers, and we want to protect the profession as well.”
  - Response: When we presented our standards to our board, we had 17 members and three high-ed folks. I was prepared and worried that our higher ed people would think, “This is terrible. We have all this accreditation that we have to go through. How dare you accept another state?” Surprisingly, they did not. One of our university people loved it and saw, “This is going to help me in recruiting. For our teachers to say yes, *this is a different* process than what you went through when you got your license. But now, if your spouse moves across the country, Utah will look and say, *okay, your Kentucky license is going to get you a license here.*” So that really made the difference in the discussion for them.
- ix. Re: An HR conference in the next two weeks in South Louisville. One thing I see is a benefit for the large urban districts is if a teacher walks in with the license. They’ll be able to look at it and say, “You can get a license in a very short time.”
- Can guarantee that unless there is some disciplinary action.
  - Thinks larger districts are going to see it as an improvement.
  - Response: They’re still held to the same performance standard once they start teaching.
  - Response: That’s the beauty of this – you’re not issuing a compact license, you’re issuing your license. You’ve got full control over this.
- x. The school psych one is different, right?
- Sam: They all use some variation of a compact privilege or a multistate license.
  - Adam: The uniformity of the profession is much clearer. School psychology allows for renewal in only one state, which fulfills renewal in the other states. It’s a healthy medium between a compact privilege, which only requires renewal in one state but is the same granting of a full state license model.
- xi. By joining the compact, you don’t have to follow the new law that the feds put out.

- Adam: It's an important distinction. At some point, if we'd like to discuss the federal law, I think we can have it as an agenda item for our next meeting.
  - a. CSG has done lots of analysis because it affects our compact portfolio, not just teaching. Mostly, Darren and Samantha have done a lot of work around that.
  - b. We'd be happy to help kind of present where those two differ because it would only affect out-of-state teachers coming from a compact state if I'm correct there.
  - c. So, some meshing must be done unless 50 states are in the contact. Which they will, but maybe not quite yet.

## 6. Continued discussion

- a. Continuing our focus on questions of the implementation within your states – either questions that you will receive or questions that you actively have since the passage of the compact that you believe would be best solved by rules, for your question about whether this would be best solved by rule, or if it can be solved by rule.
  - i. That's likely our most important thing.
  - ii. The next step will be a meeting of the executive committee, which is a rule recommendation and drafting meeting.
  - iii. So that will likely take place between now and our meeting this summer with the commission as a whole.
  - iv. It's important for us to get an idea of what you all feel are the most immediate and pressing needs, or also future needs that are not immediate and pressing
  - v. There will certainly be a recommendation on the adoption of the data system model so that work can officially begin on building out the data system.
  - vi. But also, there are other pieces that we'll want to start to address quickly in preparation for other states joining and licenses beginning to be issued. I will open the floor to that. We can carry on what we're talking about before that break.
  - vii. When and where do we resubmit the list of eligible licenses?
    - Response: We will need that info to build the system, so that will be the first thing.
    - Adam: We'll say, legislatively, the onus to do that is on the individual states themselves. We don't grant an official authority to submit those licenses outside of the general term of the member state licensing authority.
      - a. The authority is from the licensing agency to submit those licenses. The commission is explicitly available as a technical assistance resource, but not a decision-making body about what constitutes an eligible/ineligible license within your own state.

- b. So if there's a license that you don't wish to grant under the compacts, the compact can't make you include that in your list of licenses.
  - c. There becomes a question about whether a license that you've submitted as eligible really meets the criteria for the compact.
  - d. There are disciplinary proceedings that could take place from the commission, but that would have to come from the member states themselves. They couldn't come from an outside body.
- viii. I have a question on that too, and maybe it's in the legislation. We have endorsements that are micro-credentials for different special areas (e.g., reading, math). If I have a professional with these, would that also moving state-to-state?
- Adam: The simple answer is no. Article 4 in the compact covers areas not influenced by the compact within the state. One of those is specifically additional certifications, including something like a micro-credential, but also including something like the administrator's license. But it explicitly states that if the state wishes to grant additional licenses based on evidence presented by the teacher, they're fully within their power to do that.
  - So that would probably not come through the data system.
  - The onus would be on the educator to provide that education and the additional credential.
  - Sam: So it goes back to the facilitation of the sharing of information that may give them the ability to, outside the compact, unilaterally grant microcredentials. But the exchange applies to licensure. It's not any of those endorsements on that license.
- ix. This brings up an interesting idea, because in Utah, they have a license which is just their level, and then they have license areas, and then endorsements. You can't have a secondary license without the content endorsement. And so I'm not gonna ship off to Kentucky, "She's got a license." – "Well, in what?"
- Because they have to be able to determine what's equivalent.
  - In Oregon, I have a math-specific certificate. But in Utah, I have a professional license with secondary at math.
  - So even the structure of "What does a license mean" is different in everybody's state.
  - Right, but if I don't put an endorsement into the data system, how is Oregon going to know to issue mathematics?
  - Response: Alternatively, Florida could send licensure levels and micro-endorsements. And then, Utah crosswalks with their licensure levels and micro-endorsements. I think that's something we'll have to grapple with when we ask ourselves, "What information is submitted". So for your example in Utah, I would say those details are

fundamental to the license you have. Even though, technically, it's a practice area or specialization

- a. So I would suggest based on that, it's more than just literally the base license because those endorsements, microcredentials, and subareas are fundamental to the crosswalk working the way it we intend it to, which is to land you in the closest equivalent slot.
- x. So is the idea to create these documents that improves these different certification areas? For example, the executive committee receives the areas of subjects, certifications, endorsements, etc. Then they look at it and create a document. As each state comes in, they get added to the document. I'm not opposed to it, but it seems easy for the user. So, the teacher wants to go in and they're moving from state to state, they could say "Am I going to qualify here?" But then, for us, it seems like a monumental task.
- Response: Everything in the data system is designed to capture some of that, "Are you eligible? Yes/No." That would depend on whether we've built out that matrix first. The caveat is, I think that it's fine as a potential initial reference tool, check for the teacher, something like that. The problem that I have is that I don't ever want to ask my states to be in a position of saying, "I have unequivocally, and without further ability to look at this particular file, agree that I'm going to accept X license from Kentucky as Y license from Utah." I don't like the chart to be this substitute for the states to have that autonomy.
  - Response: Which is the disclaimer aspect of this would be the asterisk. "Below is a general guideline to what is available at this time. There are different...you know, how ever it's worded."
  - Response: Maintaining something like that sounds awful. Because how many times do we add endorsements and microcredits? Every legislative session. The simpler we can keep what counts and doesn't count.
  - Response: That's another area where the compact is going to leave it up to the state and say, "This is what I consider to be an eligible license." In the Utah example, I think potentially all, if not multiple of those, is part of your license. Florida's thinking of a license with endorsements is quite different. It doesn't feel different as we start to crosswalk it, but to say what the license is that we're trying to marry – it's a state-by-state determination.
- xi. Did I hear you say that we need to build that out?
- Response: We will. Technically, we've got some of that information. In Kentucky, there are thousands of different licenses. But technically there's only three licenses: emergency, provisional, professional. But the professional can be broken down to more. So if it's a professional license, that's what qualifies.

- When that license comes over then to Florida, Florida would say “Ok, they got a qualifying license. Here is the licensing equivalent. We wouldn’t have an issue with that. But I noticed on this license also you have the principal/superintendent certification. Would you like us to process that for you while we have this other one?”
  - And so it's gonna take, human eyes to look at it. You can’t line up your electronic system do to all this. But, if I bring that information over, you already see, *here are the questions you're gonna get while I've got this open*. But it’s up to each state whether or not they’re gonna take the time to do that. But I will tell you, they're gonna come back and apply for those things – so why not try to get it done?
  - Adam: This falls back to state autonomy, but if Florida said, “None of our micro-credentials are included at all. It would mean the same thing both for Florida teachers coming out and Florida teachers coming in. So if Florida would like for those micro-credentials to carry through with the teacher to potentially be rewarded with some kind of endorsement in the receiving state, they would have to be included as part of the eligible license matrix. The same way for folks coming in, of they have some kind of endorsement or micro-credential that matches the same in Florida, then it would need to be included in that list in the same way.
    - a. Follow-up: So would that be something that we decide on as each individual state or would that be something that the commission says we're going to move forward with all states submitting everything that's on the certificate, including letters, the endorsements, the micro-credentials, and then the state can decide what they do with it.
    - b. Adam: This is something that's explicitly left up to the state. The commission is a supporting organization; they can help make those determinations. Beyond deeming eligibility, where if there's a concern there, the commission can step in if licenses are being submitted that don't meet the baseline for eligibility, that's where the commission could step in. In terms of what licenses are submitted, that's fully a state-by-state decision.
- xii. Could we further define by rule not just what ‘license’ is, the information to go through the data system, but also what that license or certificate qualifies the individual to do or teach?
- Adam: I believe in our definition of license, we include the term, “content area and grade level or specific population”. So that it's broken down by content area range and population. I think if we needed to define further within that, it could likely be done by rules.
  - Response: What we’re not going to do is say, “When Utah says X, that means the same thing as Florida saying Y”.

- Clarification: What I'm saying is, if somebody has a K-8 license in Utah, with an English language arts endorsement, then that person is qualified to teach all grades kindergarten through grade 5, and 6 through 8 in English.
  - Response: I think for us the difficulties will be when get into the special education, in terms of what areas you could serve in.
  - I don't want to take the position of the commission, by rule, as interpreting whether the teacher is being authorized to do things. Because that creates the suggestion that Kentucky *must* issue a license. We're putting a lot of autonomy on the states to slot you in the closest equivalent.
  - But I think what you're saying is, in the list that Utah provides, it would say that this is the license, here's the name of the license, here's the content they can teach, here's the grade levels they can authorize. I think that's a great idea because it facilitates an understanding for the receiving state to determine what's the closest equivalent.
  - Adam: So what I'm hearing from Malia is that without the endorsements, it would be impossible to tell content area or special population outside of what we would get from the license itself. So , by my interpretation, the definition of license wouldn't necessarily include those endorsements because it meets that. I think that the description of the license as part of the crosswalk is at least a valuable resource for the receiving state.
  - Response: So then I can interpret what is closest in Utah
  - Response: So then I submit that if we require that information and put it in a matrix as a cross-walk document, what it then becomes as a reference. I would suggest probably less for teachers for trying to figure out where they land, and just more for analysts to say "where do I slot you in?" I would hesitate to take to make that publicly available.
  - So in the database, I think you call them analysis and we call them evaluators. I think there are going to be some language barriers, but I think they're the same thing.
- xiii. Would they have access to this database? So if the teacher then applies to the compact, we have 52 evaluators. Certification is our one of our heavily staffed bureaus. Is there one central point? Is there one liaison?
- Response: You can specify email addresses of people who receive notifications about the system.
  - So I can designate one or two people in my evaluation system that can specialize in this.
  - Adam: If the system is working as intended, we're reducing the staff time needed to process applications coming from other compact



member states. That's the intent of the system. And if in operationalizing that you decide, 2 of your evaluators handle applications that come through the compact information exchange system, I think that's totally appropriate and totally the decision of the state licensing authority.

xiv. So thinking from the other perspective about sending information, I get the notification that Billy wants to send his stuff to a different state, but I don't have to do anything. That would just need for the API, right? Or would the sending state have to say, "Yeah, we'll send that."

- Jimmy: The way that I was envisioning this is that the teacher would apply to the state, and so it would trigger something that basically says, they're going through the compact OR they're not going through the compact.
- We pull the information for this teacher. And from that automatically notify them based on license they have that it appears if they do qualify for the compact or they don't qualify for the compact.
- The only thing again that somebody in the sending state would have to do is mark "yes" or "no" depending on if there is a pending application being investigated.
- The other thing to keep in mind with this, and I think it's the first time that we've ever gotten to what I would consider true reciprocity. But I still think a big portion of people who want these licenses for the first new years are going to be only a minority group of people that are going to actually use the contact. It's going to grow.
- Adam: I'll say I receive probably 10 to 20 emails a week asking where somebody can take their license. And so, you know, obviously that's anecdotal and the compact is not yet operational. So at that point I assume that number will skyrocket as we see in other compacts. Jimmy is right that there's some time where this population is going to be smaller that we can work out the kinks. But obviously all of these are important things to address at the front end as much as we possibly can.

- b. Adam: Something that we are going to leave until we rule on this is the determination of whether we use the term "unique interest to the state" in the definition of state-specific requirements.
- i. Not necessarily something that we need to deal with now, but there are obvious examples of that (Arizona Constitution)
  - ii. But there are perhaps less obvious examples as some requirements become more broadly accepted nationwide (DEI requirements and sensitivity training). It's our current interpretation that those would certainly fall under state-specific requirements because it's not something that every state requires. Our main goal is to separate that from content and pedagogy as a training requirement to be a teacher. Anything outside of that is our current

interpretation of state-specific requirements. Obviously, we haven't been challenged on that yet, so we won't know.

iii. But are there are pieces of that to you all that raise concern about what you might qualify as a state-specific requirement?

- I know for us, we have Chapter 49 guidelines that are updated every 10 years. So currently , if we have an educator who doesn't have who doesn't have an active license and wants to come back in Pennsylvania, then we have them complete those chapter 49 requirements before they're allowed to get their certification.
  - a. For that, if it's before 2009 it's 12 credits: 3 classes of special ed in one of ESL. And then, recently, we just passed the competencies on our new Chapter 4. It's CRSE which we now call Culturally Relevant Sustaining Education. So I can't speak about that because we're currently in litigation for that.
  - b. Then we have, professional ethics
  - c. Then we also have the structure literacy competencies
  - d. It's only in 5 of our certificates, not all of them.
  - e. It's very sticky – I don't know how that would work.
  - f. Response: Rulemaking can put little bit more detail on legislative intent and what the role of the commission is about unique interest to the state. That is a place where we can capture that is not trying to capture substantive, pedagogical content.
  - g. [Crosstalk and confusion about what level 1 vs. level 2 entails]
  - h. Adam: Great example of where the interpretation becomes tricky.
  - i. It's a field of outliers in this world. So, how do we account for all of these extremities while maintaining the intent of the compact?
  - j. Some of our evaluators were asking before we were part of the compact, how are we gonna know? You know, it sounds like you have a clearing house, but at the same time, our worry is those who are inside the state, have to complete those chapter 49 requirements or they won't get that certificate.
  - k. If it's outside the state, they might just say, well, I'm gonna go outside the state, they might just say, well, I'm gonna go outside the state because I don't have to meet the chapter 49 requirements. [More cross]
  - l. It is something that we guard against in drafting. But I think it a grossly overblown concern because I do not think that you're seeing that type of mobility just for requirements.
    - i. Response: It's just so weird every 10 years and a new rule opens up the whole school code.

- m. Under the interstate agreement, the next agreement, your level 1 is a stage 2 license, which includes specifically jurisdiction-specific requirements. And so that's not, then, qualifying for the compact?
  - i. Adam: Only for military spouses [More crosstalk]. My assumption would be that through the compact you can give them a level 2.
  - ii. Response: I don't know how that would work though, because they would have to have 6 years of teaching to get to level 2.
  - iii. Adam: But the compact supersedes that requirement.
  - iv. Unless there is something in the Constitution – but it is unlikely to be that specific.
  - v. Evaluators are the ones who tend to get into the weeds.
  - vi. Adam: What we generally find is that after a year or so in the compact, people just get used to the process and it becomes any part of their day-to-day job like processing any other license would. In lots of states, we're gonna have deal with that kind of minutia.
- c. Adam to Jimmy: We'll need to include military spouse status as part of the application process.
  - i. It can't be just a checkbox because it needs to be, it needs to be provable.
  - ii. DoD has specific guidelines and military spouses are given paperwork that can be uploaded.
  - iii. The onus will be on the educator to provide this information.
  - iv. We do allow for, after separation from the military, for that period immediately after, that period is still considered military service.
  - v. Response: We give them a certificate
    - One of the benefits of granting a state license is that then they just follow the traditional pathway for anyone holding one.
  - vi. We do include language that states the final move after separation from the military or retirement from the military that the compacts can be used in that military spouse provision.
- d. Adam: So I will say all of this conversation is a great example of where the commission is an important technical assistance resource. The commission would never dictate which license to grant. But in these distinctions between, is this an eligible license? Is it an encumbered license? Would this be able to go for military spouses? That's where the commission is a valuable technical assistance resource in making those determinations at the state level.
- e. Sam: One other thing that we may want to consider all of this, is whether we share information as a referent resource of licenses that the member states issue that are *not* eligible.

- i. For example, it would be very useful in a crosswalk of Pennsylvania to say that level 1 is not eligible because it's considered to be encumbered. But also, if we have a military spouse, that actually is impactful in compact.
- ii. There's a difference between "this is not eligible because I'm in a state choosing that not be eligible" and "it's not eligible because it doesn't meet the definition of eligible license because it is encumbered".
- iii. All that to say, the sharing of information may be a slightly broader universe than just the eligible licenses. It could also be licenses that we issue that are not eligible for X, Y, or Z reasons.
- iv. I think you're gonna have to think about this is I'm thinking why are the punishing and instructional one holder in Pennsylvania.
- v. Response: I think one thing we should be thinking about is, why are we punishing an instructional 1 license holder in Pennsylvania who has to meet more requirements than some other state. We're saying that Elizabeth can't take it through the compact
  - Response: I'm not sure I agree with the analysis that's what the practice of it that was encumbered
  - Sam: generally speaking, the rationale is contacts are not for encumbered licenses.
  - [Cross talk/confusion about renewability of level 1 license in PA and elsewhere]
  - We're going to have to parse things out with every state so it's a good thought exercise.

## 7. Wrap-up

- a. A lot of this is not actually business of the commission but rather business of your agencies to start thinking about recommendations.
- b. Our goal in drafting and our intent was that maybe this would be a bit of a lift in your first year and then it's just something that is updated and that lift is, at a baseline, relatively small. But this first year, there might be a lift based on this conversation.
  - i. And so that's something that I think we should be thinking about preparing our staffs for in our individual agencies—that this going to require a devotion of staff time.
- c. Need to work together – Samantha, Darren, Jimmy and I don't have intimate knowledge of your own license or content areas and your own licensure content areas and how those crosswalk to each other. That's why this forum exists. It's to help solve those kinds of intricate individual issues.
- d. Not all of that is going to come through rule. Most of that is going to come through this kind of semi-informal, but official conversation.

## 8. Final questions before adjourning before the next meeting

- a. Will the June meeting be in concert with the NASDAQ meeting?
  - i. The current plan is to handle it virtually, separate from the NASDAQ meeting
  - ii. Starting in 2025 tie it in person to the NASDAQ meeting
- b. Who is in charge of setting those next meeting agendas?

- i. In collaboration with Malia and Cassie, we'll work on getting the scheduling form out to all members of the executive committee. Our goal, is sometime in late February, early March.

9. Malia motions to adjourn the meeting. All ayes.