State Council for Educator Effectiveness (SCEE)
Meeting #21
Colorado Community College System
February 11, 2010
9am-5pm

Attendees: Shelby Gonzales-Parker, Sandra Smyser, Matt Smith, colin Mullaney, Towanna Henderson, Brenda Smith, Lorrie Shepard, Kerrie Dallman, Jim Smyth, JO Ann Baxter, Bill Bregar, Margaret Crespo, Tracy Dorland

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

1. **Welcome & Announcements**
   a. State Board of Education (SBE) Meeting
      On Wednesday, the SCEE presented draft definitions and standards for teachers and principals to the SBE. The presentation went well overall. The number one question they had was along the lines of whether the state and CDE can support this work. We may want to think about getting them a more comprehensive update at some point. We impressed upon them how hard this work is. It felt very affirming to hear the kinds of comments that the Board had. There was a suggestion that we define "professional". It might be good to develop an FAQ around some of those questions.

2. **Framing and Progress Monitoring**
   a. Today, we'll start with the measurement of student growth. Then, we'll talk about the use of the state model system.

3. **Approaches to Measuring Student Growth for Teacher Evaluation (*Attachment 1)*
   a. The Council reviewed the teacher document for red flags and omissions.
      i. KERRIE DALLMAN – pg 6, 14 and 15 where it talks about districts identifying personnel categories and how to handle shared attribution, let's say there's a teacher with two sections French and one English, do we use student growth measures from both French and English, or could she just have her student growth measures come out of one of those (French or English)?
         1. That'll be part of the next meeting agenda.
      ii. MATT SMITH – Guidelines or requirements? #16
         1. Ulcca will do a read for that conflicting language.
         2. MATT SMITH – I would aggregate that CDE would have guidelines within which districts would set their requirements.
         3. ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – This will probably come up in the state model system dialogue and implementation discussion.
      iii. LORRIE SHEPARD – I think there's a general principle that's a footnote to the tiering of available growth measures. People need the caveat that however you do it, you should aim for comparability, but you should also proceed knowing that you will never have it. That'd be my principle. I think as a footnote to that section, we need to remind people that they're weighing considerations about what could be compared and what can't.

4. **Approaches to Measuring Student Growth for Principal Evaluation (Attachment 2)**
    a. The Council reviewed the principal document for red flags and omissions.
        i. SANDRA SMYSER - Suggestion to add additional bullet in the framing that talks about differentiation between how long a principal has been in the building in calculation of student growth
        ii. LORRIE SHEPARD – Can we call out remediation rates specifically? When will we talk about what came up about how CDE has reintroduced and weighted status measures heavily in the School Performance Framework (SPF) by having growth to target have such a large effect? Superintendents have looked at a paper from Poudre valley. If status is going to have a lot of weight, it should be transparently status. What's annoying is that it's backwards, introducing it in a way that's backwards. I don't think that everybody understands it well. Just say, "some amount on growth and some amount on status". I get the idea that it matters more in high school, but the problem is that the measures are less related to instruction in high school than they are in elementary. Until there's a different math CSAP, there was an indefensibly high cut score in math that has been driving the system ever since. I can agree with the idea, but not insisting on it since the current system is flawed.
        iii. JO ANN BAXTER – I have one concern about using status. It's outside of our purview.
        iv. ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – We looked at the language about academic achievement, the language "status" wasn't there, but it signaled to the Council measures other than growth.
        v. ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST - coupling between principal performance and school performance.

5. **Public Comment**

6. **State Model System**
    a. We will be clarifying to what extent the state model system should be a default vs. a resource. The Council engaged in discussion around this topic.
    b. KERRIE DALLMAN – I have had the opportunity recently to travel outside the Metro area and talk to teachers and smaller districts about the work we've been doing. There is some uneasiness about the lack of consistency that exists within the mays. Some questions include whether the weight of the standard differs by district, how will we determine what makes a difference for effectiveness? Content could be 30% in one district and 10% in another. I know we've talked a lot previously about opt in/opt out. Even in looking at quality standards and elements, how many indicators? What information do we really get about what makes an effective educator if it varies so much across the state?
    c. SANDRA SMYSER – Kerrie, did you feel that that input is markedly different from the front range, or are you hearing that same concern in the front range?
    d. KERRIE DALLMAN – Front range too, it's a teacher worry.
    e. LORRIE SHEPARD – Regarding aggregating and comparability, I can tell you that you technically cannot achieve comparability by narrative standards. You can't get to the top of the flowchart to the bottom and have comparability. I'm not in favor of comparability. I'm against imposing it because we don't know enough. If you have to come down on a side, why not learn?
    f. ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – The follow-up question would be are the shalls and mays at the right level of depth to give the Council confidence for those districts to not choose the state model…are the shalls and mays tight enough?

g. KERRIE DALLMAN – We've seen different evaluation systems that are out there with different numbers of indicators. Does it make a difference?

h. LORRIE SHEPARD – Every time you change the rules, some people will blip above or below in terms of categorization.

i. KERRIE DALLMAN – We've talked before about how big it could become. It could become so big that no one has a handle on it. Right now, we've left that open-ended.

j. TRACY DORLAND – If we believe we're going to create a state system, for us to think we're going to have comparability across the state is flawed. It's not just the inputs of the system. It's also the process of how you go about it. It's also about the training that people receive to implement. What we're learning is that the training is critical. We don't know enough because people haven't been out there doing stuff like this to be able to say with confidence that we should do it in all districts across the state.

k. SANDRA SMYSER – I agree that the complexity is overwhelming. The voice that I hear the loudest is local control. Coming out the gate, people are going to rely on CDE

l. KERRIE DALLMAN – Opt in as a pilot and then train teachers. You're dealing with a group of folks who have consistently seen evaluation systems implemented without fidelity. There is a significant concern that what's going to change unless you have a default system that spells it out.

m. MARGARET CRESPO – We've had lots of meetings. Even at this level, we still have to have the conversation. I keep coming back to the fact that there is a pilot built into the system right now. It would be nice if the model came out and a district took it off the shelf with no changes and tried it out. I do think that there's a level of fear that we have to be aware of. It is about the rollout and training and lack of time. I don't know that we do that now very well. We're always catching up. We have to get ahead of the ball. We know what we're doing but we can't teach everybody.

n. TRACY DORLAND – I just think it gets back to the conversation of what do we want this thing to do and how will we hold districts accountable? We haven't had that conversation.

o. ULCCA HANSEN – In terms of CDE, I think a large concern is the state model and how to support districts that are doing a wide array of different things. There's a benefit to maximizing districts that are doing the state model. From the CDE perspective, it'll be easier to do that if you're working off the same tools. Districts that have been doing this and have done a thoughtful process shouldn't have any trouble opting out of the system. Nina wanted to say that instead of this state model, why not use the pilot period to use the state model with different variations. They would be variations on a theme. You'd have consistency on the shalls and mays, but also geared to the needs of districts. Talking about opt in/opt out specifically, she's more open to the idea of being an opt out system where districts wishing to opt out would bring their model to the Council. The Council would play an advisory role to CDE about whether or not the system met the criteria. Nina wanted to throw that out. A big question has been who makes the decision.

p. MATT SMITH – We had a significant discussion around verbiage around our standards and some of the explanatory language around quality, validity and reliability and one of the reasons we felt that was important to delineate was to try and provide some support to the guidelines and our recommendations that would help to prevent the system from going down what we knew was a path of destruction or to provide some cautionary recommendations around if you don' t have a validated approach, you need to be careful how you utilize measures. I think the question is, "should we limit the number of indicators"? Maybe the real question is "if the number of indicators aren't limited, are we then inherently allowing system implementation that could so dilute the process that it

almost becomes invalid?" We need to ask if our guidelines are strong enough. We don't want to put forth a set of recommendations that allows status quo.

q. JO ANN BAXTER – I've heard that it would be easy for Denver, DougCo or Eagle to opt out. Would it be easy for Kit Carson to opt out? Is it feasible for CDE to have a plan in place and go through the personnel performance evaluation council? That's still part of the statute. We don't have one in place. We will by May, but those people have to be educated on the system. I don't have a problem with us putting in place an evaluation system in the resource bank. It can be as specific as we want, but that takes time and I'm not sure we have it.

r. LORRIE SHEPARD – I would be in favor of one thing now and another later if you treat it as a learning and development process. You could have something ready for the volunteers and still get a range of big and small. Gates Measures of Effective teaching Project gives a nice place to start. I think people think that you can answer all questions after one pilot year. That's not possible. It could be incremental, so one year you're just going to train on observations.

s. BILL BREGAR – I think that the decision of opt out vs opt in. I think we're really premature in making that kind of a decision. If we made that decision now, we'd be operating under the assumption that the model system is "right". I think that's a horrendous assumption. It's not a silver bullet that's going to apply everywhere. I think the opt in vs. opt out will come at some point, but I don't think we're in a position now to think about that. I think we need to develop a model system that can be used by school districts to develop their systems that will work for them. We won't end up with status quo. We now have statewide standards, they'll be used in teacher preparation and for the first time, we're basing evaluation on student growth. Those things have never happened before. After all of this, we'll recognize the importance of evaluator training. I think we're too far ahead of the game.

t. BRENDA SMITH – I agree with Lorrie and Bill. No matter what, you have to have buy-in from the system so that people understand what's occurring. It has to constantly change, because as the state gets better, the system has to be able to get better too. We are in the stage of just learning about it, so we don't want to stop creativity of districts that are already doing this. I think we're trying to make decisions that we're not ready to make yet.

u. MARGARET CRESPO – I understand the importance of testing it out and doing research and giving districts flexibility. The downside is that every time we do that, we're failing kids, districts, teachers. I think that's really what we're here for. Every time we push this back, we're failing kids. We don't have time. I caution us with the reality of what we're doing. Are districts who opt out failing kids? Someone needs to make that decision.

v. LORRIE SHEPARD – We know more about how to insist on literacy instruction than we know how to do this. We know more than we did 20 years ago.

w. KERRIE DALLMAN – There are still some unanswered questions: the number of indicators under an element, for instance. I do see the value of learning and tweaking over time, but I'm not confident that the members of this Council agree that the trajectory is to have a statewide system.

x. LORRIE SHEPARD – We've always said opt in/opt out, but another option is a trajectory from one to another.

y. ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – It does seem like there are three possible leverage points: tightening the shalls and mays, state model system and opt in/opt out conversation, trajectory idea (is there a decision around a pilot that leads to something different?)

z. ULCCA HANSEN – I think we are operating with different images of what the state model system will be. The state model is a collection of tools, guidelines for weighting, guidelines for bringing multiple measures together. So, it's not just taking it off the shelf and plugging it

in. Even if we talk about the trajectory, there's still a question of what we'll be asking districts to do while we're piloting.

aa. SANDRA SMYSER – We're dealing at the level of policy and creating a system that'll have an effect on the teacher. I think the local control issue is also a policy discussion. I see the value in allowing local flavor, but at the same time, as a policymaker, you have to think about where you want to drive the discussion. Where's the most meaningful discussion? In Eagle, there are lots of teachers who would not be able to explain our system to you. That's okay. There are others who are very involved. Those who are involved are concerned about the indicators.

bb. MATT SMITH – The opt in/opt out system implies that we have the "right model". I'm not sure that our guidelines aren't flexible enough that there really isn't an opt out. You've got to have a system that supports these standards. There's no opting out of doing that. The flexibility is all in the details of how you collect data. I don't know what the opt out is anymore.

cc. LORRIE SHEPARD – The question is should there be a number of different models? There should be a model built that people could choose whole.

dd. ULCCA HANSEN – Yes, but even within that model, districts will have to work it into their systems.

ee. MATT SMITH – Even if you had a model tomorrow, it's a certainty that as the model is implemented, you're going to learn things. But, is there a future state out there that has a common model that's implemented? That would be part of the roadmap.

ff. SANDRA SMYSER – Variability in weighting and different ways of doing things should be based on the needs of your local children rather than the preferences of the adults in the system. This is one idea.

gg. ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – Do we want to tease out the trajectory idea with some specific language? I also heard that we don't have a common definition of what this statewide model system is.

It was determined that staff would tease out a third option (other than opt in and opt out). This option would include a "trajectory" plan. Staff will also work on defining the "state model system".

7. **Implementation (*Attachment 3 & 4*)**
   What are the overarching goals and outcomes? How will we know if we're successful? What will the beta testing and piloting look like? What will implementation look like? What will evaluation towards continuous improvement look like? This was developed with lots of input from CDE. The Council reviewed this document to answer the question, "Is this generally the right direction?"

   a. Under Outcomes
      i. JAMES SMYTH – Concerned about the feasibility of districts attracting more highly effective educators over time. Maybe the intent is more to develop more highly effective educators, not necessarily to attract them.
      ii. SANDRA SMYSER – I had the same concern. Maybe we're talking about the alignment of teacher prep programs.
      iii. KERRIE DALLMAN – I don't want to lose attracting. Can we say "attracting and developing"?
      iv. ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – Do we need another bullet about the alignment of the system overall?

v. TRACY DORLAND – Should we add something about educators reporting that the process is meaningful? This might be a better process outcome.

vi. MATT SMITH – Last two bullets under Process…is the intent there, quantity? Is it about developing additional measures or enhancing the ones we have? Also, if I remember right on the last one, I think our intent was to have a greater percentage of resources being spent on research and development, not just the amount of money.

vii. ULCCA HANSEN – Is this the right number?
   1. LORRIE SHEPARD – I found the whole document too redundant and too big. I think distilling it would help because the big ideas like continuously improving process is important, but I don't think we need to go through bullets.

viii. ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – Do these outcomes feel redundant to the extent that they're too diluted?
   1. LORRIE SHEPARD – It repeats throughout the document.
   2. Council is good with the outcomes

ix. LORRIE SHEPARD – Why do we want differentiation between teachers? They could be all getting better and getting the same. You could say that the system would get better at differentiating, not that the group would become more different than one another.

b. Beta-testing and piloting
   i. KERRIE DALLMAN - Will CDE come up with questions that will guide them through self-assessment? Yes. Let's clarify #1

   ii. TRACY DORLAND – There's no mention of the resource bank until a separate section from the section about the model system. It's almost like a matrix where one side is about the model system and the other is about the resource bank.

   iii. LORRIE SHEPARD – the big idea is that CDE has the responsibility for a resource bank. Then, there's the unorganized verification of tools that go into it.

c. CDE Support
   i. KERRIE DALLMAN – It seems like the resource bank needs to be launched prior to phase 1.

   ii. KERRIE DALLMAN – In 11, I think it should be "CDE shall support districts by providing the following…" I don't want to give CDE the option of not providing those things.

   iii. KERRIE DALLMAN – In 12, why are we waiting until 2013 to do a report if we're going to be beta testing?
   1. ULCCA HANSEN – That's the language in the statute.
   2. KERRIE DALLMAN – Can we just say that we're going to get a report in 2012 so that we know the outcome of the beta testing?
   3. LORRIE SHEPARD – I think that you get different kinds of data after different amounts of time. You get alarms about feasibility early. That's different from outcomes.

   iv. TRACY DORLAND – Are we going to try and learn from anybody doing this stuff? Are we going to look at people that are engaging in what we might call "promising practice"? Would that be part of the pilot? This sounds like CDE is piloting a model system, not that they're developing a pilot process.

   v. TRACY DORLAND – In the implementation piece, there should at least be something that says "CDE shall identify districts to study".

vi. MATT SMITH – pilot could be about what selected districts are doing or what CDE is doing. If CDE's responsibility long-term is to monitor what's working and not working, they ought to be piloting that process at the same time.

vii. TRACY DORLAND – You would look at people who are doing things that seem promising.

viii. MATT SMITH – My thought is to facilitate continuous improvement that involves sharing of information across the state, CDE has to facilitate it across the state.

ix. LORRIE SHEPARD – Things can go into the resource bank based on criteria. It's different to say that it's working. That takes time. You can't do that real time in pointing people to promising practices.

x. MATT SMITH – I agree. CDE needs to be looking at the mechanisms to do it right away, rather than waiting until 2014 to start the process.

xi. BILL BREGAR – If, down the road, they're reporting back to people who weren't involved in original conversations, there'll be a learning curve.

xii. LORRIE SHEPARD – My concern in #6. You have to have a plan as to how it would be phased in for volunteer districts. The idea that the whole thing can be installed in one year is mistaken. We need sequencing that's clear about what "trying it" means.

xiii. LORRIE SHEPARD – We need something that's a little bit more narrative. A framing paragraph at the top that would allow us to simplify some of the bullets.

xiv. MATT SMITH – If implementing the system in this timeframe is unrealistic, there's different ways to scope it. We could say scope it by limiting it to this set of educators or make a recommendation that the full scope needs to be resized for this initial phase. A roadmap needs to be developed.

xv. LORRIE SHEPARD – You want to stay as responsive as what the law says is possible. My choice would be to start to beta test in the year they say, but think about outlining. We would have a 1st step, 2nd step, 3d step of what it means even to volunteer to do it.

xvi. JAMES SMYTH – When we developed our evaluation system for our district, it took six years.

xvii. MATT SMITH – So, don't start off by pushing back on the timeline, but by the end of the pilot, you'll have certain things ready for implementation.

xviii. LORRIE SHEPARD – I think the issue is, what is the "it"? What does that mean? I think the law implies that you install it in year one and you're done. It's not a thing that can be installed in one year. I think, in our model, we have to not only describe the features. By year three, you'd finish implementing it and you'd have data about the efficacy of it. In year two, you're already recruiting other volunteers based on the feasibility part of your beta testing.

xix. SANDRA SMYSER – what's happening in North Carolina?
   1. ULCCA HANSEN – They didn't mandate it statewide. Districts spent two years doing their own thing and then they rolled out the statewide system.

xx. CDE will develop a definition of the statewide model.

xxi. KERRIE DALLMAN – 13, I would like to make this list shalls. I think districts need to have access to this type of quality stuff.
   1. Agreed

xxii. KERRIE DALLMAN – Would also like to include support resources in 17

xxiii. JO ANN BAXTER – When we do our cost study, are we including in that the cost of time? Time is a critical factor when we talk about resources.

xxiv. JAMES SMYTH – 19 sounded clumsy.

xxv.   LORRIE SHEPARD – This sounded so particular. Many other particulars are left out. I'm worried that when you start mandating these details, are you sure they're all the right details and that they all fit together? It's not like I'm saying what's wrong. I just lose confidence that I could discern if this is the right set of elements or not.

xxvi.   ULCCA HANSEN – We're struggling with the right level of specificity. If we go really detailed, you run the risk of leaving something out.

xxvii.   LORRIE SHEPARD – Can we come up with a different process to do details alongside the summary? What is a summary of what we believe? Then, also do the rules and regulations part. Just having the conversation around rules and regulations is frustrating. If you're trying to write a summary document saying what are you doing, then I'm okay with this.

xxviii.   KERRIE DALLMAN – pg 7, #30, I think the could should be a shall. The same is true on pg 11, #36.

xxix.   LORRIE SHEPARD – On 18, I think you mean standardized across the schools, not normed.

   1.   ULCCA HANSEN – Normed was in the statute.

xxx.   MATT SMITH – I didn't see anything in here specifically that dealt with communication or engagement with community stakeholders.

xxxi.   BILL BREGAR – On pg 9, how are we going to determine or measure some of these things? How are districts going to do that? How are they measured? I think there's a major can of worms in terms of having to report some of this information. That would have to be rolled into the cost of implementation.

xxxii.   JO ANN BAXTER – Maybe add some language that wherever possible, embed these requirements into other reports.

xxxiii.   LORRIE SHEPARD – I find the list in 35 hard to follow. It jumps around. One big idea is use existing data. What would you do with existing data to verify that there's been adequate training and support? There's a different set of ideas that has to do with do we believe the findings of effectiveness. The big idea is what are available criterion measures? We should get in remediation and graduation rates, not just growth.

xxxiv.   MATT SMITH – There shouldn't be significant discontinuities in the system data. It should be congruous to a reasonable extent.

xxxv.   TOWANNA HENDERSON – What about students who move from school to school?

8. **Policy (*Attachment 5*)**
   a.   LORRIE SHEPARD – I think the language needs to be stronger.
   b.   SANDRA SMYSER – I think, politically, we'll get some pushback.
   c.   MARGARET CRESPO – There cannot be any gaps.
   d.   ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – The detail will come in an appendix. These are just the overall recommendations.
   e.   BILL BREGAR – These look good. Maybe we need a bullet on the effect of preservice orientation.
   f.   LORRIE SHEPARD – It's 2 and 3. It'll be elaborated.
   g.   MATT SMITH – I'm thinking about a gap analysis relative to the evaluation system with its standards and guidelines that we've put together. It would be for existing policy. Is there existing policy out there that is already crosswise or would present an impediment or constraint to the system we've now described.

h.   ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – That crosswalk and gap analysis has happened. When we look at the detail, you'll see the references to other statute.

i.   JAMES SMYTH – The only place I saw administrator prep was in School leadership Academy.

j.   JO ANN BAXTER – Nothing in here is referencing the dismissal.

k.   At the February 25th meeting, we'll look at this again.

9.   **Parent Engagement TAG group recommendation (*Attachment 6 & 7*)**

a.   Towanna's TAG group used the Maryland Parent Advisory Council's (M-PAC) Recommendation to the Maryland State Board of Education in 2003, A Shared Responsibility, as a framework for their recommendations.

b.   KERRIE DALLMAN – Would like stronger language around communications.

c.   KERRIE DALLMAN – The first bullet under leadership, in what capacity would they serve? I'm concerned about making it a requirement. I think the board should be encouraged to have a parent with kid representative. My thought is that anyone has the opportunity to run for that elected seat, so for us to actually say that we need a parent with a kid to sit on the board isn't within our purview.

d.   BILL BREGAR – Maybe they can have a couple of parent liaisons.

e.   Council agreed that a parent advisory council for the State Board of Education, instead of parent representatives on the Board, was a better option for recommendation.

f.   LORRIE SHEPARD – At the local level, isn't there already a DAC? So it's not asking for something we don't already have locally.

g.   MARGARET CRESPO – This shows the lack of communication we have with parents. As a state, we don't do a good job of letting parents know their rights and responsibilities. Parents don't have this information. They don't know that there are organizations that already do so much of this. That's where I think communication is so key.

h.   LORRIE SHEPARD – We do have those councils, but they are so told to focus on school improvement and reducing achievement gaps

i.   JO ANN BAXTER – At one time, we did deal with parent involvement strategies, but now there's not time. Can we broaden the scope of the SAC?

j.   ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – recommendation at the state board level to have a parent advisory system and expand DAC and SAC committees to include some of the accountability that's on this list.

k.   MARGARET CRESPO – What does nontraditional parent engagement look like?

l.   SANDRA SMYSER – It's not about the number of volunteer hours and fundraising goes on. It's about understanding where the child is at.

m.   MATT SMITH – Under item 3, training, what's the intent in the first bullet. Provide school systems appropriate technical support, training?

   i.   TOWANNA HENDERSON - The intent is to provide training on how to communicate with parents.

   ii.   MATT SMITH – It could be as simple as an online training module. Or it could be a training of trainers.

   iii.   ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – the training would be in the resource bank.

n.   LORRIE SHEPARD – We are under very tight constraints as to how many credit hours we can require for candidates in licensure. We would have to take out reading or math if you had to say parent involvement was required. We couldn't support a stand alone course for all undergraduates. It has to be built into the other courses. The word that's confusing is requirement. It implies you're going to require a course.

        i. ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – Could say something like "ensuring strategies are included in coursework".

        ii. SANDRA SMYSER – Is there a place for that in continuing coursework as well?

    o. MARGARET CRESPO – Under 3, I would say "provide" training. I don't know that you can ensure.

    p. ULCCA HANSEN – In accountability, do we want that to be a shall? That struck me to be more compliance oriented.

        i. SANDRA SMYSER – It's more heavy-handed.

        ii. KERRIE DALLMAN – But it is a should/strongly encouraged.

The Council reviewed Maryland's Parent Involvement Policy Resolution and agreed to recommend that the State Board of Education adopt a similar resolution.

10. **Meeting Adjourned**