

MEETING MINUTES

ADVISORY GROUP MEETING

Date:	February 4, 2026
Time:	2pm, Called to Order-2:05 PM
Meeting called to order by:	Amber Ward – Via Teams (Virtual)

IN ATTENDANCE

Amber Ward (Chairperson), Jessica Bullock (QA), Katie Johnson, Greg Minton, Amy Snider-Wells, Andrea Hyson, and Jacqueline Barbour (Note taker).

OVERVIEW

Introduction of admin, updates on pilot template and lesson plan progress, maximum student enrollment decisions, increased meeting dates and admin code suggestions.

AGENDA ITEMS

1. Introduction of Administrative Specialist Jacqueline Barbour to anyone not present for the last call.
2. Updates on pilot template- Chairperson advised that since the last meeting, there had been additional clarification removing the time restriction of five days or one week, if that did not support the content that needed to be covered for the optimal finalized product. This also allows for adjustments, per location, due to issues brought up by the advisory group previously, including night and weekend restrictions. A. Hyson included that late nights would be required at their location, but any start times would be adjusted to only keep students in class a certain number of hours per day, which is the goal.
2. Maximum number of students- Chairperson reminded the group of the feedback from the survey conducted at the School Directors Conference concerning the desired number of students per class of the new pilot presenter course and the number of average instructors available to teach in the programs. Feedback was also provided for the original justification of a 12-person class. Options were given to the group of a 12, 14, or 16-person class maximum. Unanimous agreement amongst the attending members that 16 should be the maximum student enrollment per class; however, each of them would be limiting their classes to 12 or fewer.
3. Lesson Plan Updates- Chairperson advised that lesson plan updates were ongoing but in the final phases. No feedback was received from the advisory group on the recommended changes since the last meeting. In that time, Senior Deputy Director Joy Strickland has been engaged in the process and has conducted legal reviews of the lessons, providing feedback and changes where she saw appropriate. The advisory group was informed that once the final lesson plan had been completed and legally reviewed, they would receive the content to review and provide feedback. It is estimated that these will be completed before the beginning of March. Due to this, increased meetings will be added for the advisory group, which will be announced at the end of the meeting.

4. Administrative Code Changes- Chairperson reminded the group of the three items that have been ongoing conversations within the last year concerning administrative code changes. Those items were discussed briefly and the group was advised that they would need to give their official feedback at the next mandatory meeting. The group was also asked if they had any additional items that they wanted considered within our administrative codes, all present agreed there was no additional items to address at this time. The code items under consideration are listed below.

5. Increased Advisory Group Meetings- Additional dates have been added for the remainder of the year to cover any unforeseen needs through the submission of the new materials and template.

March 18th at 2pm

April 8th at 2pm

May 20th at 2pm

June 24th at 2pm

July 29th at 2pm

October 7th at 2pm

The group was informed that the March 18th meeting would be mandatory for all members due to voting/feedback needs. If the member cannot attend due to an unavoidable issue, they will need to select a proxy who will provide feedback in their absence.

ADMINISTRATIVE CODE ITEMS UNDER CONSIDERATION

1. Require a School-Director Letter of Recommendation/Prerequisite for Candidate Acceptance Into the Program.

Justification: (1) Some schools are allowing candidates who did not have agency support, creating complications in meeting the required teaching hours for the probationary period. (2) The new shorter program, which may be approved this year, could initiate an influx of candidates with the knowledge that there would no longer be a content creation element. (3) There is potential for bias or legal concerns if one program is denying applicants while others are accepting them without agency support.

Feedback: A concern brought up from K. Johnson about the potential for an agency to deny qualified candidates, which may block good instructors from attending the program. Attending members agreed there were good arguments for and against this modification.

Standing: Legal input is required, which will be addressed by the Chairperson prior to the next meeting. Feedback will be requested from the group members during the mandatory meeting.

2. Align Testing Requirements to Match Instructor Specialty Rules.

Justification: Increase the passing test scores to 80 and permit one retest if the student's score falls within acceptable parameters. This would standardize testing across programs and match specialty requirements.

Feedback: Support from all present committee members.

Standing: Final feedback will be requested from the group members during the mandatory meeting.

3. Instructor Recertification and Accountability (Hours/Teaching Expectations).

Proposal(s): Require periodic in-class teaching hours (e.g., 8 hours every three years to match specialty) and the 1-hour update. Instructor's specialty hours would cover this requirement for those who maintain specialties.

Justification: Maintaining high instructor standards and ensuring instructors are not keeping their instructional certification if they are not maintaining expertise and currency in the field and/or topic of instruction. Concerns have been raised about instructor proficiency, especially through the feedback on the BLET program updates.

Feedback: Attending members agreed that instructor-level programs need to be held to instructor-level standards and that instructors should be actively teaching. Several discussion points, including the instructor's availability with most in-service hours being online, the quality of instructors who only minimally maintain certification, and staffing implications for small agencies.

Standing: Chairperson advised that adjustment may not be the answer, but if not, how can we move forward to fix the issues? The group was tasked with thinking through that context and providing feedback at the mandatory meeting.

NEXT MEETING

-March 18 at 2pm **Mandatory** (Designate a proxy if unable to attend.)

Meeting adjourned at 2:37 P.M.