

**State Council for Educator Effectiveness
Meeting #7
Colorado Department of Education, State Board Room
September 3, 2010
11am-5pm**

Attendees: Bill Bregar, Kerrie Dallman, Nina Lopez, Matt Smith, Jo Ann Baxter, Towanna Henderson, Tracy Dorland, Margaret Crespo

Staff Present: Ceri Dean, Ulcca Hansen, Erika Carrillo, Adrienne Pon, Vanessa Roman, Scott Marion, Mary Wickersham

1. Announcements

Led by Matt Smith and Nina Lopez

- Staff /Council Member Updates: Nina introduced Ulcca Hansen. She is employed the Colorado Legacy Foundation and will be helping staff the TAG.

Scott Marion is another staff member that will be joining us. He is the Associate Director of the Center for Assessment. He will help collect technical information around assessments in their use in our evaluation. He will help guide and inform our discussion at some point.

Nikkie Felix has resigned from the Council and we don't have a replacement named yet. As of yesterday, they hadn't yet completed the process of replacing her. That decision will be made quickly. The hope is that the replacement will be here for the next meeting.

- Public Input: The Council has worked on developing a public input process. We will set up an email inbox so that the public can submit comments. We will have the email address up soon. It is scee@cde.state.co.us. We will also have time for public input during the meeting and if public members are interested in speaking, they must sign in. The staff will synthesize comments for the Council to review.

2. Report from Technical Advisory Group

Led by Ulcca Hansen

- TAG Structure: Ulcca Hansen presented her plan of approach in structuring the Council's discussions. Ulcca plans to bring TAG members to the meeting as the Council is making decisions about rubrics. The process for the TAG will be more interactive and the TAG will also start to take on the role of drafting deliverables. Ulcca will be reaching out to the Council members individually to get ideas about the role of the TAG.

There was a question about the purpose of TAG and how it is perceived by the Council vs. the TAG. There has not been a clear set of expectations thus far. We may add members to the TAG in areas where we need deeper expertise. Ulcca

will be making sure you have the information you need in a format that is easy to digest.

The TAG will start to structure the products, but the final version will be owned by the Council. The TAG also needs to help with an initial gap analysis that would help us build the system guidelines. This is an example of an area where the Council needs help.

There was positive feedback about the idea of having the TAG put drafts together for the Council to react to.

- Online Forums: What would be the role of the TAG on the online discussion forums? That will partly depend on what the group is comfortable with. Ulcca is open to being the TAG representative on the groupsite. There was a sense that TAG input should be monitored.

There was recommendation that there be a place for the Council members to ask TAG questions directly (online).

3. Public Comment

Walter Hidenfeld, substitute teacher in 3 Metro districts: A year ago, I went back to school. I've been involved in multicultural education for about 12 years in CA & CO. Went back to school to UCD to take advantage of a MA program to instruct linguistically diverse students and my interest has been in that direction. I did attend the hearings for SB 191. It struck me that Senator Johnston had so much power in micromanaging the hearings to promote those who were in favor of the bill, minimizing the comments of those who were against the bill. At the same time, I was also struck by the fact that there was so little attention given to the appeal process that experienced teachers might have. I have had personal experience with unfair treatment of teachers. I know the train has left the station as far as SB 191 is concerned. Looking at where we are now, I'm wondering if there wouldn't be a better designation for an experienced teacher who is unfortunate enough to be labeled as ineffective. Perhaps "needing improvement"? I've met a lot of teachers and couldn't label any one of them as ineffective. I think this is one of the issues that the legislature neglected. In that sense, I'd like to see more attention given to the possibility of the opportunity to experienced teachers to have professional development available to bring them up to par. At the same time, I know working in many different schools, it's a lot easier for a teacher to be effective in a classroom with highly privileged white students than it is to work in other districts where there is a highly diverse student population. To be an effective teacher or be classified as an effective teacher in that environment is much more difficult than working in, for example, a Douglas County School. I hope that you will take that into account.

4. Quality Standards and Performance Standards

Led by Ulcca Hansen and Ceri Dean

- The afternoon was designated for the development of rubrics. Lorrie drafted definitions of quality and performance standards and they were distributed to the Council. To help illustrate these definitions, Ulcca used a “Restaurant Evaluation Rubric”, which gave performance standards for high quality standards.
- Discussion of rubrics as a product of the Council: There was discussion about the fact that legislation requires that 50% of evaluations be based on student growth and how we consider that when determining the other 50%. The Council is to make a recommendation as to what indicators will measure the 50% of student growth. Another task is to figure out the “look-fors” that need to be put in place.

One of our tasks is determining how we measure effectiveness. We know that 50% will be from student growth. The data from observations could be a multiple measure. The rubric is more about practice and the 50% is more about outcomes. There needs to be some understood connections between the outcomes and practice. The research about best practice and how it’s related to student growth is not comprehensive. Hopefully we’ll learn more through implementation of our systems.

We have to be careful about what we treat as truth and what we treat as a predictor. Perhaps the observational, qualitative things will be what we default to. At the system level, we have to be able to say that what we developed fits into a framework that requires 50% to be based on student outcomes, measured in some way.

These rubrics won’t ignore the fact that teachers use assessments and their data.

- Group work: The draft definition is very rich, and now we need to pull out quality standards from that definition. The council was asked to take some time to look at the drafted standards. These are not complete, but in small groups, the Council needs to think about effective teachers and what they would do to indicate this. Review the draft document and see if all of these things are in the document. Don’t worry yet about where in the document these things are. Then, start editing. After that, think about whether there are things that should be in “blue” (quality standards). This is where we determine value. What do we think is important and how important are those things?

5. Group Report-out

Small groups reported out about the work that was done.

Group 1

- Under Quality Standard 2, they felt that the 1st bullet should be a quality standard, not an indicator.
- They now have 7 standards.

- Instead of a rubric, would like to recommend that every district's framework needs to address the quality standards. Districts could take our recommendation and translate it to a rubric, others could take the quality standards recommended and map it to their own framework. Options: "we have it", "we have it but it's in a different place", "we don't have it and this is why".
- The indicators should be represented within the performance standards on the district framework.
- The minimum requirement for "effective" has to be comparable.
- This gives districts the flexibility to use Danielson, build their own.
- Perhaps, when we monitor implementation, if there are things that many districts aren't meeting, we look for that and then remove the indicator. Then, this becomes a living document that will be changed over time.

Following the report-out of Group 1, the Council reassessed the approach of creating a rubric:

- Does the group like the more flexible model or continue with a more rubric-like approach?
- Does legislation tell us we have to define what the levels of performance standards are? Yes. The legislation implies that we must define the minimum, but that doesn't mean the district can't go beyond.
- What are the key pieces? The quality standards are the big pieces. We have to get to a point where we all (regions/districts) have a shared understanding of what these quality standards actually mean.
- Quality standards have to be worded such that they're universally acceptable and don't change district-to-district. When you get down to a lower level, then you can be more flexible.
- We have to find a way to look from an altitude that provides a system for district to be able to adopt their own verbiage that are specific to their programs.

Working on the rubrics

- The council agreed to work on deciding on quality standards. Then, the TAG will drop them into a rubric before the next meeting.
- Parent and family involvement quality standard will be added.
- Engaging students as partners in their learning.
- The end goal is to facilitate the transition of students to adulthood
- Perhaps the quality standard is "teachers empower students" and the indicators are different ways that teachers do this.

Working on the quality standards

- How did we go from what we did last time to the quality standards we're working on? The Council would like us to post everything to the groupsite separately so that they can comment on it.
- Each of the bullets can be divided between the concepts of "leadership" and "management".
- There were several things lost in translation in the creation of the new quality standards

- Elevation of the profession.
- There's nothing about embracing a diverse learning community
- There's not enough about raising the bar and closing the gap
- This will be an iterative process.
- We'll ask the TAG to bring us back a product/ Do the new indicators strike a balance between being broad enough and narrow enough?
- The goal is to post the product to the wiki.
- We will eventually have to go back to the definition.

Moving Forward

- Ulcca and the TAG will work on the teacher standards. Then, next time, we'll work on the principal standards.

6. Housekeeping

Led by Nina Lopez

- We are proposing to move the retreat to January. The purpose of the retreat would be to reflect on public input.
- Meeting times will be changed to 10am-4pm
- We will do a doodle on the new proposed meeting dates.
- Nina passed out a handout "Measuring Educator Effectiveness" meeting hosted by NCTQ. This will take place on Monday, Oct 4 and Tuesday Oct 5. Please let her know if you would like to attend.

7. Cross-Council Update

Led by Adrienne Pon

- 2 weeks ago, the group met and provided an intro to each of the cross-council groups.
- Groups involved: Quality Teachers Commission, School Leadership Academy Board, the Council, CO Educator Effectiveness Project
- This group has determined a process for having timely drafts of each others work: within two days after the group meets, the groups' support staff will email the rest of the cross-council group all documents and products that came out of the meeting.
- If there's a document that the individual groups would like others to review, that'll be brought up as they come in the cross-council meetings.
- Ian McGillivray asked if the principal standards that the Council is working on will be for practicing principals and the SLAB would be for preparing principals. The question was, how they would be different. We need to make sure preparation is aligned with the performance evaluation process.
- The SLAB is coming up with one set of standards that will supersede teacher prep. We want them to be relevant and usable through the whole system.
- The standards that we're developing will hopefully be the same standards for preparation.

8. Public Input

- Scott Groginsky, CO Children’s Campaign, Sr. Policy Director: I want to encourage you, as you’re considering indicators for teacher effectiveness to have a consideration of teacher’s ability to prevent dropouts. An unintended consequence that we want to avoid in basing half of evaluations on test scores is that we want to avoid pushing students out that might do bad on tests. Something like, “teachers promoting school attendance and other student-based dropout prevention practices”. When you get to the principal standards, I’ll probably come forward with a similar thing.
- Walter Hedenfelder: With regard to rubrics, I want to say that as teachers, we use them regularly in conjunction with our lesson plan. Rubrics are an attempt to be objective; to present objective goals for the students, but inherently, they are also subjective. In evaluating teachers, we can’t get away from this inherent unfairness that can come up when judgments are made subjectively. When I look at the teacher effectiveness standards, I understand that this is the teacher from Planet Perfect. We don’t live on Planet Perfect. At what point will a teacher be rated ineffective? How will it fit into the rubric? I think the component of fairness has to be in whatever you come up with.

9. Review Meeting Process and Effectiveness

Led by Ceri Dean

- Positive
 - Started nearly on time
 - We stuck to the agenda
 - Ulcca is here!
 - The straw man was helpful
 - We have consensus that we’re working in a rubric
 - We’ve done a lot during a short time
 - Help with process with product
 - We’re of one mind about the implications of our work
 - We got a lot accomplished today
 - Climate is good
 - People are listening and feel heard
 - Small groups are helpful
- Negative
 - Chairs aren’t comfortable
 - It’s hard to hear

10. Next Meeting: Friday, September 17, 10am-4pm, State Board Room