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**State Council for Educator Effectiveness**

**CEA Offices, 1500 Grant, 4th Floor Board Room**

**September 28th, 2012 from 9:00 a.m.–4:00 p.m.**

**Minutes**

**Council Member Attendees**

Bill Bregar, Kerrie Dallma, Mandi Marcantonio, Lorrie Shepard, Tracy Dorland, Katy Anthes, Matt Smith, Amie Baca-Oehlert, Kim Ash, Jo-Ann Baxter, Sandra Smyser, Margaret Crespo and Brenda Smith

**Staff Attendees**

Angela Baber, CLF; Micaela Michie, CLF; Alyssa Whitehead-Bust, Facilitator; Jean Williams, CDE; Cortney Cabrera, CDE

**Welcome and Announcements**

Matt called the meeting to order and welcomed the two new SCEE members; Kim Ash, charter representative and Mandi Marcantonio, student representative.

**Meeting Objectives**

Alyssa identified the following meeting objectives:

* SCEE will understand the process and recommendations of the OLP work group;
* SCEE will review, provide feedback on and confirm proposed standards for OLP;
* SCEE will review and provide feedback on a process for finalizing elements for OLP; and
* SCEE will review and provide feedback on CDE reporting structure.

The Council approved the meeting objectives.

**Review of SCEE OLP Work Group Process and Packet Materials**

Angela provided an overview of the Other Licensed Personnel (OLP) Work Group Process for meeting the Council’s charge and walked the Council through the work group report and other meeting materials. See the September 28th SCEE OLP Work Group report located on the CDE Educator Effectiveness site for additional information.

***SCEE Charge to OLP Work Group***

At the June 22, 2012 SCEE meeting (see June 22 SCEE [Meeting Minutes](http://www.cde.state.co.us/EducatorEffectiveness/downloads/Council%20Meeting%20Documents/6.22.12/SCEE%20Minutes%2006%2022%202012%20-%20final.pdf)), the Council put forth the following charge.

1. CDE is to form one work group with two major categories of personnel: medical and social emotional. These two groups are to focus on specific categories of licenses.
	1. Medical; which includes the following license areas:
		1. School Audiologist
		2. School Nurse
		3. School Occupational Therapist
		4. School Physical Therapist
		5. School Speech Language Pathologist
	2. Social/Emotional; which includes the following license areas:
		1. School Psychologist
		2. School Social Worker
		3. School Counselor
2. The work group is charged with identifying how each of the license categories of OLP listed above align to the quality standards for teachers; to articulate how they do not align; and to provide a thoughtful rationale for any changes that need to be made to the quality standards (including draft language) for review of the Council at the September 28th meeting. At this time, recommendations are to be made at the standards and element level, not at the practice level. However, the Council requests example practices for performance levels if they come up naturally in the workgroup work.
3. The two major sub groups are also charged to articulate similarities between the categories of licensed personnel (outlined above) for the purpose of developing a single set of standards – if possible – for all of the licenses within the sub group.

To meet this charge, CDE convened an initial meeting of CDE staff and other practitioners from across the eight licensure categories listed above. During this meeting, practitioners reported that the grouping of the licensure categories into medical and social/emotional did not make sense and that the language was not representative of their professions. The work group also decided next steps in terms of meeting the Council’s charge.

***SCEE OLP Work Group Timeline***

* 6/29/2012 CDE convened a planning meeting and identified points of contacts/facilitators for each of the 8 licensure categories identified by the Council as OLPs
	+ CLF and CLF identified staff to serve as notetakers/reporters across each of the 8 licensure categories
* 8/10/2012 CDE and CLF convened a planning meeting for the first SCEE OLP work group meeting
* 9/11 – 9/12/2012 CDE hosted a two-day work group meeting for the SCEE OLP to address the Council’s charge
* 9/17/2012 CDE and CLF convened the SCEE OLP Work Group facilitators and notetakers with other SCEE staff to plan for the September 28th meeting
	+ This sub group developed a common set of standards for OLP that was not reviewed by the larger group. The rationale for this common set was to provide the Council with an option of common standards to better address their charge.
* 9/21/2012 CLF staff sent the SCEE OLP Work Group report to SCEE in preparation for the 9/28 SCEE meeting (see the [CDE Educator Effectiveness State Council site](http://www.cde.state.co.us/EducatorEffectiveness/Partner-SCEE-Meetings.asp) to access this report and other related meeting materials).

**Break**

**Panel Presentation: OLP Work Group Purpose, Process and Outcomes**

***Katy Anthes***, CDE and SCEE

***Jean Williams***, CDE

***Amie Baca***, School Counselor and SCEE

**Katy Anthes, CDE and SCEE**

* **Purpose of the work group**
	+ Met the charge from SCEE
	+ Started from a place of commonality
	+ Kept to our value of ensuring meaningful feedback to improve professional practice

**Jean Williams, CDE**

* **Process**
	+ Jean’s NC process and how it informed our work
	+ The CO process
		- Identified practitioners and other key stakeholders
		- Leveraged existing groups
		- Reviewed national standards
		- Convened a 2 day meeting with 71 practitioners, staff and stakeholders to develop recommendations
		- Provided groups with a series of materials
		- Developed recommendations
		- Next steps for the OLP work group

**Amie Baca, School Counselor and SCEE**

* **Outcomes**
	+ Explained the reason for unique standard and element development
	+ Explained proposed unified standards drafted by facilitators and note takers
	+ Went over both the unified and unique standards process

**1 of 2: OLP Work Group Panel Presentation**

***Amy Barr***, Physical Therapist, Cherry Creek School District

***Franci Crepeau-Hobsen***, Assistant Professor, University of

Colorado Denver

***Amy Baca***, School Counselor, SCEE Member; Adams 12 School District

***Lisa Cannon***, Educational Audiologist, Denver Public Schools; Colorado Department of Education

Facilitators of four of the eight OLP licensure category sub groups for the SCEE OLP work group addressed key elements of work group rationale.

**Presenters**

***Amy Barr***, Physical Therapist, Cherry Creek School District

* **“Our Charge from the State Council and how we think we met it”**
	+ SCEE wanted our best thinking and wanted us to start from a place of commonality with the Teacher Quality Standards.
	+ We developed standards that are completely aligned to the Teacher Quality Standards, even though there are recommending wording revisions.
	+ We needed to develop distinct elements to (1) represent what we actually do (2) align with national standards and (3) align with state licensure laws for OLP.

***Franci Crepeau-Hobsen***, Assistant Professor, University of Colorado Denver (slide 18)

* **“How we approached developing these recommendations – The process we followed, the time it took, and why we developed unique standards and elements”**
	+ Gave examples of why wording changes and unique elements became necessary.

***Amy Baca***, School Counselor, SCEE Member; Adams 12 School District

* **“The proposed OLP Unified Standards; pros and cons”**
	+ The work groups were clear on the charge, so any wording changes represent a thoughtful rationale.
	+ Not the whole group was present to agree to unified standards.
	+ Unified standards make this more streamlined

***Lisa Cannon***, Educational Audiologist, Denver Public Schools; Colorado Department of Education

**2 of 2: OLP Work Group Panel Presentation**

***Kathy Patrick***, Assistant Director, Office of School Nursing Supports, CDE

***Elizabeth Wall***, Occupational Therapist, Jefferson County School District

***Liz Davis***, Integrated Services Coordinator, Poudre School District

***Cindy Milliken***, Director of Results Driven Accountability, CDE

**Presenters**

***Kathy Patrick***, Assistant Director, Office of School Nursing Supports, CDE

* **“Examples of the need for distinct elements”**
	+ Walked Council through an example and rationale from group.

***Elizabeth Wall***, Occupational Therapist, Jefferson County School District

* **“Examples of the need for distinct elements”**
	+ Walked Council through an example and rationale from group.

***Liz Davis***, Integrated Services Coordinator, Poudre School District

* **“Addressing some of the potential unintended outcomes of having distinct elements (e.g. this will be a heavy burden for evaluators and they may not be able to be trained on 9 different rubrics)”**
	+ Training on 9 rubrics is a lot
	+ Admins may not get to really understand 9 rubrics well.
	+ Might open this back up and teachers may want distinct standards by content, SPED, ELL, etc.

***Cindy Milliken***, Director of Results Driven Accountability, CDE

* **“Next steps from the work group perspective; scrub through the elements to see if we can get closer to alignment on 2, 4 and 5; defining OLP effectiveness; developing instruments”**

**Working Lunch**

**SCEE Discussion Regarding OLP Work Group Report**

* Katy: Naming out the profession in each standard, however the language is the same
* Matt: I would not have defined naming out the specific groups as ‘uncommon’- In my mind it is the content in each standard that we wanted to keep in common.
	+ Ex: Audiologists
* Amie: I do not like the uniformed standards, I think it diminishes the work those people are doing. From being involved in the workgroup we spent a lot of time going through this. From a practitioner point of view I noticed a huge change in being evaluated as a practitioner and as a counselor. I think there is different, and having distinct standards highlights this standard. I worry about honoring those people’s work, and most of the people haven’t even seen the uniformed standards or weigh in on it.
	+ Matt: If we put the specific group name in the standard that is a level of specificity that we haven’t used in the teacher standard, is there a real difference at the standard description level around having the distinctions on the OLP and having distinctions among different content teachers.
	+ If we got too specific about describing OLPS, it would be different than how the council decided to keep all of the teachers under the same title
* Tracy: We do not want to get to a point where these professionals are still seen as educators.
* Brenda: You want to make sure the evaluation links back to the individual. OLPs become the afterthought and they are building off of what teachers do. I think it is Ok to have these differences because it does look different than a teacher in a classroom. In the end there are differences and we have to value that. When you saw the words that were changed under a standard, it was truly applicable to the profession.
* Sandra: Started off wanting parallelism – but this needs to work and to be an effective evaluator tool. Now leaning towards differentiation, if the elements are different anyways, the document will say counselor anyways.
* Kim: How often are the standards going to stand alone without the elements? Since the standards will not stand alone without the elements you are looking at it cohesively.
	+ Evaluators differ from district to district. We have to be realistic about training on the rubrics. We want them to embrace it so they want to do this. Common language makes it easier with an evaluator.
	+ Common language with specific roles inserted.
* Kerrie: I see a need to differentiate between standards 1 and 3. The work is so different and detailed, I would like to see that in the standard level.
* Margaret: Allowing the standards and elements to define each role allows me to evaluate without being in their profession.
	+ This could be a good opportunity for the ‘OLPs’ to feel like they do count and they are not the ‘other’
	+ Worried that every time we talk about evaluation we are talking about the principals – we need to start talking about evaluators
	+ Concerned about the weighting – if you have a district where one person does all of the work it will overwhelm them.

**Public Comment**

* Cindy Miliken, Speech Language Pathologist Work Group member: Feel that it is respectful to use the specific name instead of OLP.
* Liz David, Social Worker Work Group member: Seeing my profession in an actual evaluation rubric would be a huge change. It makes you feel like you belong in a system. It is nice when someone makes an effort to highlight your profession.

**SCEE Discussion Re: Recommendations for the OLP Work Group**

DECISION POINT: YES, changing out OLP to distinct professional titles.

* Amie: Agree that 2,4,5 will be common. We’ve already committed to 9 different rubrics. To me, where there is distinction, it is important to honor that. This gives the different categories to educate the administrators, collegues, and it gives them the leverage to do things they should be doing. It shows specific things counselors should be doing. 1 and 3 lets honor where the professional saw differences enough to spell it out.

**In standards 1 and 3 distinctive language:**

* Kim: Seeing how broad the standard level is, the ‘meat’ is in the element.
* Amie: Because it is the overarching statement
* Kim: It is nice seeing the commonality within the standards – it shows we are all educators
* Kerrie: Can’t 2,4,5 show that commonality?
* Matt: 2 criteria for being distinctive:
	+ the distinction is adding real effectiveness to the standard
	+ the distinction does not diminish the overall objective of the particular standard. We could say the elements define the details.
	+ If the distinction makes it more effective for professional and evaluator and if it does not detract from the philosophy of the standards – then I am OK with those distinctions
* Sandra: Professional Development – It would be nice if the system lends itself to PD – using PD in standards where they are similar and
* Margaret: We didn’t have this conversation about the principals. We allowed distinction. In the pilot we are seeing that it is driving the work

**OPTION: 2, 4, and 5 are common – then asking working group that distinctions in 1 and 3 align**

* The distinction is adding real effectiveness to the standard
* The distinction does not diminish the overall objective of the particular standard.
* Amie: This was already our charge.
* Katy: The group didn’t have the chance to ask the commonality questions.
* Tracy: On standard 3: there are similarities between Nurses and OT, but with Counselors and audiologists they are trying to get their specific practices into the standard. The uniqueness in the standards could be dropped down into an element.
* Kerrie: It could be valuable to have the groups go back over and not having to force the words to fit into the similarity.
* Katy: The groups have not had the chance to look at the unified standards and to see if they agree with the language.
* Matt: Standard 1: EX: OT used the word ‘pedagogical’ instead of domain –
* Margaret: The workgroup did not get a chance to read the others to see if there is commonality.
* Amie: If we are going back to them and showing everyone else’s 1 and 3 to see if there could be common language. Let’s see what remains common or what needs to remain distinct. Keep 2,4,5 common.

**2, 4 and 5 will be common. The workgroups will reconvene and look at 1 and 3 to see if there is common language**

* Matt: We need to give guidelines to the working group.
	+ EX: There is a fundamental difference in the content between Standard 1 with audiologists and counselors. One is practice and skill only, the other is broadened and includes the science behind the practice. The science behind the standard is the reason OLPs are separated.
	+ Guiding principles to shape this revisiting:
		- The distinction is adding real effectiveness to the standard
		- The distinction does not diminish the overall objective of the particular standard.

**II: Elements for working group:**

* Tracy: Common language matters: ‘Collaborate for positive student outcomes’ if it is written differently from group to group that may be ok – but common language is important because it gives us common understanding, purpose, and culture.
* Amie: Everyone based their elements off of the teacher language. Starting by showing everyone’s elements and where they are different. Being cautious of putting more in the elements of olp than is in the teachers.
* Kerrie: Talk about the word and role of ‘advocacy’ as related to each profession.
* Amie: We discussed why ‘advocacy’ isn’t in the teacher rubric.

**III: Standards**

* Cindy: It would be helpful to go through the teacher elements and define what the key aspect is and aligning it under the same standard.

*Parking lot item:*

* Matt: discussing any changes in statute – wording supportive of professional development and advocacy missing from teacher standards.

 -Talking about legislative changes in the spring for the next legislative session.

**SCEE Recommendations for OLP Work Group**

The Council provided additional direction to the SCEE OLP work group. Specifically, the Council recommended the following actions.

***Revise OLP Standards***

* Insert name of profession in each standard (not OLP)
* Adopt common language for standards 2, 4 & 5
* Evaluate language of standards 1 & 3 looking for opportunities for common language but accepting / reviewing distinctions as needed
	+ Distinct language makes standard more effective & relevant
	+ All language represents philosophical intent of standard
* Effectiveness of distinction, alignment to intended philosophical approach
* Aligned to high level purposes we i.d.’d for teachers and principals
* Aspirational
* Coherence
* Unified philosophical intent
* Usability 🡪 weight of system
* Elevation of profession / buy-in
* Ability to stimulate growth
* Relevance to work
* Common elevation
* Function of language itself
* Parallelism
* Distinction-vs-Difference
* Language of standards should be at same level of elevation

***Recommendations for Elements***

* Elements distinct to professional group
* Working groups re-convene:
	+ Cross-walk language across groups
	+ Aspirational scrub 🡪 Future vision
	+ Alignment of match between standards & elements
	+ Scrub for what’s missing
	+ School –vs-individual focus
	+ Scrub for ‘charge’’ of language
	+ Correlation with field guidance revisions
	+ Leadership elevated
* Collaboration: internal and external (have we captured?)
	+ Collaboration for awareness
* Professionalism within building and common to profession
* Look for common language when appropriate and relevant
* Advocacy?
* Cross walk elements across groups to share element language
* Correlation with revisions of field-specific prof-guidance.

***Revise OLP Title***

* Term “other” “licensed” “personnel”
	+ Specialized service / student providers and professional
* Wording supportive of professional development
* Advocacy missing from teacher standards & elements

**CDE Update**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Important Trends** | **Successes*** Ahead of schedule on the rollout plan for district training for teachers and principals
* Preliminary findings of principal evaluation ratings shows increased differentiation
* Feedback from districts indicates that the principal evaluation rubric is not representative of assistant principal responsibilities
* CDE now has a team in place with staff focused on student growth

**Challenges*** The 50% multiple measures of student growth is getting clearer but still difficult to communication and train on
* Retraining is a need as there have been revisions to the rubrics and turn-over in districts and new information on Growth
* Even though the CDE team has grown, it is still challenging to meet the increasing demand for trainings and other SB 191 supports
 |
| **Data** | * First year implementation data regarding principal evaluations
* Pre- and post-principal survey data
 |
| **Items to Flag** | * TNTP licensure report
* 4 pt verses 5 pt comparison study
* Validation Study will occur in 2013-14
	+ If we are committed to this being a true pilot, we need to be able to revise the system based on feedback, so the pilot cannot serve as the validation period because there will be changes.
* AP Issue
 |
| **SCEE Actions** | * Make recommendation regarding OLP
* Monitor privacy (EDAC)
* Data collection
 |

**Next Steps**

1. Provide recommendations to SCEE OLP Work Group
2. Form Data Workgroup
3. Schedule webinar to dive into pilot findings (record for later playback)
4. Send Doodle for November meeting
5. Invite Senator Johnston to the next SCEE meeting to engage in a discussion regarding the following
* 4 point rubric mini-study
* Student growth and timeline of implementation
* Other
1. Develop work plans for making policy recommendations in the 2013 vs 2014 legislative session

**Closing Thoughts**

Matt concluded the meeting through reflecting on the effectiveness of the Council and through thanking staff and members for their support and commitment.