Missouri Alliance for Arts Education
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This is a long report of a long two-day meeting. I have identified portions of the report with direct arts education implications by bold, underlined print, so you may skim through if you wish. There are interesting discussions at other points in the meeting, but your Executive Director can sympathize with the lack of time to read his exhaustively descriptive and sometimes exhaustingly un-witty remarks. Enjoy.

Board members present--Herschend, Still, Shields, Demien, Jones, Lenz

The first thing I noticed when I walked in today a full half hour before the scheduled start time of the Board of Education meeting was that I found myself at the end of a line of people that kept me at least 100 feet from the entrance to the Board Room. I was surprised at first and then realized there was a good reason that I should have anticipated. We had a Huge crowd to hear the CEE Trust proposal about unaccredited districts--specifically KC schools. There were signs reading "Save Public Education," "Keep Your Hands Odf Our Schools" and "Humpback Whales Are Our Friends." Ok, well, not that last one, but they are.

Well, we had so many people that they finally decided to move things over to the Governors Office Building and the conference room there (the same place that MCA always gathers everyone for Citizens Day's initial briefing.). It took quite a while to get all set up so we didn't start the meeting until well over an hour after the posted time. By then I had met up with Gary Brandes of MMEA. Unfortunately Gary was not going to be able to stay into Tuesday and it became apparent pretty quickly that the Arts Ed. Certifications issue was not going to come up on Monday. Luckily, at the end of the meeting we were able to talk with Paul Katnik of Educator Quality and express our concerns. More on that later.

Peter Herschend, Board President, talked to the crowd about ground rules. He made clear that no decision would be made today. He noted the discussion would not be about CEE- Trust (CT) or particular people or particular schools. Instead it's about kids, he said, and hearing about a plan to help them get the best education possible. He noted other plans existed and were also being considered. He thanked everyone who came out and commended their passion for what was best for the children. However he also noted that audience members would not be allowed to speak. Essentially, he did an excellent job of defusing the tensions in the crowd.

Normal pro forma business--Closed meeting motions made by Still and passed

Introduction of CT report--The presenters from CT were introduced. For detail on the form and content of their presentation go to the Missouri Board of Education agenda webpage and click on the the point in the agenda about the report. That will take you directly to the power point they used. I've noted some key points below. Although not specific to arts education, arts teachers could be affected by this policy in the future. I have included the link to that page below


Under the rationale for change CT noted that Individual schools in urban areas are achieving well in places but no urban district is doing so. This made them think that a radically new 'system' would be needed to administer whatever plan they proposed. They noted that great schools are run by educators and are held accountable by the community. They brought up a number of exemplars (many of which
were charter schools or groups of charters) which makes it clear why people fear CT is going to propose charters. **Some of these exemplar schools have strong arts programs.**

They interviewed teachers, administrators, community members and leaders in the KC district (so much for it not being about a specific district). In the interviews they heard that teachers want control of curriculum and decision making about what happens in their classroom but worry about the poverty of scarcity affecting what they are able to do. Parents want options, accountability, neighborhood schools, and effective pre-K education programs. Community members and leaders want similar goals. Essentially, effective Pre-K and educator control seemed to be the recurring themes.

An important point of view expressed over and over by CT was that reform and incremental change won’t work. Transformation is needed.

A key moment came when they discussed misconceptions people had about what CT was doing in the process. They are not going to recommend privatization. They are not recommending a charter school plan. They claimed they are not anti-labor. They emphasized they did not favor State Board intervention and direct control of the district. Their assurances mollified the crowd a bit but a number of grumblers continued to point out what they felt were flaws in their reasoning in under-their-breath muttering.

From that point they proceeded to make their case about Kansas City. Lots of data was presented to demonstrate that KC students were not achieving. CT projected that it would take two decades to catch up with state averages in ELA, and one decade in math. Of course, that assumes current rates of achievement growth, a dangerous assumption. CT went through lots of categories in the power point, showing low achievement. Charter school performance is marginally better but the bottom line is that only about 30% of KC students were scoring proficient or above, while the state average was above 50%. H’mm that's not particularly encouraging either. CT did note that this remains a statewide challenge with problems in each urban area and in some rural schools.

Conditions for success--CT began to talk about what kinds of schools were seeing success in urban settings. Certain things about schools stand out. YES Prep is an example. Uncommon Schools another example. It Takes A Village Academy were all held up as examples. See powerpoint for details on these examples.

Essentially, then, their proposal calls for a Community Schools Office (CSO) that will administer Pre K directly and have loose administrative control over other individual schools. Those schools would be almost completely run at building level, if they were meeting accreditation and if not, then by a Transition Authority until they were. Each school would be a nonprofit entity and responsible for curriculum, personnel, management decisions at the building level. Decisions would be made by the educators with input from community members.

The floor is opened for questions from Board members. Here are my notes on those questions--Shields asks about how this is different than charters.

Reply-CSO is the operator not a 3rd party sponsor; He asks about pensions and health care plans and what impact that would have

Reply- no change is anticipated
Jones asks about a 19th century system, more of a comment about the outmoded systems we currently use

Reply-We agree the current system fails, that's why the new one is proposed
Still asks about how this actually changes the model of instruction,

Reply--schools have freedom to choose methods that best suit their needs
Still asks about the loss of the best students who will move to innovative and appealing buildings

Reply--all students should be able to find a model they like.
Still asks where does money come from and Jones interjects a real concern here, too.

Reply—lots of money in the system is working on trying to keep system as is. Money is there. Herschend says that happens with any change.

Lenz asks about money available, says that most funds are personnel so where is the money coming from that will be re-allocated.

Reply—downsize the central administration and non-classroom expenditure and there will be plenty of money.

Lenz is still not sure that will give very much discretionary. Questions again the costs still required in the CSO.

Reply—CT believes the money is there.

Demien is excited about local control.

Lenz still expresses problems with how local control might work. Thinks that CSO will still be too big.

Jones talks and expresses the point of view of let’s take a chance. Why not?

Reply is about history. KC PS had 26 supers in 45 years. That instability is the same nationwide. A nonprofit board is more stable. They note that the full report is available. It is not exactly clear where.

Reply—CT does not believe it will be much more than currently spent.

Herschend asks where the $10,000 per child figure they quoted comes from and how that money follows the child.

Reply—the figures are derived from district and DESE figures and the money is sent to whatever school the child attends.

He asks what if a church wants to be one of the nonprofits that run a school.

Reply—since these are public schools the law would prohibit that from happening.

Herschend asks about how standards are determined, not just Educational but logistical too.

Reply, CSO determines overall targets and individual schools or Transitional Authority do most logistics.

Herschend asks what if no one applied to run a school.

Reply—the transition authority would do it. The goal is for them to try to put themselves out of business by turning over improving schools to other operators.

Herschend asks who are the non-profits who might do that?

Reply—out of town charter operator maybe, but there are many possible models.

Herschend how does that work without the same problems as charters?

Reply—the charters are not the LEAs and thus under the control of the CSO.

Jones doesn't think there are enough people to apply.

Lenz asks whether Lincoln Prep is succeeding because it is selective or because it is managed well.

Reply—go back to our examples of types of schools that succeed.

Demien. This will rely on the people in CSO. If you build it they will come.

Reply it’s our hope that the system will attract the best people.

Herschend says it is a change in system and that’s good to have on the table. He then adjourned the meeting for the day.

By this time most of the KC concerned citizens had left, either because they were bored silly by the presentation or because they realized little was going to happen of significance today. There will be hearings in late January and early February in Kansas City and St. Louis with a chance for input from the crowd.

Gary Brandes was very disappointed that he would not be here for the certifications discussion.

However, we were able to have an extended discussion with Paul Katnik, the head of the Office Of Educator Quality about the presentation and proposed changes. Essentially, he assured us of the following—
1. All rules have adoption dates of August 1, 2017. This gives students and institutions time to adjust, instead of the rather rushed 2014 date that was originally proposed.

2. DESE commits to ongoing conversations and tweaking of the rules based on meetings with people in the field and evolving ideas about best practices.

3. For K-12 certificates, professional education courses have been moved back to 26 hours from the proposed 36. This, then, also applies to art and dance certification.

4. Student teaching clinical experience still reads as a "one placement" 12 week activity. However, Katnik felt that would be interpreted in the broadest possible way. So, a single placement could be with a single teacher who has a k-12 schedule, OR a single school district that would split the students schedule between elementary, middle and high school throughout the 12 weeks OR a single district that might elect to have the student in one level for 6 weeks and another for the final 6 weeks OR the student could use the earlier interim classroom experiences as a sophomore or junior to experience the level that would be missed during the final student teaching. Again, dance and art are affected by this as well.

5. Redistributing the credit hours required for specific music content certifications from the original DESE proposal was possible. That would be the topic of ongoing discussions.

As Gary Brandes and I left the meeting we had an extended conversation about what we had accomplished with the campaign. DESE only showed 118 comments from the music community. While that seemed a disappointing result after the broad-based campaign within MMEA to generate comments, I noted that even though that seemed low, it was actually a large turnout when compared with other comment periods I had observed in the past year. One thing I’ve observed is that sometimes comments were lost because they did not go to the proper e-mail address or arrived late and thus were not counted. For example, we know there were comments from the dance community but they were not listed as received.

However, DESE had definitely listened to us. We actually got a large number of concessions and the one big loss (one placement student teaching) might well be defined so broadly now that it would not impact the majority of music teacher candidates. And we still have until 2017 to hash it out. It is important that we continue to read the rules carefully with an eye to detail to be sure they accurately reflect what we think effective teacher training in the arts should be.

Overall, a fascinating day.

Day 2 January 14, 2014

We proactively moved the meeting over to the Capitol Plaza Lincoln Room to handle the large crowd expected that day. Many were expected to hear the opposing presentations on the Common Core.

Herschend opened the meeting this morning with thanks to Debbie Demien for her service. This is her last meeting. Her term does not seem to be expiring, so I wonder what the back story is. So, just as governor Nixon appoints two replacements (who were not present today because they have not been approved by the Senate yet) the Board loses a long time member. We'll see how long it takes for another appointment.

Agenda item K. Educator Evaluation Although this discussion mainly revolved around a tool to train administrators on evaluation techniques, we need to keep our eye on this to be sure the training properly addresses differences in the way arts classrooms operate.

Paul Katnik talked about the 7 aspects of effective educator evaluation and the training roadmap. For more details refer to agenda, Tyler Barnett talked about the training for leaders. DESE is creating an
online training system that gives leaders a chance to view sample lessons in various settings and do a mock eval. They then see what a group of master scorers did and the suggested feedback to help the teacher.

Lenz praises the idea.
Still asks about details on verbiage. Worries about the urban teachers being evaluated and all the distractive behaviors.
   Reply-this is for principals to be trained on, not teachers.
Demien likes it.
Herschend asked how soon this will be ready?
   Reply-Colorado already using so we've been moving quickly.
Herschend, how do we know how many are going to be using it.
   Reply-we already have buy in.
Herschend says to stay the course, there will be pushback.
Lenz clarifies that it is a training tool for principals

The link to the report power point is below.


Agenda L. Government update Van Zandt

Van Zandt reports that it is still early in the session, he noted that DESE is working with the committee chairs in both the house and Senate education committees. He noted Lots of action on the transfer process, at least 5 bills in the Senate. They propose similar things. Lower tuition, transfer hardships, charter expansion,
Jones asks about charter accountability in those bills,
   Reply- there is not in those bills but others do address that.
Herschend, what kind of accountability is there then?
   Reply-not exactly sure.
Van Zandt finished with discussion of Sen Pierce's bill on failing districts.
   Although not mentioned specifically by Van Zandt, we ought to track HB 1111 because of the possible impact on funds to attend conferences.
The link to the report power point is below.


Agenda M. Revised Assessment plan. Vandeven, Helwig, Muenks

Nicastro prefaces with comments about Smarter Balanced assessment problems with time and cost concerns foremost.

Helwig leads off. A large group had input. Input suggested that major concerns were expense and time lost from instruction. DESE listened to these concerns and addressed them.

All districts would have access to a digital library of evaluations to help prepare for implementation. Some phase in time is allowed which will help districts prepare. Details of the presentation can be found on the PowerPoint.

Muenks talked about the changes via the charts. In grades 3,4,6,7 the testing is much reduced in time spent and also in the report back time. Grades 5 and 8 remain about the same.
Demien asked if these hours are over the year or one test.
    Reply--is one test.
Herschend says that's a big reduction in time. Can you still get a meaningful result?
    Reply--it is a challenge but a survey can do it. Vandeven says we still have formative and interim tests which will be very effective.
Herschend continues his concerns. Demien asks about comparisons with interims and formatives and summative.
    Reply--there will be some key similarities.
Lenz asks about using the resources. Herschend says time to vote.
    Presenters still had lots left. Herschend says take the hint. Muenks speeds up.

At the high school level, the time required for EOC tests are reduced quite a bit. The ACT test becomes the EOHS test. (End of High School).

The proposal actually reduces total testing time by almost 10 hours almost a 40% savings over current plan.

Still asks about ACT prep courses and there is discussion about teaching to the test. Discussion about EOCs and ACT comparability.
Demien asks whether the students were forced to take the ACT and wonders if that limits their ability to take future tests. She seemed under the misapprehension that you could only take the test 2 times.

Lots of advantages in the proposal are listed in the PowerPoint. Lots of support from a variety of education organizations was given to this outcome. In fact, DESE was able to go back to the Legislature and reduce their ask by $3 million because of less reliance on big standardized tests. Many surprised but rather happy looks were exchanged around the room.

The link to the power point of the presentation is below.


These next few items flew by with little discussion or questioning. I did not include the links to the presentation in the agenda.

Agenda N. Cade's law. Physical fitness requirements
    Recommend, motion, pass

Agenda O. Diabetes training program
    Comments were submitted during the comment period, a number of which were inserted into the rule
    Recommend, motion, pass

Agenda P. Bryce's law
    Recommend, motion, pass

Agenda Q. Cooper. Charter sponsors rules about closing or dissolving
    22 comments were received. revisions were made on the basis of some comments,
Shields asks about what the closing procedures are under the new rules?
    Reply-transfer of records, disposition of resources, fed fund purchases to other fed fund schools,
Jones, et al ask about enforcement and how to make sure sponsors fulfill responsibilities.
    Reply- the rule clarifies from the beginning what the procedures must be
    Recommend, move pass

6
Herschend says that the meeting can move on to Agenda Item R, but at 11 a.m. the Common Core presentations must begin.

Katnik prefaces the testimony by noting that the office is asking for approval today, even though they fully intend to go back and tweak many of them. Key point is-
1. All deadlines moved back to August, 2017.

General GPA requirements will go to 2.75 overall and 3.0 in the major.
Shields asks about the gpa requirements and what happens with students who have multiple schools and programs.
   Reply--not that different than current, things are in place.
Shields asks about what happens if a student just misses GPA
   Reply-- there is an exception based on how well a candidate scores on the certification test (e.g. Praxis)
Herschend notes that raising standards will raise the esteem of the entire profession

The presentation then moves into each individual standard. There are 21, so hang in there!

Pre-K stays birth thru grade 3 as requested by feedback

Grades 1-6 certificate--there were lots of comments, but not much consensus. DESE recommends Board move to keep current rule and then do further study. (Opportunity for us to do an arts integration requirement within elementary teacher training?)

At this point Herschend called a Break and the. The Anti- Common Core presentation was next.

Common Core Presentations. 2 points of view. Herschend prefaced the presentation with the observation that this was not to be a debate or he said/ she said confrontation.

First a group against the Common Core. Demien introduces Dr. Mary Burn, a Missourian. Dr. Karen Effrem, pediatrician from Florida.

Mary Burn first observed that her Coalition had No 3rd party funding. She described them as a "group of moms who love their husbands." This lady must have been a debater because she structured her case just like one.

Contention 1. Common Core was just a new name for old controversy. Her analysis seemed mixed between what is the purpose of education: to prepare Workers or Thinkers? AND local versus national control.

There is quite a bit of conjecture here and stretching isolated phrases trying to prove a vast governmental conspiracy to control the thoughts of young people. AND a vast business conspiracy to hijack education and make it into simple basic worker training. Obvious anti-Clinton and anti-Obama signs here. (I apologize that my own biases will bleed through in this part of the report)

Contention 2. Common Core is not a state led standard movement, but rather a federal takeover of education policy. Again a series of scattered quotes that all talk about the federal role, use the phrase common core and are attributed to the key personalities associated with the conspiracy.
Contestation 3. Common Core increases business profitability in the education sector. Essentially, she claimed that common core was being used by big education related corporations to rake in millions of dollars as they devise the assessments, literature, etc. I actually have a lot of sympathy for this point, but we don't need common core to do it. It's already here.

Contestation 4 Adoption was a violation of state law. The way that Governor Nixon signed the agreement with the consortium and the method the board used to adopt it did not meet the requirement for parties within the state to propose the program. Again a series of documents flew by us on the power point all purporting to show the intent of the constitution and how the agreements violated it.

She spent more time on the people who wrote the standards and their lack of education experience AND their financial interests in seeing Common Core adopted. She ended with an emotional plea to stop Common Core.

Herschend asked if she wanted questions then or if they should wait until after Dr Effrem spoke. She asked that questions wait until after Dr. Effrem.

Dr Effrem starts with Minnesota picture. Their minds in our hands, sowing a baby in a pair of hands. It was kind of a nicely composed shot and seemed to express great care for the child. However, to Dr Effrem it was chilling. Ah, well. . . .

The good doctor is a child psychologist from Florida where she heads the stop common core coalition in her state. She had two main messages

1. Common Core was developmentally inappropriate and will cause psychological stress for students and teachers.

She noted that there were serious Developmental issues in ELA elementary standards. No K-3 input came from people at that level in education. She claimed that the Literature level is too high and language expectation is too high. Examples were given from the standards. In each case she says the standard is too high. It creates high levels of stress. Evidence of the symptoms is already present in states that have implemented CC.

She went on to say that Common Core ended up with the wrong kind of instruction. Didactic techniques would dominate and we lose play based instruction in young grades.

2. Psychological or psychosocial teaching concerns. Behavioral skills are a part of the Common Core expectations and this is not what parents want. She claimed that it turned teachers into psychologists and they are not trained in that.

She ended with a series of recommendations which essentially are stop Common Core.

Questions
Jones--commends them for being there. We differ a lot, he says. But there are 2 points of agreement. He naturally goes on to name four. Teachers can't be the only influence, the purpose of Education is not to produce workers, corporations should not run education, play based learning is crucial.

Lenz--Thanks for being here.

Shields--Thanks, the how we got here is not important to him but have you done the analysis standard by standard,

Effrem yes my written comments have it,
Burns gives two examples of individuals who would not have achieved under Common Core, so she says—a famous neurosurgeon and Albert Einstein. Shields. Do you think we should have state standards at all.

Burns, yes as a model not as a mandate. She notes a model curriculum existed before--Curriculum Alignment initiative back in 2008?

Herschend--which is it no standards or better standards? Can we compare current and Common Core?

Reply—pretty much a rehash of the previous answer.

The link to the Anti-Common Core Presentation powerpoint is below.


LUNCH!—During lunch I was able to sit with Heidi Geisbuhler, a legislative assistant to Senator Dempsey, President pro tem of the senate. We had a good but very noncommittal conversation about a variety of issues.

Brian Kraus. Cheryl Oldham. Pro common core presentation

Both were with Chamber of Commerce, which struck me as playing into the hand of the anti group in the morning.

Kraus is a Missouri Chamber leader, Oldham is VP for Education with the US Chamber of Commerce. She introduced herself as a native Missourian even though she left the state at a fairly young age. She identified problems with education as unequal levels of quality across the country, a lack of high achievement and labeled it as a national security issue. She noted that business cares about this perceived crisis and supports Common Core as one of the best ways to address it. She quoted a number of stats about how the US is falling behind the rest of the world and reiterated that this is a National Security issue.

The Chamber wanted to point out 3 things that were crucial to understand
1. Common Core is an elevated set of standards. Not curriculum.
2. Common Core brings nationwide clarity and consistency to student achievement
3. Common Core is on a par with global standards found in other countries.

She identified what she called Myths about Common Core--
1. CC will not bureaucratize education.
2. CC is not a federal takeover of education.
3. CC will not dumb down state standards. She spent quite a bit of time on this including quotes of a study of Missouri standards which was not very complimentary of the current system.
4. CC will not require collection of individual student personal data

One major issue that she identified is that too many students need remediation when they enter college. That is a major drain on resources.

She then spent quite a bit of time on quotes of Missouri jobs statistics and projections emphasizing that a highly educated workforce would be needed in the future.

After a fairly brief (by comparison) presentation she asked for questions. Shields—Is CC occupational training only?

Reply—She strongly disagreed with that characterization.

Jones--How to better advocate for this plan to eliminate the myths.

Reply--We don't have a ministry of Educ. in the Fed. Government and we don't want one but there does need to be a national discussion.
Demien--Disagrees that we had a system of tracking in the past (This addressed a fairly minor point that Oldham had brought up). She doesn’t ever remember anything other than overzealous counselors trying to steer students.

Reply--There is no overall tracking, but there are some things that happen within the overall system. CTE is an example.

Jones--Interjects he was in a tracking system growing up and that obviously he and Demien grew up in different systems.

Herschend-- What about the implication the CC is a government conspiracy.

Reply—She’s not sure either where that comes from. The Tucker Letters? She has read those letters and she doesn’t see it.

Herschend-- Respond to idea that psychological stress would be a problem.

Reply--No real expertise there but she doesn't think they would stress her kids

The Common Core presentations wrap up for the day.

Unfortunately, this presentation had no powerpoint materials to support the oral report.

Editorial Comment from your Exec. Director—It was very interesting to me that Oldham and Kraus listened to the presentation by Burn and Effrem, but Burn and Effrem were nowhere to be seen when Oldham and Kraus were speaking. The Anti-Common core presentation was far too ‘conspiracy-theory’ oriented for me, although I had some sympathy for corporate profits point. Yet, I found the pro-common core presentation really un-compelling as well. The Board listened to two business people spout statistics and studies, but who had little understanding of what actually occurs within a classroom. IN FACT, none of the presenters were classroom teachers or administrators.

Back to Agenda Item R and Teacher Certification—I’ll be pretty cryptic here, there is more detail on the powerpoint

Middle School Ed--accepted feedback from people in the field for the most part Recommend, motion, pass

Secondary Ed—accepted the general feedback as well
Ag Ed and Business Ed feedback asked for an increase in requirements, which was granted Recommend, motion, pass

And Here is the Big One!

K-12 education—The feedback said that increasing professional education hours to 36 was a real burden. DESE accepted feedback to move back to the 26 hour requirement. There were a number of changes in language based on feedback to better reflect best practices.

Question from Still are these sub-category certificates within a larger one?

Reply--No, each one is an individual certificate within the larger rule.

Herschend--Asks about other systems that start student teaching much earlier in response to the one placement rule.

Reply--The system actually does have varied levels of initial, intermediate and final clinical experiences.

Recommend, motion, pass

Comment from your Exec. Director--So, the Board accepted feedback to reduce professional education requirements for dance, art, and music to 26 hours, accepted changes in language that better reflect current practice, instituted a 'one placement' student teaching experience, but DESE Educator Quality Office assures us that will be a broadly defined term and, perhaps, most
importantly, all of these changes will go into effect on August 1, 2017 giving everyone plenty of time to either adjust or advocate for further revision.

Special education--All feedback was accepted into the changes
Recommend, motion, pass

ELL--Feedback was to change the language. Accepted feedback
Recommend, motion, pass

Gifted--Change is to require a 3 hour grad course in research. Feedback was a bit mixed
Recommend, motion, pass

Elem math specialist--Change names based on feedback
Recommend, motion, pass

Special reading certificate. DESE would like further study this one because of the lack of any kind of consensus in the feedback. The board was simply asked to pass the certificate into rule exactly as it now appears.
Recommend, motion, pass

Initial administration--Language change based on feedback
Recommend, motion, pass

Transitional administration--No feedback comments came in, DESE recommends that the Board approve change.
Recommend, motion, pass

Career administration--Same comments as Initial category and same recommendation
Recommend, motion, pass

Initial student services (Counselor, school psych, speech path)—Based on feedback DESE recommends name changes and the requirement that these individuals need teaching certification prior to receiving this certificate.
Recommend, motion, pass

Career student services
Recommend, motion, pass

Career Education Culinary arts, tech and engineering, personal finance--Changes suggested in feedback about language and a couple of courses
Recommend, motion, pass

Career Education Adult--Same issues as above
Recommend, motion, pass

Adult Education and Literacy--Language changes recommended in feedback accepted.
Recommend, motion, pass

AND, everyone celebrated. The Compendium is no more and we have 21 separate certificates that can each be addressed individually.
The link to the power point that went with this presentation is below.


Agenda Items S thru AA. Vocational rehabilitation services. Minor changes in language were proposed. These rules also bring rules up to date with current practice and requirements by government. Recommend, motion, pass on each item with little or no discussion.

Licensure issues the rest of the way and then the Board moved into closed session. This was easily the longest board meeting I’ve attended to date.

**Wrap Up**—In the issues where we had a specific interest we were able to get the ear of DESE and the Board and effect change. We did not get all that we wanted, but the changes that did come about should be seen as confirmation that arts advocates are listened to. However, we can also continue to improve our advocacy with even more broad-based commentary to DESE when they propose initiatives that have an impact on our work with students.

Respectfully submitted,

Ben Martín, Executive Director
MAAE