

- SUBJECT:** Setting specific continuing education requirements for educators
- COMMITTEE:** Public Education — committee substitute recommended
- VOTE:** 9 ayes — Aycock, Allen, Deshotel, Farney, Huberty, K. King, Ratliff, J. Rodriguez, Villarreal
- 0 nays
- 2 absent — J. Davis, Dutton
- WITNESSES:** For — Clayton Travis, Texans Care for Children; (*Registered, but did not testify*: David Anderson, Arlington ISD Board of Trustees; Priscilla Aquino-Garza, Stand for Children Texas; Jennifer Bergland, Texas Computer Education Association; Miryam Bujanda, Methodist Healthcare Ministries; Harley Eckhart, Texas Elementary Principals and Supervisors Association; Monty Exter, Association of Texas Professional Educators; Eileen Garcia and Josette Saxton, Texans Care for Children; Wendy Reilly, TechAmerica; Geoff Wurzel, TechNet)
- Against — None
- On — Melva V Cardenas, Texas Association of School Personnel Administrators; Ted Melina Raab, Texas AFT; (*Registered, but did not testify*: David Anderson, Texas Education Agency)
- BACKGROUND:** Education Code, ch. 21 requires the State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) to establish a process of continuing professional education (CPE) training for educators. Types of educators include classroom teachers, superintendents, principals, school counselors, and librarians. Classroom teachers must obtain 150 hours of CPE and principals and counselors must obtain 200 hours of CPE over a five-year period to renew their certifications.
- DIGEST:** CSHB 642 would require CPE requirements for any educator certified by SBEC to be linked to areas identified in that person’s appraisal as needing improvement. The bill also would require that a percentage of continuing professional education, not to exceed 25 percent in a five-year period, include specific areas of training for classroom teachers, principals, and

counselors.

Training areas for classroom teachers would include:

- collecting and analyzing information that would improve effectiveness in the classroom;
- recognizing early warning indicators that a student could be at risk of dropping out of school;
- integrating technology into classroom instruction;
- educating diverse student populations; and
- increasing knowledge of the subject area taught by the educator.

Training areas for principals would include:

- effective and efficient management;
- recognizing early warning indicators that a student may be at risk of dropping out;
- integrating technology into campus curriculum and instruction;
- educating diverse student populations; and
- providing instructional leadership.

Training areas for counselors would include:

- assisting students in developing high school graduation plans;
- implementing dropout prevention strategies; and
- informing students about career opportunities and college admissions, financial aid resources, and application procedures

Current educators would not be required to comply with the percentage requirements of the bill for any requirements period that ended before January 1, 2017. They would not have to comply with the requirement that training be linked to areas in need of improvement for any requirements period that ended before January 1, 2016.

CSHB 642 would take effect September 1, 2013, and would apply beginning with the 2014-2015 school year.

**SUPPORTERS
SAY:**

CSHB 642 would improve the CPE process by requiring training for educators in areas crucial to 21st century learning. Currently, almost all CPE requirements are permissive. Educators are not required to take training in important areas and may fulfill CPE requirements without meaningful training that improves classroom instruction.

CSHB 642 would improve classroom effectiveness and student achievement by requiring educators to learn about making data-driven decisions, identifying at-risk students, integrating technology, and working with diverse populations. Requiring education certificate holders to fulfill CPE requirements linked to their areas of deficiency would help educators improve their instruction.

Because these requirements are small, the SBEC still would be left with a great deal of autonomy to set its own guidelines for the profession and educators would maintain significant flexibility in choosing their CPE.

OPPONENTS
SAY:

CSHB 642 would interfere unnecessarily with the CPE process by prescribing specific professional development requirements in statute, taking authority away from the education profession to self-regulate. As professionals, educators should be able to establish their own curriculum with guidance from their own licensing agency, the SBEC.

Requiring that CPE courses be linked to an educator's areas of needed improvement would be problematic because educator evaluations are confidential. SBEC would not have access to the evaluations and could not enforce this requirement. Also, SBEC rules already encourage educators to identify CPE activities based on the results of their annual appraisal. Verifying that educators met the requirements in CSHB 642 could be burdensome for the educators and for SBEC.

NOTES:

The committee substitute differs from the bill as filed by:

- requiring not more than 25 percent of the CPE credits include the specified areas for classroom teachers, principals, and counselors; and
- including mental health disorders in the population of students with disabilities.