State Council for Educator Effectiveness
Meeting #20
Del Pueblo
January 28, 2010
9am-5pm

Attendees: Jo Ann Baxter, Kerrie Dallman, Towanna Henderson, Jim Smyth, Nina Lopez, Matt Smith, Shelby Gonzalez-Parker, Sandra Smyser, Amie Baca-Oehlert, Brenda Smith, Bill Bregar

Staff Present: Ulcca Hansen, Alyssa Whitehead-Bust, Vanessa Roman, Scott Marion

1. **Welcome & Announcements**
   a. This will be the last time we meet before Nina and Matt go to the State Board to present standards and definitions.

2. **Teacher Standards (*Attachment 1)*
   a. The Council reviewed this document and discussed any omissions and red flags that they saw.
      i. KERRIE DALLMAN – 2b, in the descriptor, take out gender identity, because it's repetitive.
      ii. MATT SMITH – 4a, given that the descriptors below the element aren't shalls, the essence of 4a is that student learning is analyzed and applied to improve instructional practice, so as stated, you could say "demonstrate and analyze student learning", but that's not the objective, the objective is to take that and apply it.
         1. "apply what they learn to improve their practice" was added at the end of 4a.
      iii. MATT SMITH – understanding, developing, leveraging 21st century skills has been brought up in public comment. It's in 1b, but is it necessary to put that nomenclature in a shall statement?
         1. BILL BREGAR – If you take the elements that are considered 21st century skills: critical thinking, understanding technology, etc. they are all there, they just aren't called 21st century skills.
      iv. BILL BREGAR – Every time I read through this, I think there's something missing, but I don't know what it is.
   b. The Council reached consensus on this set of teacher standards.

3. **Definition of Teacher Effectiveness (*Attachment 2)*
   a. Lorrie and Tracy sent in feedback electronically.
   b. Council members commented on this document
   c. JO ANN BAXTER – This definition says that effective teachers ensure mastery. Can teachers ensure mastery?
      i. Change "ensure" to "facilitate"
      ii. NINA LOPEZ – But if we do that, it feels like there's a step missing. Can we add something about identifying appropriate interventions for students who aren't mastering?

iii. Changed to "In addition to facilitating mastery of content and skill development, effective teachers identify appropriate strategies for students who are not achieving mastery."
d. BRENDA SMITH – What's the difference between working and "actively working'?
    i. Actively implies a sense of urgency
    ii. Change "work actively" to "strive"
e. NINA LOPEZ – Is there a difference between democratic and civic?
    i. It's language out of the standards.
f. ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – There's o reference to parents, families or guardians
    i. Language was changed to "Effective teachers communicate high expectations to students and their families and find ways to engage them…"
g. AMIE BACA-OEHLERT – I think this definition is what most teachers would strive to do.
h. NINA LOPEZ – We changed leadership at the end to say "leadership within the profession" rather than "leadership". What does that mean?
    i. SCOTT MARION – I think this was intended to restrict from having to be a community leader.
    ii. NINA LOPEZ – I think "leadership in the profession" is more limited than our standards imply.
    iii. ULCCA HANSEN – What about "leadership with the school and the profession".
    iv. BILL BREGAR – I like that. It implies that a teacher will contribute beyond my school. I might be on committees. I might be available to do work outside of the district. Or, I can be part of a professional organization.
    v. KERRIE DALLMAN – Doesn't "in the school" imply "in the profession"?
    vi. BILL BREGAR – Not in my mind
    vii. JO ANN BAXTER – I think if we end it with leadership, then, we can refer back to the standard. When we look in the standard, we refer to ethics and advocacy as well.
    viii. ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – Do people feel comfortable getting rid of the prepositional phrase altogether?
    ix. MATT SMITH – We had a lot of discussion setting a vision that would help drive a significant long term elevation within the teaching profession in many different ways. Maybe we've captured it well in the standards. "The profession" includes collaboration of all sorts. That is the definition of someone effective as an educator in their profession. The modifier here is leadership.
    x. JIM SMYTH – When I first read it, that was the one thing that really stood out to me. Teacher leadership seemed too vague. I liked when we added "in the profession". It's understood to be a leader in the school. If you just say leadership, it's not specific enough. I'm fine with "in the profession".
    xi. BILL BREGAR – I'm fine with that.
i. There was consensus around these edits and this version of the definition.

4. **Teacher Standards**
   a. Shelby brought up the idea that student engagement should be elevated from the descriptor to the element (3b).
   b. There was no change.

5. **Measuring Teacher Practice for Use in Teacher Evaluations (*Attachment 3*)**
   a. The Council reviewed this document and provided feedback:

b. KERRIE DALLMAN – In the section titled "weighting policies", I would like to see in 19, the language about "in collaboration with teachers and their association. I'd also like to see this in the "weighing policies" section.
  i. ULCCA HANSEN – If there are other concerns about this, we should focus on the purple section about quality standards for right now.
c. BRENDA SMITH – Why is first 2 years novice, not 3 years?
  i. We'll revisit this in the definition and scrub all language.
d. AMIE BACA-OEHLERT – "other teachers determined to need more intensive evaluation" in 3i. This needs a qualifier.
  i. JIM SMYTH – There needs to be a norm that all districts follow the same system.
  ii. ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – Can we leave that language out and assume that principals could provide more intensive support at any time.
e. JIM SMYTH - #11 has a word missing. "of".
f. JIM SMYTH – 9 talks about the tools to be used. Then, later we talk about how they were used. We need to add something about how they will be used. Put the "how" in the pre as well as the post.
g. JIM SMYTH – 11(2)(b), I've never heard the word intermediary. Change to "intermediate".
h. KERRIE DALLMAN – Maybe we ought to split out secondary. Use primary, intermediate, middle and high school.
  i. Done
i. SANDRA SMYSER – My district felt that secondary people who have been teaching successfully for a long time should need one year of getting up to speed.
j. TRACY DORLAND – 15, says "districts shall use the following measurement tools". The use of shall here is in conflict with strongly encourage in the subsections.
  i. Changed "use" to "choose from among"
k. MATT SMITH – Isn't there a similar issue in 14 where in the main statement, we use "shall in the main statement and the sub points are "strongly encourage".
  i. MATT SMITH – We said we believe these are research, experience-based valid measures, but I don't think we intended to not allow districts to use from other available measures.
  ii. SCOTT MARION – We could say that there are other measures that have appropriate levels of validity.
  iii. ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – It felt like, during retreat conversations, that we were trying to flag preferred methods of measurements, but not prohibit districts from being innovative.
  iv. NINA LOPEZ – Split the last sentence in 14 into two. We could say that Districts may use additional measures that are aligned with CDE technical guidelines.
    1. ULCCA HANSEN – But that implies that it's not districts developing it. It would have to be developed at CDE.
  v. SCOTT MARION – We should add that measures are "validated for use"
  vi. SCOTT MARION – there should be a way for districts to go about validating this. Something should be laid out for how to validate these measures.
  vii. SANDRA SMYSER – Maybe there's a strong recommendation for those that aren't validated should be weighed very lightly.
  viii. In 19, added – "guidelines for districts wishing to validate measures for use in teacher evaluations and guidelines for use".
  ix. SANDRA SMYSER – Our values include promoting innovation and not using measures that aren't validated.

l. MATT SMITH – It seems that 4 and 5 could be combined.
    i. ULCCA HANSEN – The intent here was to see what could be in the rules. The idea was to have a document that could be more easily translated into rules.
m. MATT SMITH – It seems like 8 and 9 could be combined.
n. JO ANN BAXTER – What about the panel approach?
    i. ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – Hopefully we'll get it to today, but might not get to it until a later meeting.
o. AMIE BACA-OEHLERT – What about other personnel?
    i. NINA LOPEZ – I think the statute is inconsistent. There's the part about all licensed personnel. Then there's the part about having to use it for teachers and principals. I think we've always talked about having an evaluation for all staff in the building. We have a choice about how we want to recommend or revise guidelines for
    ii. AMIE BACA-OEHLERT – At one point, we said standards would apply to everyone.
    iii. KERRIE DALLMAN – We ought to have that conversation at the end of the day.

6. **Principal Standards (*Attachment 4*)**
    a. Red Flags and Omissions
        i. SHELBY PARKER – Why "focus on"?
            1. ULCCA HANSEN – Added for consistency sake and so that it reads better.
        ii. MATT SMITH – If these are standards, isn't it "responsible for", instead of "focus on"? "focus on" detracts from the weight of the standard.
            1. ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – So, something slightly stronger than "focus on"?
            2. NINA LOPEZ – Can we just eliminate it?
            3. ULCCA HANSEN – Yes, we'll eliminate it.
            4. AMIE BACA-OEHLERT – But in teacher standards, we do have a verb, but in principal standards, we don't.
            5. MATT SMITH – But isn't the statement after the colon, part of the shall? So you could put the action verb in there.
                a. ULCCA HANSEN – But some of the language verbs have been softened. While they are responsible for some of these things, they don't have to develop them. In some ways, the focus on measurability was a little bit different in these.
                b. MATT SMITH – So, "shall develop" means that it's their responsibility, not necessarily that they have to do it all. The subsequent elements bring in distributed leadership.
                c. AMIE BACA-OEHLERT – If you reference your teacher standards, what's happening is in the standards, we actually have the verb and not in the principals. We can add the verb in the heading.
                d. BILL BREGAR – If you want to make them read in similar fashion, for example, Standard 1 should possibly dread, "principals will demonstrate strategic leadership" and then you go into the elements.
                    i. So, we changed, in Standard I: "Strategic Leadership" to "Principals Demonstrate Strategic Leadership".
            6. ULCCA HANSEN – Just highlighting the fact that the principal standards are reading differently because they were done differently. Does it matter that they're consistent?

a. AMIE BACA-OEHLERT – I like the verb consistency. I'm okay with the headings being inconsistent
b. BILL BREGAR – Consistency doesn't matter to me.
c. Staff will work on alignment at the standard level
iii. JO ANN BAXTER – Standard 5e, focus on supporting policies and agreements. Do we need to define those policies and agreements more clearly?
1. SANDRA SMYSER – It's the same list we were using in the other one.
2. ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – Should we just copy that list and put it in here?
iv. JO ANN BAXTER – 7b, how does a principal ensure attitudes?
1. Changed "ensure" to "facilitate"
2. ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – Staff will search for the word "ensure" and replace with "facilitate"
v. SANDRA SMYSER – Can we also replace the word "deploy"?
1. Yes
vi. AMIE BACA-OEHLERT – In 4c, where principals evaluate teachers and other staff in a fair and equitable manner, should we reference how principals implement the evaluation system?
vii. AMIE BACA-OEHLERT – 1a, can we put "collaboratively" before the word "determine"?
1. No opposition.
viii. JIM SMYTH – 4b, rather than "school's improvement priorities", can it be just "school's priorities"?
1. ULCCA HANSEN – This was trying to capture the idea of the improvement goal, not just priorities. This was trying to capture counts and percentages as part of the shall language.
2. NINA LOPEZ – I remember Margaret raising some of these. I think my recollection was to make the improvement plan a focus.
3. JIM SMYTH – That helps
ix. Standard 2a, strike Teaching and Learning
1. BILL BREGAR – I'd take learning out. I'd put curriculum, instruction, learning and assessment. It makes better sense in terms of the order of the process.
x. TRACY DORLAND – Add in the use of data in a number of different places.
1. 2a, include "data on student progress".
a. Agreed
xi. TRACY DORLAND – Universal change to replace "all students" with "diverse population" of students.
1. NINA LOPEZ – Tracy and Lorrie have both advocated to call out the idea of diverse populations.
2. KERRIE DALLMAN – Don't we do that with a focus on equity pedagogy?
3. AMIE BACA-OEHLERT – I think "all" is more inclusive.
4. KERRIE DALLMAN – In 2d, it would then be, focus on high expectations for diverse students. That may mean that we would have different expectations for different sets of students.
5. BILL BREGAR – Don't we do that?
6. KERRIE DALLMAN – Outcome is different than expectation
7. ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – The majority would like to leave the language as "all".
xii. TRACY DORLAND – In Standard 3, combine language in a and e.
1. Agreed

xiii. SHELBY PARKER – More active language about involving students families and staff in creating a collaborative school culture in Standard 3e.
1. Agreed.

xiv. SANDRA SMYSER – 2d, I think that a large part of the role of a principal as we go about being committed to high expectations for all students, it's not always about instructional strategies from a teacher perspective, but also about the principal's perspective for structures. Maybe add something about the structures and daily schedule in the descriptors.

xv. SANDRA SMYSER – 2a, last sentence of the description, change "advocate for" to "ensure" or "committed to the goal of"

xvi. SANDRA SMYSER – 3c, we're saying that they ensure that all adults in the school have high expectations and believe that all students can learn. Can we add something stronger than "all students can learn"?
1. Yes

xvii. TRACY DORLAND – 6c, get rid of "develop systems and relationships". Add in "and customize" after "leverage".
1. SANDRA SMYSER – But they are developing those relationships with groups outside the building.
2. Decided not to change this language.
3. ULCCA HANSEN – In the element, added language about "principals developing systems and relationships to leverage the district and community resources available".

xviii. TRACY DORLAND – 6c, in descriptor, struck "and the local school board".
1. AMIE BACA-OEHLERT – You may not work with them directly, but you're still expected to work with them in a sense.
2. Qualifying language "if applicable" was added.

xix. MATT SMITH – 4b, I'd like to throw out an idea for discussion. Recruiting, hiring, mentoring…and then the whole flavor changes to dismissal. If the element is really about recruiting, developing mentoring staff,
1. ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – People felt really strongly about making sure principals are able to dismiss.
2. MATT SMITH - It seems that dismissal when appropriate is part of developing high performing staff. It is one way to help improve the performance of overall staff. I'm wondering about the need in the element to say "dismissal".
3. JO ANN BAXTER – Maybe we say "if necessary, recommendation for dismissal"
4. SANDRA SMYSER – I need principals to be able to dismiss when they need to do it. It ties my hands if they don't do their part.
5. Mat t was comfortable with this change.

xx. NINA LOPEZ – Margaret wanted to make sure we called out the Unified improvement plan in 2b, maybe we need to be consistent in 1a and 1c and add "unified" in there.
1. NINA LOPEZ – How do we make explicit that whatever plans exist in the school ought to be mutually reinforced?
2. ULCCA HANSEN – Would it be possible to add something to c? about ensuring that improvement plans for the school are aligned?
a. Yes, agreement.
3. NINA LOPEZ – The whole purpose of the UIP is to get at root causes.

4. S<small>ANDRA</small> S<small>MYSER</small> – I see it as a local control issue. We're all being measured with the same set of criteria, so then the creative sigh of a plan for how we're responding to that in the district, I anticipate that schools or districts will write some other document that looks better.
5. B<small>ILL</small> B<small>REGAR</small> – What if we change "school improvement plan" to "planning for school improvement"?
    a. K<small>ERRIE</small> D<small>ALLMAN</small> – But that focuses on planning, not executing.
    b. A<small>LYSSA</small> W<small>HITEHEAD</small>-B<small>UST</small> – Could we put in language referencing plans, including state plan.
    c. N<small>INA</small> L<small>OPEZ</small> – I wasn't talking about the school performance framework. If something is important in the school, it should be in the UPI.
6. Nina will work on drafting language around this.

7. **Principal Effectiveness Definition (*Attachment 5)***
    a. The Council took time to review the Principal effectiveness definition.
    b. Red Flags and Omissions
        i. J<small>O</small> A<small>NN</small> B<small>AXTER</small> – Not "take" responsibility. They "are" responsible.
        ii. L<small>ORRIE</small> S<small>HEPARD</small> – Change "cumulative" to "collective".
        iii. J<small>IM</small> S<small>MYTH</small> – Do we say all professional staff? Are they responsible for a custodian's learning and growth, though?
            1. S<small>ANDRA</small> S<small>MYSER</small> – It leaves out classified staff. I think this applies to everyone, but will staff know that they're included?
            2. B<small>ILL</small> B<small>REGAR</small> – How about "students and staff".
        iv. T<small>RACY</small> D<small>ORLAND</small> – "student progress" added as one of the things principals enable.
        v. T<small>RACY</small> D<small>ORLAND</small> - at the end, add "lead their schools to promote equity, create positive learning environments for a diverse group of students and, improve student achievement"
            1. S<small>ANDRA</small> S<small>MYSER</small> – Add manage next to lead. "'lead and manage".
            2. A<small>MIE</small> B<small>ACA</small>-O<small>EHLERT</small> – We need families in there. It's left out of the whole definition.
            3. The last sentence was decided to be "By creating a common vision and articulating shared values, effective principals lead and manage their schools in a manner that supports the school's ability to promote equity and to continually improve its positive impact on students and families and improved student achievement".
        vi. M<small>ATT</small> S<small>MITH</small> – Maximize the utilization of resources and human capital.
        vii. "with an emphasis on improving student achievement" was removed at the end.
        viii. A<small>MIE</small> B<small>ACA</small>-O<small>EHLERT</small> – enable critical discourse…" do we need to add, "and create structures to implement change/facilitate improvement". So that you've allowed the discourse, and then what do you do?
        ix. S<small>ANDRA</small> S<small>MYSER</small> – It's very growth oriented, but doesn't say much about actual achievement. They're responsible for the final product, not just how we all got there.
            1. Achievement added to first sentence.
        x. S<small>ANDRA</small> S<small>MYSER</small> – Make sure teacher and principal definitions are consistent and either plural or singular.

8. **Categories of Personnel**
   a. To what categories of personnel do our standards apply?
   b. What are the attributes of the professionals to whom we think the quality standards apply?
   c. NINA LOPEZ – It's not clear. The statute says something and the executive order is broader. To whom do we think this does apply? Then, we'll plot out how we think the rest of that process should be. For now, we need to say who this does apply to.
   d. KERRIE DALLMAN – So, we do need to tell the state that we think more needs to be done.
   e. NINA LOPEZ – I don't think anyone's suggesting that our system has to meet all of the qualifications in the law, but that our system is for a subset of those teachers that are outlined in the law.
   f. AMIE BACA-OEHLERT – In the measurement piece, we talk about other categories.
   g. SANDRA SMYSER – Proportion-wise, we've got most people covered.
   h. ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – Who's not covered?
   i. SANDRA SMYSER – When we looked at personnel assessment categories, we got most instructional people.
   j. ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – Would you feel comfortable with the categories of personnel developed that is the list of those to whom this system applies?
   k. NINA LOPEZ - No. Because there are some in those categories who this doesn't apply to.
   l. NINA LOPEZ – Can we put it in the parking lot to talk about the implementation guidelines?
   m. BILL BREGAR – We could recommend that this system be adapted by local school districts for those who don't fit the teachers this works for.
   n. SANDRA SMYSER – What do you think the intent of the legislators was? Did they mean classroom teachers? I don't know that it was their intention to include counselors. Maybe our statement is that we recognize that significant and important school staff has been left out. That is a concern to us. We need to say that it's a problem. Counselors should be evaluated too.
   o. AMIE BACA – I know it's a lot of work, but I feel like it is something we should do to include all staff in the system. It just says, you don't matter as much.
   p. SCOTT MARION – But how many classes of standards would you have?
   q. SANDRA SMYSER – You could follow licensing.
   r. BILL BREGAR – They would have to be very broad standards.
   s. SANDRA SMYSER – For PTs [physical therapists], OTs [occupational therapists], it wouldn't be difficult to develop a set of standards that they all share.
   t. AMIE BACA-OEHLERT – For most of those categories, the professional standards already exist.
   u. ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – So, we make a statement that our standards minimally apply to teachers teaching academic subjects and the definition omits other categories of personnel and we recommend a process to develop a system that fits other categories of personnel, potentially using the licensing standards. Where are folks landing on this special ed question?
      i. JO ANN BAXTER – They should be included
      ii. SANDRA SMYSER – Unless you're talking about Occupational Therapists. We're talking about those who are instructing.
      iii. Special ed teachers are in. Specialists are not.
      iv. NINA LOPEZ – I don't feel like I have enough background to feel comfortable that they apply appropriately to special ed teachers. There are others with more teaching expertise. I would want to look back at the shalls and mays and make sure they apply. I think we should get special ed and ELL [English Language Learning] teachers to review this.

> v. It was agreed that we should take another look at the standards with that lens.
>
> vi. JO ANN BAXTER – Is the language broad enough to say that school districts may weight standards differently for different teachers. Professional teachers have responsibilities beyond others. So, our language is broad enough to allow districts flexibility.
>
> vii. AMIE BACA-OEHLERT – So we're saying that we're going to look at those other job categories at some point?
>> 1. Yes. We didn't come to consensus on who does this.
>
> viii. AMIE BACA-OEHLERT – I have concerns if we pay attention to one job category and not enough attention to others.
>
> ix. NINA LOPEZ – I think we need to recommend that this be addressed prior to implementation.
>
> x. JO ANN BAXTER – I think that since this Council has so much ownership over this, I don't think it makes sense to farm it out. However, we need to bring in those other experts.

v. It was decided that the Council's standards minimally apply to all teachers teaching academic subjects and the definition omits other categories of personnel. The Council will recommend a process to develop a system that fits other categories of personnel, potentially using the licensing standards. The Council will bring in ELL and Special Education experts to take another look at the standards through those lenses. This will happen prior to implementation.

9. **Measuring the Principal Quality standards (*Attachment 6)*
   a. KERRIE DALLMAN – pg 1, 6, add in "and meet CDE technical guidelines" at the end.
   b. JIM SMYTH – At the end of 5, says "quality standards". Should be "standard"
   c. KERRIE DALLMAN – In 15, we say teacher input is a may, but down below in 17ai, we say it's required.
      i. Change it to shall in 15.
   d. BILL BREGAR – Is there anything else on that list that is meant to be a shall?
      i. KERRIE DALLMAN – What does the law say about incorporating TELL survey
   e. MATT SMITH – Relative to Item 6, my question is, in the wording of these, do we adequately capture or allow the ability for a district to map what they're currently doing into these standards? Does the wording allow that? We say, "you shall use these standards". I'm just wondering, we talked about a process where a district could say they're already using a standard and and they go through a mapping process. What is the practical expectation? Is it that a given district will modify to use these?
      i. ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – I heard that yes, people will have to change the language of their standards to fit with ours.
      ii. ULCCA HANSEN – We did have language in the teacher standards that districts shall go through a process of mapping . But we pulled it out because we went with something more prescriptive.
      iii. KERRIE DALLMAN – So, districts can re-write the descriptors under the elements for principals , but not teachers?
         1. MATT SMITH – I thought we used wording in the teacher standards that the descriptors were there to ensure clarity and consistency of understanding about what we meant by the elements. I'm not sure we ever overtly said they're not part of the shall. We were trying to eliminate if we only had the element, would we get 150 different versions of what that means.

2. KERRIE DALLMAN – So, wouldn't we do the same in the principals?
3. ULCCA HANSEN – The problem is that in the principal standards, we had a lot of text in the descriptors. The booklets reflect that.
4. JO ANN BAXTER – My understanding was that the standards would be shalls, the elements would be shalls. I'd like to avoid making those descriptors bullet points that have to be met. If we make the descriptors part of the shall,

f. It was decided that for both teacher and principal quality standards, the shalls are the standards and elements, not the descriptors.

10. **Combining multiple Measures (*Attachment 7)***
   a. Scott did a presentation on combining multiple measures.
   b. There's a long history of wrestling with how best to combine multiple measures to make a single decision
      i. MATT SMITH – You mentioned a hybrid version of compensatory model. What's the difference between that and the profile system? The profile is more than just establishing minimums. There might be certain types of categories. Profile is more explicit about what is overall the acceptable level.
         1. MATT SMITH – So it's a more prescribed approach based on district priority or school needs or something like that?
   c. An index system is when points from various categories are combined; certain categories carry more weight. Overall, you get a single number that's then categorized into effective or not.
      i. The tough thing about an index system is that once they're mashed together, you have to peel it apart again to get at where these numbers are coming from.
   d. Profile/Panel Approach:
      i. National Board Certification. If you're applying for National Board certification, you don't exactly know what your profile looks like. They just know they have to get above a certain cut score. What we like about the panel approach is that you always see where the numbers are coming from.
      ii. MATT SMITH – Can we use something like "matrix" as the title? Panel makes me think of a group of people making a decision.
      iii. SANDRA SMYSER – It's not just yes or no. It's helpful to think about the two tails.
      iv. SCOTT MARION – We need to be careful, though, because the law says 50%. If you weight observation as more, then you're not weighting growth as 50%. We have to do some offsetting so that there's at least the appearance of 50% being growth. We talked about whether or not there should be a state model ("common pantyhose chart"). It's worth considering, but we can't get lost in the illusion that by doing that, it'll be completely comparable across districts. But districts might be using different measurements for quality standards, so they're not really the same. There would be more comparability across districts if there was a common framework than if there wasn't. But I don't want to kid anyone into thinking that they're completely comparable.
      v. SANDRA SMYSER – If I can adopt the standards and elements and so can Jeffco and we decide to weight the components of them differently. And DPS will rate everything on cultural equity high and Jeffco is rating something else super high. Then, the observation weighting will be different.
      vi. ULCCA HANSEN – Then, that argues for stronger shalls around weighting.

      vii.   SCOTT MARION – If we want to use the CO Growth model as a guide, we'd be hard pressed to get more than 4 defensible categories. I think 4x4 is manageable.

      viii.   ULCCA HANSEN – Lorrie is not in favor of a statewide panel.

              1.   SCOTT MARION – Comparability comes with tradeoffs. The more comparability you want, the more you have to give up. It's not either/or, there's some middle.

      ix.   MATT SMITH – A lot of it has to do with to what level of process methodology does the comparability go. There's a level of comparability based on the fact that whatever the given district's method is, you have to have this level of mapping combinations. By design, I think we're saying it doesn't get into individual measures and weighting that each district does.

      x.   SCOTT MARION – If you make it totally laissez-faire, then you have no hope of portability.

      xi.   SANDRA SMYSER – I like your example earlier of putting in minimums to narrow the range without prescribing too much. You could say you have to use all content standards, but no content standards can be weighted less than a certain percentage.

      xii.   NINA LOPEZ – With respect to the portability of nonprobationary status, the statute talks about that being premised upon the demonstration of the student growth. You could imagine where you allow more flexibility in things like the practices, because, for example, Jeffco wants to weight heavily on leadership and DPS wants to weight differently. We have said that it's not "anything goes" as far as student growth.

      xiii.   SCOTT MARION – The law asks for these quality standards. The council is recommending that every district shall base their evaluation on these quality standards.

      xiv.   SCOTT MARION – So, if it helps, I could come back with some more choices of language.

e.   ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – One question is to track some of your questions and issues you've raised.

      i.   Minimums

              1.   Technical rigor

              2.   Portability

      ii.   Statewide consistencies

      iii.   Novice teachers

      iv.   # and meaning of teachers (4x4 matrix?)

      v.   SANDRA SMYSER – Just to be clear, a panel only takes two variables?

              1.   ULCCA HANSEN – You could do levels of it

              2.   SANDRA SMYSER – So, there could be panels inside each panel.

      vi.   AMIE BACA-OEHLERT – Are we talking about the shalls and the mays with the panel as well? Would there be some type of education piece to districts on this and the use of the panel?

      vii.   SANDRA SMYSER – As we get more creative with the panel, are we circumventing the 50% in legislation?

              1.   SCOTT MARION – You have to limit creativity a bit.

f.   ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – Another question is how would you like to receive this information?

g.   MATT SMITH – Year to year, looking at the evaluation result as a continuum vs. carving it up into pieces. I don't think an analog scale or something like that is necessarily something

we'd prescribe, but the idea that you could see growth or performance improvement year to year…

       i. SCOTT MARION – Trying to prescribe it as a state would be challenging.

h. MATT SMITH – Any given district/school has the prerogative to hire someone coming from another district. If there's a commonality of ratings based on a matrix approach, but what goes into the weighting other than the 50% is district=-specific, is that a problem with the district accepting someone onto their staff who's been deemed effective/highly effective by a district using a different lower-level methodology.

       i. ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – We'll talk about that on the 11th.

11. Communications Training

Tanya Caughey and Lesley Dahlkemper from Schoolhouse Communications talked to the Council about communications efforts and media inquiries.

Media Inquiries
There will be reporters locally and statewide who will be interested in the recommendations. Right now, we want to make sure you're comfortable with how to respond to reporters. The reporter's responsibility is to make sure that coverage is fair and balanced, but they will also be looking for controversy. We want to make sure you're really prepared to respond. We want to make sure that everyone is sharing the same information with the media. If needed, it might be helpful to designate a key spokesperson or spokespeople.

The other piece is to think about what kind of questions you'll get from reporters. What's significant about these recommendations? It all circles back to kids, teaching and learning. In what ways will these recommendations change education in Colorado? What do these recommendations mean for students and principals? People will really want to understand your rationale for these recommendations. Where do you expect people to push back? What's the worst question a reporter could ask you today? The more brainstorming we can do, the better. One of the things we really wanted to get a better sense from you on is your comfort level in working with the media. We have recommendations too.

What is the Council's comfort level/interest in designating a couple of key spokespersons in speaking with the media?

a. NINA LOPEZ – My sense is that some of you are already in that role, right? People are going to get calls, so the issue is, who do we direct people to?

b. LESLEY DAHLKEMPER – Matt will be a natural on the chair. They'll turn to teachers, parents.

c. JO ANN BAXTER – If somebody were to call and ask who to talk to, I'd refer them to Matt. I don't think there's anyone on the Council who would do a poor job of communicating on their own. I do think it's important to have some consistent message that we're going to give.

d. BILL BREGAR – We've been covered.

e. LESLEY DAHLKEMPER – So, we'll designate two Council members as the spokespeople. Across the board, then when contacted directly, everyone will use the same talking points.

f. AMIE BACA-OEHLERT – Are you going to address the questions we're getting from our own constituents and how to respond to them? Our districts have their own communications departments. Are we going to use the same kind of message?

        i.   LESLEY DAHLKEMPER – I recommend that if they come to you and ask how you think it'll play out in the school district, I'd recommend you direct them to the school district.

       ii.   AMIE BACA-OEHLERT – Superintendents are the ones asking! It's been this big waiting game.

     iii.   MATT SMITH – For stakeholder groups, if people are asking about Kerrie's perspective from her stakeholder group, I think that's completely valid. I think the issue that Amie raised comes in two flavors We all have to keep in mind where we are in the process. We don't have an impact study/cost study. Anything we'd be saying would be largely speculation. Anything that's speculative we'd want to steer away from and say we're not there in the development of the system and evaluation of it. A lot of the people are looking for information that could be answered by some of these common communiqués.

     iv.   BILL BREGAR – There needs to be an understanding that this is the first step in a number of steps. We're going to make recommendations to the State Board. The state board will then work with CDE to put together a process that'll then be reviewed by the legislature.

      v.   LESLEY DAHLKEMPER – This is the beginning. It's not surprising that there would be pushback that the stakeholder conversation is being held in the front range. This is only the very beginning of what will be a very long public input process. It'll be helpful if we can get our arms around saying that these are the three or four big headlines that the Council identifies as the big picture. Here's some of our rationale, here's how we got here. It's all wrapped with "it's a work in progress". One key message is that this is a work in progress, draft recommendations.

     vi.   AMIE BACA-OEHLERT – The reality is that the work goes on while the Council is sitting here drafting these recommendations.

    vii.   JIM SMYTH – Once these drafts are released, it'll be a barrage from the district.

g. NINA LOPEZ – We need to get peoples heads wrapped around what we know. The big statements, like we'll have a common teacher definition at the end of this.

       i.   JO ANN BAXTER – We need to start the process of educating on the evaluation.

      ii.   NINA LOPEZ – There are, on the CDE website, materials, including an FAQ. We've been trying to get staff to update that on a regular basis.

     iii.   BILL BREGAR – Our state level organizations are working very hard to keep their members up o speed.

h. SANDRA SMYSER – Part of my concern with communication is that the people who aren't involved with this work are heavy on the concern side. They need facts. If we focus too much on taking care of those issues, we lose our opportunity frame this work. I think about the values that we spend so much time talking about and the opportunities that this process will bring to the state to accomplish those values and I think that this is an important part of the message. It's about using this process to accomplish these high level values.

       i.   LESLEY DAHLKEMPER – We can promote those themes when we talk about the rationale behind the recommendations. Part of it is being crystal clear and simple.

i. MATT SMITH – It might be good to look at what public input we've had and you may want to make recommendations to how we close that loop.

j. SANDRA SMYSER – You said something about Colorado. I'm thinking about the national scene of education reform. We're doing this even though we didn't get R2T. We're blazing forward anyway. We have districts in our state that have been blazing forward for years already.

We're developing a local control look. On the national scene of education reform, those are interesting ideas.

      i. NINA LOPEZ – This might be something to include in the state board presentation.

      ii. SANDRA SMYSER – Promoting innovation, promoting local control, we're not being forced to do this because of federal money.

      iii. MATT SMITH – We've had a lot of people say we couldn't do this unless we changed our local control model.

PUBLIC INPUT

For the public input piece, one of the things we'll do is come back to share the feedback we got. Any thoughts on how it would be most helpful for the Council to receive that information? Big picture themes? Common areas of pushback? We're trying to structure this so that people don't get too deep in the weeds.

a. Common pushback, themes in content, but themes that are coming from different types of groups; different geographic areas.

b. For April, once you have final recommendations, we'll be more proactive with the media. We'll look at editorial board meetings, opinion columns, local media, interviews, pitching story ideas to TV/media. Right now, we're focusing on making sure you're comfortable with answering media inquiries.

c. AMIE BACA-OEHLERT – What is the stakeholder conversation?

      i. We had put together a memo for gathering info. We thought hard, given the amount of time you have between now and final recommendations, about the capacity and the budget, thinking about getting their input and having a dialogue. We recommended 3-4 different approaches. One of those is a conversation with stakeholders. The idea is that we'd hold a 2 hour conversation, small groups, report outs. The second part is here are some of the resources. We thought it'd be a great opportunity to hear about the resources they need. The idea is to have this one big group conversation. In addition to that, you have meetings with smaller constituencies and go into detail about issues they're really concerned about.

d. AMIE BACA-OEHLERT – Will there be a message that we won't do a re-design?

      i. Yes, we'll keep it at the 50,000 ft. level

12. Public Comment

No Public Comment

13. Housekeeping

a. The Council will add a meeting to the calendar – February 18th