

SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE

April 16, 2024

9:02 a.m.

9:02:30 AM

CALL TO ORDER

Co-Chair Stedman called the Senate Finance Committee meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Senator Bert Stedman, Co-Chair
Senator Click Bishop
Senator Jesse Kiehl
Senator Kelly Merrick
Senator David Wilson

MEMBERS ABSENT

Senator Lyman Hoffman, Co-Chair
Senator Donny Olson, Co-Chair

ALSO PRESENT

Senator Jesse Bjorkman, Sponsor; Raymond Matiashowski, Staff to Senator Bjorkman; Joe Felkl, Legislative Liaison, Department of Fish and Game; Lisa Purinton, Legislative Liaison, Department of Public Safety; Lisa Parady, Executive Director, Alaska Council of School Administrators; Kelly Manning, Deputy Director, Division of Innovation and Education Excellence, Department of Education and Early Development.

PRESENT VIA TELECONFERENCE

Ted Spraker, Former Chair, Alaska Board of Game, Soldotna; Rebecca Schwanke, Self, Glennallen; Ryan Scott, Director, Division of Wildlife Conservation, Department of Fish and Game; Colonel Bernard Chastain, Director, Alaska Wildlife Troopers Division, Department of Public Safety; Sarah Pinsky, Senior Director, Policy, National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

SUMMARY

SB 168 COMPENSATION FOR WRONGFULLY SEIZED GAME

SB 168 was heard and HELD in Committee for further consideration.

SB 215 TEACHERS: BOARD CERTIFICATION INCENTIVE

SB 215 was heard and HELD in Committee for further consideration.

Co-Chair Stedman discussed the agenda.

#sb168

SENATE BILL NO. 168

"An Act relating to wrongfully seized game."

9:04:07 AM

SENATOR JESSE BJORKMAN, SPONSOR, explained that SB 168 dealt with instances in which game had wrongfully seized from hunters by the Department of Public Safety (DPS), and then found to be legal. He hoped there would be compensation in the form of comparable game meat, but if not possible the goal of the bill was to provide cash compensation. He discussed the training and preparation necessary for a hunt. He discussed animal identification for the purposes of legal harvest.

Senator Bjorkman mentioned Alaska's selective harvest regulations based on horn composition and mentioned disagreements between hunters and law enforcement. He described a scenario in which game was seized while the court addressed the matter, during which time the meat was given to another person. Even if a hunter was in the right and the seized animal was legal, the meat could not be returned. He relayed that hunters had described being put on the "roadkill list" as compensation for seized game. He asserted that trading a roadkill animal for a well cared for hunted animal was not just compensation. The bill sought to provide monetary compensation for the seized animal, so a hunter could purchase meat of their own choosing.

9:07:12 AM

RAYMOND MATIASHOWSKI, STAFF TO SENATOR BJORKMAN, read from a Sectional Analysis (copy on file):

Section 1: Amends AS 16.05 by adding a new section, AS 16.05.197, which compensates hunters who have had certain edible animals seized by the state and are later found not guilty of violating the statute the animal was seized under. The value of this compensation comes from the restitution schedule found in AS 16.05.925(b).

Section 2: Amends AS 16.05.925(b), by increasing the penalty imposed on hunters who unlawfully take any of the animals listed in the subsection.

9:08:06 AM

Senator Kiehl observed that the restitution schedule was increased for animals that were eaten as well as animals that were not eaten. He noticed that in the section, all bears were included. He noted that not all bears had a requirement to salvage edible meat. He asked if the sponsor had looked at differentiating getting paid only if the hide and skull and claws were confiscated.

Senator Bjorkman relayed that he had considered many circumstances when deciding whether or not to include bear in the legislation. After discussion it was decided to include bear. He discussed eating bear. He thought it was difficult for hides to be cared for properly if not under a hunter's watchful care and supervision. He thought if a hunter's animal could not be satisfactorily restored, the hunter deserved compensation if the animal was wrongfully seized.

Co-Chair Stedman asked for the sponsor to help clarify the difference between edible black bears and brown bears. He was not aware of anyone that ate brown bears, wolves, or wolverines. He asked the sponsor for more detail.

Senator Bjorkman did not know anyone that ate wolf or wolverine, but knew that many people ate brown bear. He noted that all bears should be cooked well. He noted that as he updated the restitution schedule to accommodate for inflation, the amounts for the entire restitution schedule were adjusted.

Co-Chair Stedman asked if there was testimony from the department to indicate the frequency of wrongfully seized game and the geographic spread.

Senator Bjorkman thought there had been differing recollections. He thought there had been instances of animal seizure in the Fall of 2021 that were legal according to many in the hunting community. The situation had caused the Board of Game to take action to change moose harvest regulations on the Kenai Peninsula. He thought invited testifiers could provide perspective on the issue and the reasoning for the board's action.

[9:12:53 AM](#)

TED SPRAKER, FORMER CHAIR, ALASKA BOARD OF GAME, SOLDOTNA (via teleconference), spoke in favor of the bill. He supported the bill primarily because of fairness to hunters. He relayed that he had worked as a wildlife biologist for the Department of Fish and Game (ADFG) for over 28 years and had served on the Board of Game for 18 years. He thought the bill addressed an important issue. He mentioned previous testimony that iterated that the occurrence of improper game seizure happened only once or twice per year. He was puzzled and thought the instances happened more frequently.

Mr. Spraker continued that if a hunter took an illegal moose, the hunter was fined and could be subject to equipment seizure and payment of restitution. He pondered the improper seizure of game and thought restitution should be paid to the hunter. He thought compensation of \$1,800 was not sufficient. He knew that the Alaska Wildlife Troopers did their best to compensate hunters that were subject to wrongful game seizure by moving the hunter up the roadkill list. He mentioned that in his many years working for the department, he had dealt with many roadkill issues and had found that the majority of the animals suffered significant damage. He discussed the process of caring for game and described the difficulty of applying proper field dressing techniques to a roadkill moose. He considered that roadkill was not a substitute for hunted game.

[9:16:46 AM](#)

REBECCA SCHWANKE, SELF, GLENNALLEN (via teleconference), testified in support of the bill. She was a lifelong Alaskan, avid hunter, and had taught hunter education for 20 years. She was a wildlife biologist that had worked for ADFG and as a consultant. She described that she had worked as an expert witness for Dall sheep cases. She acknowledged the work of Alaska State Troopers. She discussed cases of wrongfully seized game, and the need for appropriate compensation. She discussed the prospect of losing hunted meat through the improper seizure. She thought the troopers needed to make more of an effort to properly keep and store seized game. She did not think roadkill was an acceptable alternative for compensation. She thought the bill was a remedy.

Co-Chair Stedman asked how many times that the proposed bill would have been implemented over the previous decade.

[9:21:11 AM](#)

RYAN SCOTT, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF WILDLIFE CONSERVATION, DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME (via teleconference), noted that the instance of mistaken game seizure happened predominantly with sheep and moose. He noted that he had been a biologist for many years and had been involved in some related cases. He thought the situations had been limited and estimated that there were two to three per year.

Co-Chair Stedman asked how people in Southeast were compensated for wrongfully confiscated moose.

Mr. Scott answered that if there was a court proceeding in the near term, another seized moose would be given.

Co-Chair Stedman asked for more data. He was unaware of any moose being run over by a car or boat in Southeast. He thought more definitive answers were needed and thought the species and location could be identified.

Mr. Scott identified that road kills of moose primarily occurred in Haines and Yakutat.

Senator Kiehl asked if the department was in the position to seize game meat, or if the task was taken on by law enforcement.

Mr. Scott relayed that typically ADFG was the first contact with hunters, and if there was a question, the troopers would be contacted for guidance.

[9:25:52 AM](#)

JOE FELKL, LEGISLATIVE LIAISON, DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME, noted that DPS also had its own fiscal note. He addressed a new fiscal note from DFG, OMB Component Number 473. He noted that if a person was found guilty of illegally taking game, the court may impose restitution to the state in the amounts under AS 16.05.925(b). The restitution payments were transferred into the Fish and Game Fund in accordance with statute. The deposits were the focus of the fiscal note. The department anticipated a positive revenue impact as a result of the legislation. If enacted, the bill would increase the amount of revenue per restitution payment for the species listed by 55 percent. The amount received by the Division of Wildlife Conservation would also increase by 55 percent.

Mr. Felkl noted that the Analysis section of the fiscal note included restitution amounts identified in different years, with a low of \$30,000 and a high of over \$100,000. The increase could range from approximately \$20,000 to a high of approximately \$60,000. Based on the uncertainty, the department submitted an indeterminate fiscal note, however it estimated a net positive due to the increased restitution amounts.

[9:28:40 AM](#)

Senator Wilson asked how an individual would seek restitution under the bill, or if a lawsuit would be filed for restitution.

Mr. Felkl noted that the Committee Substitute from the Senate Resources Committee (SRES) clarified the matter, and the restitution would be upon the court overturning a guilty conviction or having a finding a person not guilty. The department's position was that restitution would be automatic. He thought the Court system could address the question.

Senator Wilson mentioned the expense of a sheep hunt and pondered restitution of only \$2000 as proposed in the bill, which might not cover the airfare for a hunt. He asked if a

person could engage in a civil suit against the department, and how often such a thing occurred.

Mr. Felkl deferred the question to another agency.

9:30:40 AM

LISA PURINTON, LEGISLATIVE LIAISON, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY, addressed a new fiscal note from DPS, OMB Component 2746. She identified that the department had a small fiscal note for \$10,800. The cost was derived from research compiled by Alaska Wildlife Troopers, from taking a five-year average of cases in which an individual with seized game was found not guilty. The results showed one to two cases per year. The bill would require that the compensation would be required to pay for the seized game and using adjusted restitution rates for two muskoxen. She noted that there had been no data on cases that were appealed or set aside. She believed that there was staff from the Alaska Wildlife Troopers available for questions.

Co-Chair Stedman asked if Ms. Purinton had indicated there had been one case per year.

Ms. Purinton relayed that there had been one to two cases per year based on the five-year average.

Co-Chair Stedman asked about the frequency that the compensation would be implemented and asked for history about the data gathering for the five-year average.

9:33:12 AM

COLONEL BERNARD CHASTAIN, DIRECTOR, ALASKA WILDLIFE TROOPERS DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY (via teleconference), indicated that when considering the impacts of the bill, the department had done a five-year lookback to cases that were found not guilty in court. He continued that Alaska Wildlife Troopers were required by law to seize animals that were determined to be not legal in the field. Animals were seized before a legal process was underway. Once through the court process, a case could be dismissed. Within the five-year lookback, there had been one to two cases per year found not guilty, including seizures of moose, sheep, caribou, and other animals across the state. He thought it was important to note that statute

required law enforcement to seize an animal that was thought to be illegally taken.

Co-Chair Stedman thought the reasons for animal seizure were clear. He asked if Mr. Chastain could provide the committee with the data from the five-year lookback, including species and location.

Col. Chastain agreed to provide the information.

Senator Kiehl asked about types of violations and associated trooper policy that would include animal seizure.

Col. Chastain relayed that there were different categories of violations and crimes within statute. Some of the violations were listed on the bail schedule, which he likened to a traffic ticket. He mentioned a citation for failure to include evidence of animal sex, after which an animal would not be seized. He noted that typically if a violation was not on the bail schedule, the default crime was a misdemeanor, and the troopers would determine whether the animal would be seized. He mentioned examples of a sub-legal moose, or a cow moose taken out of season, and described scenarios in which an animal would be seized.

[9:38:25 AM](#)

Senator Bjorkman appreciated the clarification from Col. Chastain regarding the one to two instances per year of cases going to court and not including cases that had been dismissed. He noted that it was his intention for the bill to include language for cases that were dismissed or dropped. He contended that a hunter should not have to go all the way through a court process to get property returned in order to receive just compensation.

Senator Bjorkman explained that the reason the bill was coming forward was to ensure that hunters were compensated appropriately, and for hunters to be presumed innocent until proven guilty. He mentioned instances on the Kenai Peninsula in the fall of 2021 in which a hunter's moose was seized and later charges were dropped, or the animal was determined to be legal. He emphasized that it was just for the hunter to receive compensation, and many hunters had not. He discussed actions by ADGF in which a panel of three biologists determined whether a moose was legal. The Board

of Game had changed ceiling requirements to eliminate the problem and minimize the number of moose that were wrongfully taken. He wanted hunters to be duly compensated when animals were taken that should not have been.

Co-Chair Stedman thought the bill mentioned a court order to pay restitution. He asked if the sponsor suggested reverting to an earlier version of the bill, whether he supported amending the bill, or whether he supported the SRES version of the bill.

Senator Bjorkman recounted that there had been discussion in the SRES Committee that indicated a desire for a change to be made in order for hunters to be compensated when they were not found guilty.

Co-Chair Stedman asked about the bill language.

Senator Bjorkman relayed that the bill did not currently have the language, but he would support an amendment to ensure that hunters were compensated fairly if they were not found guilty.

SB 168 was heard and HELD in Committee for further consideration.

#sb215

SENATE BILL NO. 215

"An Act relating to teacher incentive payments for national board certification; and providing for an effective date."

[9:42:17 AM](#)

Senator Jesse Bjorkman, Sponsor, explained that SB 215 was designed to raise pay for the state's most highly qualified teachers and encourage other educators to engage in the best professional development in their field and to become nationally board certified. He cited studies that showed that national board-certified teachers obtained better educational outcomes and were better teachers after completing the steps of the four-part certification process. The National Board of Certified Teachers was a board that required to undergo a rigorous and personal training program.

Senator Bjorkman continued that teachers in the program were required to demonstrate content knowledge and the ability to teach to every student. He highlighted elements of the program that included recordings and reflection for improvement, submission of student work, and the provision of video teaching samples. He thought that the process showed teachers reflecting on teaching methods and success. He emphasized the importance of teacher recruitment and retention, and of improving educational outcomes.

[9:44:22 AM](#)

AT EASE

[9:44:43 AM](#)

RECONVENED

Co-Chair Stedman relayed that the director for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) would give a presentation.

[9:45:03 AM](#)

SARAH PINSKY, SENIOR DIRECTOR, POLICY, NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL TEACHING STANDARDS (via teleconference), relayed that NBPTS was an independent, non-profit organization was founded more than 30 years ago and worked to advance accomplished teaching. She discussed a presentation entitled "Using National Board Certification to Strengthen the Teaching Workforce" (copy on file).

Ms. Pinsky showed slide 2, "What is National Board Certification."

Ms. Pinsky read slide 3, "By Teachers, For Teachers":

National Board Certification is a voluntary advanced credential that signifies the teacher is an instructional expert in their grade and subject level.

Ms. Pinsky noted that the certification was recognized as the gold standard in teacher certification. She emphasized that the professional expertise of educators was the foundation of everything NBPTS did. She continued that the standards that were the foundation of the certification process were developed by panels of expert teacher practitioners that came to consensus on what accomplished

teachers should know and be able to do in the certification areas. There were 25 certification areas in each level.

Ms. Pinsky showed slide 4, "Peer-reviewed, Performance-based":

This student-centered process requires teachers to demonstrate evidence of the impact they have on student learning through

- samples of student work,
- videos of their teaching, and
- deep reflection and analysis of their practice.

They must also demonstrate their understanding of their grade-appropriate subjects through a content knowledge exam.

Ms. Pinsky showed slide 5, "Maintenance of Certification":

- Maintenance of Certification (MOC) is the pathway for National Board Certified Teachers (NBCTs) to keep their certification active.
- Successfully meeting MOC requirements will extend an NBCT's certificate five years.
- The process is designed to ensure that NBCTs continue to grow professionally while substantially impacting student learning.

[9:47:34 AM](#)

Ms. Pinsky showed slide 7, "Impact on Teaching":

Teachers who engage with the National Board standards report making specific changes to their instructional practice including:

- Adjusting lesson plans to meet the needs of individual students
- Gaining and/or deepening knowledge in content areas
- Using data in new ways to assess student progress

Ms. Pinsky showed slide 8, "Impact on Students":

More than a decade of research from across the country confirms that students taught by National Board Certified Teachers (NBCTs) learn more than other students.

- Estimates of the increase in learning are on the order of an additional one to two months of instruction.
- A 2017 Mississippi study found Kindergarten students taught by an NBCT are 31% more likely to be proficient on the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment (see image).
- Students of NBCTs demonstrate evidence of deeper learning.

Ms. Pinsky showed slide 9, "Impact on the Teaching Profession":

- National Board Certified Teachers remain in the profession longer than their colleagues.
- National Board Certified Teachers are more likely to host student teachers than other teachers.
- New teachers who are mentored by National Board Certified Teachers exhibit improvement and generate additional student learning

Ms. Pinsky cited that in the most recent year, the turnover rate for board certified teachers was about one-third of the average rate.

Ms. Pinsky looked at slide 11, "Leveraging Policy." She relayed that she would discuss state policy approaches and reasoned that policy could be a critical lever and could create the right conditions for teachers to pursue and achieve national board certification. She referenced three kinds of policies: financial incentives, fee support, and support programs for teachers pursuing certification. She cited that certification cost approximately \$1,900.

Ms. Pinsky looked at slide 12, which showed a national map identifying 29 states that offered financial incentives for certified teachers. She noted that states that were wildly different with regard to population, size, and politics all found the incentive to be worthwhile.

Ms. Pinsky turned to slide 13, "Salary Incentive Structures":

Increase for all NBCTs
 Example: North Carolina
 NBCTs placed on salary schedule 12% above base pay.

Example: Wyoming
NBCTs earn an annual \$4,000 stipend.
Increase for NBCTs in high-need schools
Example: California
Both – increase for all NBCTs and additional increase
for NBCTs in targeted schools
Example: Utah

[9:52:53 AM](#)

Ms. Pinsky reviewed slide 14, and addressed Delaware's policy whereby board-certified teachers earned a stipend equal to 12 percent of base salary. She cited that over about four years there had been a significant increase in the number of national board-certified teachers. She anticipated further growth.

Ms. Pinski showed slide 15, which addressed program highlights of Texas' financial incentives. The state allocated between \$3,000 and \$9,000 for each national board-certified teacher. Teachers could get closer to the \$9,000 by teaching at rural schools or schools with a high percentage of low socio-economic students. The state also reimbursed for the initial cost of certification as well as the maintenance of certification that was needed every five years. She identified a pattern similar to that of Delaware.

Senator Bishop asked if Ms. Pinsky was aware of any state universities that taught to the national certification, whereby graduates would have the national board certification.

Ms. Pinsky explained that the standards were somewhat advanced for students that were pursuing completion of pre-service preparation programs. She noted that programs aligned standards or taught the baseline framework but was not certain if Alaska had adopted standards for future licensure. She noted that the standards were for accomplished practitioners and were more aligned to those with more expertise and experience than a teacher coming right out of college.

Senator Bishop asked for Ms. Pinsky's professional opinion regarding a timeline for new teachers to apply for national certification.

Ms. Pinsky noted that previously teachers were required to have three years of experience before beginning the board certification process. Recently the rule had changed, and teachers were allowed to start the process in the first year of teaching, while still being required to have three years of teaching experience to complete the certification.

9:58:18 AM

LISA PARADY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, ALASKA COUNCIL OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS, introduced herself and relayed that the Alaska Council of School Administrators (ACSA) was in support of the bill. The council felt that SB 215 was an important policy bill for education. The council supported the certification because it believed that every Alaskan student deserved a qualified effective teacher, and promoting national board certification was a proven pathway to the goal. She referenced ACSA's joint position statement (copy not on file) that listed priorities that education leaders had identified. She noted that recruiting, retaining, and preparing qualified educators was a top priority.

Ms. Parady pointed out that research demonstrated that teacher quality was the most effective school-based factor in student achievement. She considered that the bill would aid with the goal of student achievement. She referenced a study by the Journal of Research on Education Effectiveness that found that students with a board-certified teacher produced gains of up to a month and a half to two months of additional learning when compared to non-board-certified teachers with similar experiences. She continued that national board certification promoted teacher quality by encouraging teachers to reach the highest available benchmarks in the field.

Ms. Parady noted that as of January 20, 2022, Alaska ranked 44th in the nation, with only 200 (or 2.7 percent) of teachers with national board certification. The council believed the state should encourage teachers to pursue the certification. She noted that a majority of states already did so, and noted that once there were incentives, about 2 percent of teachers pursued the certification every year. She highlighted that teachers with the certification took on enhanced leadership roles and mentored new teachers, which also improved new teacher quality.

[10:01:46 AM](#)

Ms. Parady discussed the significant cost of obtaining the national certification, which was rigorous and took three years to complete. She noted that the process required taking examinations at an authorized testing site, which was only available at 12 testing centers in the state. She considered that by offering a bonus for teachers that had completed the certification, the state could ensure that certification was financially accessible to all teachers.

Ms. Parady emphasized that the incentive was a retention mechanism. She relayed that ACSA and its members strongly encouraged the development of a comprehensive statewide program to prepare, attract, and retain high-quality diverse educators and professionals. She thought increasing the share of the state's teachers with the certification was a critical step to improve Alaska's school for all students. She added that ACSA was especially appreciative that the bonus would be a state-funded incentive available to all districts, rather than relying on district budgets.

[10:03:54 AM](#)

Senator Bishop pondered why the state would not work with the University system to incorporate the curriculum in order to start the process of obtaining the certification.

Ms. Parady noted that Alaska used benchmarks in the University to align with the certification. She thought that it generally took a couple of years for teachers to practice in the classroom before being ready to take on the rigors of the program. She likened the certification to a Ph.D. program and thought the University pre-service was preparing students to teach at the highest levels, but that board certification would add an additional layer of rigor that teachers may not be ready for right from the start. She agreed that elements of the certification should be included in teacher education.

Senator Bishop asked if Ms. Parady knew of any Alaskan districts that were currently offering the certification to teachers.

Ms. Parady thought there some districts offering the certification. She mentioned work on the North Slope, which had the certification as part of its agreement. She thought

some districts offered the opportunity because of the strong research that showed the impact on students. She thought given the current financial situation in school districts; the certification would not be the highest priority for a district. She thought state funding would be a high priority in being able to offer the certification to all school districts.

[10:08:42 AM](#)

KELLY MANNING, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF INNOVATION AND EDUCATION EXCELLENCE, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND EARLY DEVELOPMENT, discussed a new fiscal note from the Department of Education and Early Development, OMB Component 2796. She identified that the CS had presented additional costs. She continued that the note showed an estimate of \$1,456,000 for year one, with anticipated growth over time. She identified that the bill provided for an incentive payment of \$5,000 for each teacher that held a current and valid national board certification. In addition, the bill noted costs incurred to achieve board certification.

Ms. Manning continued that the board certification cost an average of \$1,900 per candidate, with \$475 for each of the four components. The amount could be higher if an educator needed to retake any of the components. Additional costs to achieve board certification may include supplies. She referenced required videos and videography supplies. There were retake fees for the certification components, and there could be travel requirements. The assessment sites for the state were mostly at the state's universities. She noted that there could be travel required to observe other teachers. She mentioned registration fees. All the components had an estimated average of about \$10,000 for full certification.

Ms. Manning noted that states with similar incentive programs that covered the cost of certification were found to have a 2 percent increase, which was factored into the fiscal note.

[10:12:19 AM](#)

Ms. Manning continued to address the fiscal note. She made note of an anticipation of \$1,075,000 for grants in year one to cover the incentivization of \$5,000 per board-

certified teacher and \$6,000 in legal fees. The amount increased over each year based on the anticipated increases in certified educators. She listed a cost of \$375,000 in year one for covering reimbursement of board certification costs. She noted that the costs were estimates without knowing the number of teachers that would pursue board certification. The estimates were based on other states that had funded the costs and incentives.

Co-Chair Stedman asked if the department supported the program.

Ms. Manning relayed that the Teacher Recruitment and Retention Working Group had determined that teacher incentives was a potential avenue for increasing certified teachers. She thought looking at different incentives was an outflow of the working group's work.

Co-Chair Stedman considered that looking at something and implementing it were two different things. He asked if the department had a position.

Ms. Manning relayed that the department was neutral on the particular approach in the bill, but definitely supported incentivization of getting teachers in the door and getting them to stay in positions.

Senator Wilson mentioned recertification for teachers every five years. He asked if the national board certification would qualify for recertification in lieu of professional development classes, either for recertification or for pay increases and bonuses.

Ms. Manning agreed to research Senator Wilson's question and get back to the committee with the information.

Senator Kiehl mentioned a comment about an increase in board certified teachers in states that funded the cost of the certification. He asked if Ms. Manning had examples.

Ms. Manning noted that she did not have the information at hand but would get back to the committee. She thought that Maine was one of the states in question.

Senator Kiehl appreciated that the department had done diligent work to see how much more effective the legislation could be.

[10:16:11 AM](#)

Senator Bjorkman thought the committee had heard of the many benefits, proven through research, that indicated students who learned from national board-certified teachers learned more and learned more effectively. He spoke to Senator Bishop's questions pertaining to why the state did not start training teachers on the material at the university level. He explained that teachers in training programs had much to learn about pedagogy and how to handle the everyday rigors of teaching, which often involved more than just instruction of students. He thought teachers needed some on-the-job training to be ready for the level of training involved in the board certification.

Senator Bjorkman discussed the in-depth content related to certified subject areas, and the required teaching video to reflect active teaching and demonstrate skills developed in the first years of teaching. He asserted that the certification being discussed was difficult and was for the most skilled teachers. He emphasized that when the process was incentivized and the state invested in the process, the results would come. He discussed the benefits of teachers going through the process together in job-alike groups to become better together. He described "collective teacher efficacy," which he cited as the primary factor that made teachers better as a team.

SB 215 was heard and HELD in Committee for further consideration.

Co-Chair Stedman relayed that there would be no afternoon meeting. He discussed the agenda for the following day.

#

ADJOURNMENT

[10:20:53 AM](#)

The meeting was adjourned at 10:20 a.m.