STATE OF IOWA

Fields of Opportunities

TERRY BRANSTAD, GOVERNOR
KIM REYNOLDS, LT. GOVERNOR

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BRAD A. BUCK, DIRECTOR

Council on Educator Development Minutes

Google Site: https://sites.google.com/a/gpaea.org/ee-council/home

Date:	Location:	Task Force Members Present:
Friday, Oct. 4, 2013 10 am – 3:30 pm **Future Meeting Dates:** TBD	Grimes Building B100 (basement conference room)	• Elaine Baughman, Special Education Teacher, Harlan CSD, Harlan • Tom Buckmiller, Professor, Drake University, Des Moines • J.D. Cryer, Field Experience Coordinator, University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls • Byron Darnall, Bureau Chief, Iowa Department of Education, Des Moines • Carol Farver, Principal, Newton CSD, Newton • Joel Illian, Special Education Teacher, Pekin CSD, Packwood • Joe Judge, Albia CSD • Michelle Lettington, Executive Director of Curriculum and Professional Learning, Waukee CSD, Waukee • Patty Link, Parent Representatitve and State Director, Students First, Des Moines • Stephen Miller, Employment Consultant, Iowa Association of School Boards, Des Moines • Patti Roush, Dennison CSD • Derek Schulte, Business Education Teacher, Southeast Polk CSD, Pleasant Hill • Billy Strickler, Elementary Teacher, Fairfield CSD, Fairfield • Jon Sheldahl, Chief Administrator, Great Prairie AEA, Ottumwa • Dan Smith, School Administrators of Iowa • Robin Trimble-White, Director of Teacher Education and Professor, Grand View University, Des Moines • JoAnne Tubbs, Licensure Consultant, Iowa Board of Educational

Examiners, Des Moines
- Dave Versteeg, Superintendent, Montezuma CSD, Montezuma
- Tammy Wawro, President, Iowa School Education Association, Des Moines
- Herman Quirmbach, State Senator, Ames*
- Ron Jorgensen, State Representative, Sioux City*
- Cindy Winckler, State Representative, Davenport*

Absent:
- Bev Smith, Human Relations Director, Urban Eight Network, Waterloo
- Joni Ernst, State Senator, Red Oak*

*Non-voting member

Overall charge of the Task Force:	Intended Outcomes of this meeting:
A Council on Educator Development is established to study and make recommendations for a new statewide teacher evaluation system and a new statewide administrator evaluation system. **The goal of the study is to determine the efficacy of the current systems in providing practitioners with clear and actionable feedback to enhance their practice and advance student learning. The council will review the current teacher and administrator evaluation systems, the Iowa Teaching Standards, and the Iowa Standards for School Administrators, as well as other related components.** In developing recommendations for any evaluation system, **the council shall consider numerous factors, including the "fair and balanced" use of student outcome measures, multiple indicators that demonstrate professional practice, and student and parent surveys.** **Facilitators**: Jon Sheldahl & Byron Darnall **Recorder:** Jennifer Woodley	By the conclusion of the meeting we will have: (1) Establish a set of working norms (2) Gain a sense of perspective from all members of the Council (3) Elect a chairperson to facilitate the Council's work (4) Establish a timeline for engaging in the work (5) Establish the current context of teacher & administrator evaluation in Iowa

Activity:	Time:	Person(s) Responsible	Materials Needed	Need to do:
Connector: Welcome and Overview Introductions of members; review of charge to the group; role of guests and observers; generation of group norms **Nominate a Recorder** <u>Protocol</u>: Name, position, one "norm" you would suggest in response to the question: "What do we deserve from one another throughout this process?	10 – 10:30	Jon Sheldahl	Chart paper	Establish connections between team members and introduce guests. Establish a collective understanding of the context for the council and frame the conversation for day's agenda.
• *Director Buck welcomed and thanked participants for their commitment and time.* • *Dr. Sheldahl reviewed the overall charge and intended outcomes for the meeting (noted above).* • *Established Norms (see attachment)*				
Setting the Stage: Fears & Hopes Form small groups of 4-5 people (facilitator, timekeeper, spokesperson, recorder) • One side of index card write what worries, concerns, anxieties, fears about recommending changes to standards and evaluation practices. (5 mins) • Small group share-out, chart responses, group like answers. • Select two to share w/ whole group. (15 mins) • Repeat process • Using other side of index card—list hopes for this work. • Afterward collect index cards for master list.	10:30 – 11:15	Byron Darnall	Index Cards	To acknowledge authentic concerns and hopes of task force members as we enter the work. We will bring the compiled lists of fears and hopes to each meeting and analyze the work by asking… • To what degree are we doing what we can to avoid fears and achieve our hopes? • How do these decisions help us avoid the fears we identified and achieve the hopes we want?
• *Mr. Darnall handed out an index card and asked participants to write a worry or anxiety about the work on one side and a hope for evaluating administrators/teachers on the other side*				

Entering the Work:
Are we all speaking the same language?
• Group process activity: concensogram
   --assess knowledge
   --build common vocabulary
	11:15 – 12:00	Jon Sheldahl & Byron Darnall	1 sheet of chart paper
			Easel
			Magic markers
			Several sheets of
				A consensogram is a chart that indicates a group's perception of various topics. Members of the group place stickers on the chart to show their responses. By observing

			circle-dot stickers (red, yellow, green, and blue) Copies of the Consensogram process	the stickers, one can tell the consensus of the group at a glance.

- *Mr. Darnall asked participants to indicate their level of understanding using color dots about the following topics: Peer Assistance & Review; Value Added; Sole Evaluator; Weighted Measures; Multiple Performance Levels; Multiple Measures; and Observation Rubrics*
- *Dot Rubric (Level of Understanding):*
  - o *Blue - high level*
  - o *Green - mid-high*
  - o *Yellow - mid-low*
  - o *Red - low level*
- *Baseline Measurement of topics – we need to create common language and meaning*
- *Weighted Measures*
  - o *Putting weight in with specific criteria*
  - o *In current system, no weighted measures – in a new system, we would incorporate*
- *Peer Assistance and Review*
  - o *Collaborative process to ultimately help teachers*
  - o *PLC work and collaborative conversations*
  - o *Currently don't see tied to evaluations*
  - o *Formalized with teacher conversation and growth, but not within final evaluation*
  - o *An area from what Legislators thought they were moving forward into how it was interpreted – there was misunderstanding (Bill referenced Senate File 2284 http://coolice.legis.iowa.gov/linc/84/external/SF2284_Enrolled.pdf)*
  - o *Instructional Coach*
  - o *Is it part of an evaluation or is it a positive part of an environment*
  - o *Difference between peer assistance and peer review – can we lump them together?*
- *Multiple Performance Levels*
  - o *Proficiency, emerging*
  - o *Initial teacher vs. Master teacher performance levels*
  - o *Waukee incorporates a multiple performance rubric*
  - o *Exceeds Standards, Meets Standards, Need to Improve – absence of "rubric" for what each means*
- *Observation Rubrics*
  - o *Think in terms that observation rubrics not just for evaluation – use for pd, peer review, etc.*
- *Sole Evaluator*
  - o *Context – Elementary Principal evaluates Elementary Teachers, Secondary Principal evaluates Secondary Teachers*
  - o *Walkthroughs vs. Sole Evaluator*

- *Value Added*
  - *Incremental contribution*
  - *Figure out where students are when you begin and end*
  - *Whatever students achieve come from a number of sources (within/outside of school)*
  - *Need to learn more about the term*
  - *Student Achievement – are we on the same page with what that word means?*
  - *One size doesn't fit all kids, teachers, and administrators - Looking at variety doesn't mean that it creates value added system*
  - *Resource: October ASCD – Leveraging Teacher Leadership – Make sure evaluation system is compatible with culture of building*

Lunch	12:00-12:45		Lunch On Site	Refuel/Calibrating/Housekeeping Items
Defining the Work: • Overall charge in order to meet requirements in HF 215 • Conversation from Twitter (#Iaedchat) on Sept. 8th—Jimmy Casas • State data on system effectiveness (PPT) • Dr. Kim Huckstadt's conclusions (overview of dissertation conclusions)	12:45-1:30	Jon Sheldahl & Byron Darnall	Teacher Evaluation law and code (copies or on projector?) State data on evaluation pulled form BEDS (PPT)	Teacher Evaluation law and code (copies or on projector?) State data on evaluation (PPT)

- *Dr. Sheldahl reviewed the current evaluation system – Model Framework For Designing A Local Teacher Evaluation (In October 4, 2013 Agenda/Meeting Documents folder on Google Site)*
- *Fast forward from 2001-2012 – Yearly evaluation - added peer review and superintendent evaluation*
- *Summative evaluation is every three years*
- *Definition of beginning teacher and timeline needs to be clarified*
- *Coaching piece is important*
- *Need common definitions of what quality looks like*
- *Active engagement*
- *High stakes licensure process in Iowa – this became a good growth tool to develop skills*
- *A teacher can become tier 3 at anytime – there is a level of informality*
- *Do we have any idea how many tier 3s happen throughout the year? What happens with them?*
- *How many districts are using the model to fidelity?*
- *What are the problems we are trying to fix? What do we need to do differently that we aren't in the current model?*
- *This is the charge by legislature – review current and recommend changes*
- *What are others doing to implement 2012 requirements?*
  - *Teachers in PLC are asked to be observed and observe everyone in their PLC – documented via Google Doc*

- o *Not evaluation, but conversation – giving feedback*
- o *How have districts built in collaborative time?*
- *Mr. Darnall shared Teacher Evaluation Data*
- *No common report provided to the State – BOEE faces challenges, b/c they do not receive data*
- *Waukee District – added to evaluation system with rubrics, models, etc.*
- *Keep large and small districts in mind – keep it manageable*
- *Evaluations must be meaningful*
- *Is the system meeting your needs? Is how it is being implemented meeting your needs?*
- *Written and verbal feedback more valuable than checkmark*
- *Southeast Polk – Peer Observations are not required, but it is encouraged – just beginning, very new process*
- *Get more out of a walkthrough form than an evaluation form – not sure that is a good thing*
- *Walkthroughs validate daily practice – my teachers want me in their classroom every week – you have to build a trust relationship with your evaluator for it to be meaningful*
- *What are the important pieces for teachers? Teachers want feedback – it is crucial*
- *Walkthroughs are formative and every three-year is summative*
- *Evaluations can be very powerful for improvement - we can create a process, but if we don't follow through with implementation it doesn't matter*
- *Before we make any jumps, we need to evaluate is the system broken or the implementation?*
- *What is a fair means of monitoring implementation?*

Extending the Work:	1:30 – 3:00			
• Establish a chair person to facilitate future meetings of the Council • Establish a timeline for the work and future meeting dates • Establish the best means for communicating and documenting the work (i.e., Google site, email, etc.)		Jon Sheldahl & Byron Darnall	Index cards	Agreed upon process for selecting the chairperson
• *It was moved, seconded, and approved that Dr. Jon Sheldahl be the Chair* • *Meeting Dates – a Doodle poll will be sent out with available dates* •				
Clear Next Steps:	3:00-3:30			Review Parking Lot questions that are yet to be answered but did not align with the work of the day
• Review any unanswered questions in parking lot and intended outcomes • Gauge clarity of goals leading to next		Jon Sheldahl & Byron Darnall		

meeting • Ending activity: "I used to think and now I think"				
• *How are we going to keep people informed about this council? Posted on DE website and social media* • *Prioritize the next steps of work*				