

I support the RETELL initiative. I do believe teacher training would be more beneficial with secondary and elementary delineation as these are two different areas developmentally for students. For future support of SEI teachers, I recommend a document similar to an IEP that explains best language acquisition practices aligned with individual student need determined by the ESL teacher. I also hope that in the future, some thought be given to the difficulties associated with pull-out ESL instruction in low incidence districts, especially for level 3 and 4 students.

I really think that this plan is very well thought out and you have supported the districts by impacting higher education as well as teacher licensure. I know that our superintendent was very much in favor of this in light of the difficulty getting teachers trained in the category training. This plan has the teeth it needs to get teachers on board.

I also am extremely happy that there is a special education requirement as well as SEI/ESL for PDPs required for license renewal. It really sends a message that these are all our kids!

My questions: If the RETELL course is a three credit course, will teachers have to pay a college/university to get these credits or will they just get the 67.5 PDPs? This could impact our tuition reimbursement policy.

Also in your opinion should we wait until May to get the information out to teachers in the district since the plan has not yet been approved by the board?

I am an ELL educator who has a question concerning "time requirements" in working with ELLs vs. the new RETELL initiative. Specifically, DESE statutes require that I work with my ELL students for a specified amount of time per day/week (e.g., 2.5 hours a day for Beginners). I would like to know if this requirement is going to change with the new RETELL initiative.

Comments: If the State is mandating that school systems require specific mandates, the State should be providing additional funds to each school district in order to achieve this. We are cash strapped in our town, looking at class sizes moving up towards 40 from elementary up through high school in September. There are NO extra funds to basics, let alone new requirements you expect of us. PLEASE HELP US HELP OUR STUDENTS!

I am writing to express my dissatisfaction with your proposed changes to licensure. In particular, I feel the ELL requirement goes too far. While it is necessary for working in some districts, I do not believe all educators need this specialized training. I urge you to reconsider your stance on this matter and make it optional.

Conversely, I strongly support the Special Education component since every classroom presents with a student needing assistance. This requirement would be far more practical and beneficial to the classroom teacher.

It has come to my attention recently that the state is considering changing the requirements for teacher licensure. It is my understanding that for teachers to get recertified, the DOE is considering making all educators take 15 pdp's in SEI and 15 more in teaching students with disabilities. This sounds like another mandate from the state that would be good for a portion of the teaching population but completely unnecessary for the vast majority of teachers. I teach Physics and engineering in a suburban district and have taught students with disabilities for my entire career. I feel confident that I already know how to approach these students, and do not need to take more pdp's to tell me that. Is the state considering LOWERING the pdp requirements overall? I tend to think not. My guess is that we will just be required to do MORE. In these times of SEVERE budget cuts in virtually all districts, one of the first things to get cut is professional development money. We have not had any for the last two years, and now instead of looking into classes that would help me teach Physics and Engineering better, I have may have try and find something to go to that satisfies this requirement. The big push is STEM and getting more kids involved and interested in taking STEM classes and instead of finding ways to do that I may get to spend time in workshops or classes that will not benefit me much or at all. I would hope that the DOE takes a very serious look at making this requirement mandatory for all. Things keep changing but I am not sure for the better. I got my original license and it said it was good for LIFE - I don't have a problem with making people remain current in their fields - I think that is prudent - but to implement this across the board is unnecessary and futile.

My name is XXXX XXXX and I am an ELL/ESL teacher in a vocational high school in XXXX XX. I am very happy with the new regulation changes that are being discussed for SEI teacher preparation and licensure procedures presented in the RETELL documentation. Nevertheless, I feel that the new regulations overlooked at shop instructors who also teach ELLs in vocational/technical high school settings. English language learners spend a significant amount of time in vocational settings with instructors who may or may not have the minimal foundational knowledge to teach ELLs. I believe it is imperative that vocational area instructors be expected to comply with the same requirements as academic instructors of core academic classes in the RETELL initiative. Shop/trade instructors are not mentioned in any part of the RETELL initiative. ELLs and their families choose vocational high schools because learning a trade seems more convenient to the immigrant family. Many immigrant families cannot send their students to college because of their immigration status, so a vocational education is a shortcut to obtaining a career. While in class these students are presented with challenging texts and are required to comprehend the material to participate meaningfully in the trade. Since shop instructors don't always have the SEI knowledge to teach ELLs, often times ELLs fall behind their classmates because the ELL can't access the curriculum the way the rest of the class does. Some students feel left out and frustrated. Many even drop out of school. The new law should include vocational instructors since these instructors spend more direct contact with the ELL student than the regular academic teachers do. If this initiative does not take in consideration the active participation of shop teachers in the process now, ELLs will continue to perform lower than other subgroups. Adding compliance from shop instructors in the RETELL initiative will strengthen and assure improvement in the vocational education ELL students receive in vocational and technical high schools.