



Vision

All students in Colorado will become educated and productive citizens capable of succeeding in society, the workforce, and life.



Goals

Every student, every step of the way

Meeting Logistics & Desired Outcomes

Meeting:	Effective Instruction & Leadership Spoke Committee				
Date:	9/7/16	Time:	10:00-2:00	Location:	6000 East Evans Ave, Denver; Bldg. #2; Suite 100
Meeting Lead:	Colleen O'Neil, ED, Educator Development, Licensing & Ed Effectiveness				
Meeting Participants:	Colleen O'Neil, Karen Martinez, Ty Valentine, Mark Rangel, Heidi Fredericksen, Jessica Cuthbertson, Sue Sava, Chris Selle, Jodie Cantrell, Theress Pidick, Angela Denning, Jill Lewis, Mary Bivens, Jennifer Simons, Sarah Almy, Kerrie Dalman, Randall Peterson; Scott Ross [via phone]; Mike Gradoz [arrived 11:00]				
Meeting Objectives:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Share synthesis of working group discussions ➤ Address follow-up questions ➤ Determine draft recommendations 				

Agenda

Time	Agenda Item	Notes & Next Steps
10:00	Introductions & goals	
10:30	Working group: Equity [1, 3, 5] Key decision making point: 1 Key decision making point: 3 Key decision making point: 5	
12:00	Break: Lunch	
12:20	Working group: Supports [6, 7, 8] Key decision making point: 6 Key decision making point: 7 Key decision making point: 8	
1:20	Working group: Paraprofessionals [4] Key decision making point: 4	
1:30	Working group: ECE [2] Key decision making point: 2	
1:40	Next steps	

Minutes**Introductions****Frame for today: Update on ESSA work writ large, reminder about consensus model**

- Hub group is meeting next Monday, September 12
- Our spoke is on the agenda for the October 12-13 SBE meeting → presentation update
- Consensus model – Can we live with it?
- Reminder of working group discussions did have some talk about other related working group decisions as well as thoughts for CDE apart from what might end up as recommendations for the draft ESSA plan

Working group: Equity [1, 3, 5]: See synthesis template of discussion**Key decision 1:****--Inexperienced and experienced**

- 1: Foundational decision → definitions; points of agreement reviewed
- Kerrie: Report cards → should be reports (p. 2)
- Ty: There is a lot of concern from CASPA about alternative licensure being lumped into emergency licensure; candidates in alternative route are in their field; alt licensure is not a red flag for inequity
 - Emergency must be reported separately
 - Alternative licenses: Professional competence holds; this is not lumped with emergency
- Colleen: There is some flexibility in ESSA; there are state laws that still hold (e.g., definition of professional competence)
- Group came back to this as opportunities, supports, growth → going back to equity plan
- How do you paint a picture that honors the work that is going on?
- Follow-up questions
 - How do you count years of experience?
 - What percentage of FTE is equivalent to a year's experience?
 - We are talking about .2 increments in some contexts; in elementary, .5
 - This does come into play in licensure, including with CTE

Consensus:**Recommendation: Consistency, agreed-upon guidance for districts → Guidance for how CDE recommends calculations**

- **Who counts as FTE? → .5 and above**
 - **Cumulative → .5 for 2 years**

Conversation about experience:

- How will definition here impact leadership? Is this going to be damaging for those who have been a para for years and go ahead and become a teacher? (how to honor what experience folks bring to the table) (perspective of pipeline)
- Licensure law is about having licensed or certificated experience.
- If one is concerned about overall # of inexperienced teachers – and this is about the aggregate
- This is about the story behind the numbers
- We have tried to balance this out in terms of the data presented (e.g., if there is growth of students → no matter experienced teachers or not → will look at big picture. Colorado ahead of the game in terms of requiring growth of students)

Equity plan: Definition of 1-3 years for inexperienced teachers. Mary: 0 came in because of folks who have no experience yet; Value of 3-5 recognized. Sue: The research shows that teachers keep climbing for 3-5 (did her homework)

Conversation about years of experience

- Reporting of inexperienced teachers: 0-2
- Randall: Not loving the word, “inexperienced” → rookies in sports is different than this term because implies lack of experiences and skills; is vernacular determined. Term focuses on “lacking” → can we use novice? Can we report out on novice; many agree with this
- 0-2 years; 3-5 years
 - Draft language → can we draft “novice” as our definition of “inexperienced” → in terms of definition
 - CASPA is not on board with this because not sure of purpose of adding another box – data input concern (burden)
 - Clarification: If we just need to report a number → no extra burden on districts; state will do the work; this is how the data is currently collected and will continue to be the same
 - Jessica - Teacher retention is key
 - Special education: Helpful to see where transitions/leavings happen
- Ed prep report law might be helpful

Consensus:

- **0-2 years for federal reporting of ‘inexperienced’**
- **3-5 years additional public reporting in order to provide meaningful data to districts**

Note:

- There are teachers who are lost in the HR data collection → those who are nonrenewed at end of first year
- If you had to report on teachers who were with us in May and no longer with us (how many is this really?) (10 or 12 in Ty’s district)
 - This is changing potentially the language of the question around ‘what is the status of folks who were here last May?’ [maybe in October or November] – could we change what is being submitted?
 - Also need to consider student count in October and time for out-of-state candidates to take tests
 - Note: Perhaps a work group is needed on this

--In and out of field

- Keep professional competencies, keep tie to licensure
- Group did not want to lower the bar, and recognized alternative pathways
- Clarification: Holding a license (alternative, initial, interim, professional) – endorsement is what teacher is endorsed to do
- Direct reporting: in-field: English endorsement teacher + classes taught are coded as English; teaching math without endorsement is out-of-field
- HQ was at the district level – not portable; what is portable is an endorsement
- Taking away HQ → just because a teacher takes and passes the test does not automatically mean that the teacher has the ‘endorsement’
- Next steps at the state level: explore options such as middle-school math endorsement

What we are saying is that the 24 credit hours in math (licensed English teacher) → under current system, could teach a math class and be qualified. Under proposal → candidate would be out-of-field
 Federal statute allowed for flexibility → state requirements are more specific
 Content evaluation worksheets → could we adjust the sheets to meet the needs more flexibly? → yes

Under NCLB: had to assure that all title teachers are HQ; now: title school: must meet state licensure requirements – but not necessarily teaching in field; we would report those teachers as out-of-field; but there are no forced movements of teachers (state statute does not require in-field)

How does this affect a really outstanding teacher in English who wants to become a special ed teacher? → Sped teachers must meet federal laws (IDEA)

Clarification on TEE? → Counts as a license; you can be teacher of record; SSPs alt license; must demonstrate content

Is this about equity for student or about portability of teacher? → there is a difference in terms of levels of knowledge for potentially HQ and endorsement

Next steps to consider:

- CDE needs to communicate the pathways to obtaining an endorsement.
- Also: How can we make it as flexible as possible for endorsements to happen?
- CDE will need in communicating the flexibility in hiring versus in-field requirements.

Consensus: Keep with endorsement as in-field

- With need to consider flexibility with 24 semester hours, endorsement communication writ large
- We need to make sure to provide information on all of the pathways
- More hiring autonomy and not as many reporting requirements → and we have this definition
- Can we consider K-6 endorsement for middle school teaching? Can we consider ECE as well? What overlap is needed?

What does “quick entry” mean? What is year 0?

- Might be more about preparation reporting in state law

Key decision 3:

- Federal law might not apply to rural districts because there is not a big enough “n”; there is one elementary school; requirement applied in pooling districts does not make sense because holding this district accountable for another district does not make sense.
 - If not doing disproportionate lens → there are other lenses (e.g., effectiveness, turnover) – at the state level, too – for providing supports
 - What other measures might be included? (see bottom p. 13 for list) (could add out-of-field)
 - Are there people who have concerns about using student growth in the equity report? If ESSA does not require it – where do we start that conversation about student growth and alternate measures?
 - Yes to assessment of student learning – yes to alternate assessments – yes for special ed kids – and concern about portability
 - Is there a way to provide a menu of options?
 - What will our SBE and legislature do? → need to talk with legislators, too

- How do we measure student success? (ESSA listening tour brought out multiple measures, personalized learning measures, common PARCC assessments, etc.)
- CEI working with districts on a lot of measures
- Effectiveness data should be reported to CDE for every teacher every year

Key decision 5:

- This set aside of Title II funds → has nothing to do with the funds that are allocated to the districts
- What should/not be CDE doing with its funds in terms of equity for/with districts? [not what CDE should be telling districts around their allocations]
- DHE will not be getting funds for Title IIa → will get this one more time (this year)
- Money will depend on appropriations
- CDE could offer direct support → what might this look like, given local needs?

Possibilities

- CDE → Robust cultural competency training – anti-bias training that is not a check-off
- Recruitment, marketing – getting teachers into the pipeline
- CLD support
- Bolster supports with dollars
- Opening pathways into teaching
- CDE can provide guidance around districts' use of funds → can use Title II dollars for teachers to participate in National Board training
- Can we do anything about salaries? – bigger issue for rural districts that are at a total disadvantage
- Hub could use voice to advocate for equity as well in terms of teacher salary [legislative fixes that are needed]

Key decision 6:

- How do we use this law in the way it was intended? How can we ensure that folks understand the spirit of the law and operationalize flexibly?
- Dearth of support around principals/principal managers
- 50% on student growth → would need a legislative change if this is to change
 - “Did not make sense for the level it is at” – anchor group is talking about doing survey of field to get smarter about what is needed
- Also: need to look at doing this for every teacher every year → need flexibility for principals to determine if every year is needed, and give time to support struggling teachers
 - Need to give districts the choice – Every year? Every 3rd year?
 - Districts want flexibility to determine how often (practitioners' feedback – teachers, principals, superintendents, rural, urban)
 - What about the equity lens? → teachers move and change year to year
 - Key: Where are folks in the implementation of the work – not in a compliance mindset – when shift of perspective happens – this is what moves instruction (far more than evaluation); transforms to an authentic process [feedback depends on depth of work]
 - Not about the what anymore → this is about the how
- State gets to decide on evaluation system now → we do not need to proceed with the specifics on language that is there

- Have we talked about shared standards for this work? (Theress)

Key decision 7:

- This conversation is more about the operationalizing of CDE supports – aligned support
- Less about content
- More about interconnectedness of the work – this has surfaced in integration group with Pat Chapman*
- Shared standards on professional learning

Consensus: Remove details that were inserted into the ESSA draft plan; articulate at a high-level – including intentions

Key decision 8:

- We need to talk more about the how – not the what
 - Exemplars of practice from CDE
 - Do we need more “Marys” in the field, engaged in the support for the work?
 - We also talked about getting the students into the programs? How can we help higher ed?
 - How do we have more teacher cadet programs?
 - What is possible re: educator preparation entities?
 - Criteria: Educator preparation in partnerships with districts – with multiple districts – in your region
 - Communications – match-making between ed prep entities and field
 - CDE has had a shift from reauthorization as compliance to supports
 - We have been burnt too many times --- need to frame this – for the field: is this really about support? -- need to continue data conversations around equity; CDE has to keep modeling
- Need to consider recommendations for legislation as well as statutory changes

Consensus:

Recommendation: Consistency, agreed-upon guidance for districts → Guidance for how CDE recommends calculations

- **Who counts as FTE? → .5 and above**
 - **Cumulative → .5 for 2 years**

Experience:

- **0-2 years**
- **3-5 years**

Keep with endorsement as definition of in-field

- With need to consider flexibility with 24 semester hours, endorsement communication writ large
- We need to make sure to provide information on all of the pathways
- More hiring autonomy and not as many reporting requirements → and we have this definition
- Can we consider K-6 endorsement for middle school teaching? Can we consider ECE as well? What overlap is needed?

Remove details that were inserted into the ESSA draft plan about educator effectiveness; articulate at a high-level – including intentions