

Commission on Educator Leadership and Compensation
November 26, 2019
2 p.m.
Minutes

Members Present: Mary Jane Cobb, Deb Barry, Roark Horn, Lisa Bartusek, Mike Beranek, Matt Townsley, Paul Gausman, Judy Zeka, Joan Corbin, Catherin Parmerlee, Tara Irwin, Jim Green, Jeff Orvis, Kevin Ericson

Members Absent: Diane Pratt, Jeff Herzberg, Mary Jo Hainstock, Doug Wheeler

2:00 p.m. Welcome with introductions and sharing of data they have heard about TLC:

The focus of this meeting will be on the role of the Commission on Educator Leadership and Compensation (CELC) members and how to share out data.

2:15 p.m. Purpose of CELC with discussion

CELC shall monitor, with fidelity, the implementation of the TLC systems by school districts. They shall also monitor the expenditures of moneys for the TLC purpose.

Ryan Wise shared information regarding House File (HF) 215. He used this to highlight the purpose and focus of the CELC as per the original HF 215, which intentionally spelled out the make-up and role of the CELC.

The first three years, the CELC focused solely on the application and selection process for the Teacher Leadership system. Wise briefly described the scoring process. When that scoring process ended, the role of the CELC shifted to a different role (read from HF 215). Monitoring the implementation of the TLC has become the focus now. The big ideas were to look at the data that would point to fidelity of implementation: are districts doing what they set out to do and what has the impact been of those efforts. Look at what we don't and what is still needed. What are needed resources to help us gather and analyze data?

A member stated that it is critical that we see that programs are implemented with fidelity; even fidelity around our state's evaluation system. TLC is too important and too big of an investment for this CELC to not insure the law (HF 215) is being followed as it was written. Also, accountability is both monitoring with fidelity and using that information to make adjustments to know where needs might be regarding capacity; have seen some exciting things (i.e., instructional framework).

2:30 p.m. Review of data to help measure implementation

Data sources to review / what we learn from each source.

Student achievement data from End of Year Report

Desk audit shows self-reported data from districts at the end of the year.

Q: If a district is unmet, will there be an opportunity to go back and add in data?

A: Hard to do that because data is already out there; 58% met or mostly met their student achievement goal (up 2% from previous year).

Member conversation:

Look at not only the percentage of districts who fall into a reported level, but also the number of students served within a district. This provides a different picture of information.

All districts' goals are different and on a different timeline; not met yet may not mean the goals have not been met at all.

Framework implementation

Reinforcement that the four common frameworks are National Institute for Excellence in Teaching (NIET), Danielson, Authentic Intellectual Work (AIW), and Marzano while some districts are creating own plans, often hybrids.

Instructional Framework adoption is something we are watching; data point; not a goal or required in initial legislation.

Carry forward funding

How much allocation has been over last years. This data shows the remainder of the balance for each district. Balances should be used to help support learning. Lora Rasey has been strategically contacting schools to help support them in spending down their balances in support of school improvement initiatives.

Ryan Wise wrote a blog wherein he highlighted the fund balances and linked to appropriate documents.

Discussion around target for unspent balances.

Suggested no more than 15%. Timing is an important issue because budgets are not known many times until after plans are set. Legislature makes decision after budget has been done and can be burden on funding; superintendent perspective concern is if funding is cut after positions have been filled; keep reserves; security makes it easier to spend down; stick to 15% as it gives latitude and sustainability of TLC in districts.

Targets that are a focus of superintendents; also, turnover may have an impact on the spending/funds for new training of new people once current leaders return to the classroom.

Group decided not to set a hard target, but provide a guideline, as guidelines are reinforcing a local decision; some districts have good reasons for higher balance; be thoughtful about how we word this.

Suggestion in this CELC's report; put in graph about funding; continued discussion and monitoring as opposed to a hard and fast directive. Will also link to the TLC Use of Funding Guidance in the report.

Raising the percent target point, without a clear path forward about how to change it might be difficult for Legislature and we don't want that group to take steps around this CELC and scale back funding; which would then perpetuate people hanging on to money.

Percent of teacher leader positions

Reviewed data—looks good. Questions have been raised about the percentage and how to use the money disperse the funds.

Group Discussion:

Wondered about relationship/correlation between low percent and district size?

Counselors are often asked if they must have teacher license to receive TLC funds, the answer is yes.

Wondered about how many serve in multiple teacher leader roles.

Percent is about 27% of teachers in leadership roles statewide; individual teachers not double counted for multiple leadership roles; legislation cited good faith effort to reach 25 percentage.

Wondered if we track over time those who are less than 25%; could lead to dialogue with district; consistent patterns of behavior.

Some interested in data on length of time in positions; some folks have been doing this a long period of time; rotation is important; would this be in BEDS document? This is a fundamental element of the TLC.

The group was reminded that some data cannot be asked to collect based on legislation from a couple of years ago. We are at the edges of what we ask for at this time.

Agreed to look at ways to ask in a nonobtrusive, general, position information (i.e., x percentage of our teachers have been in position for x years); as opposed to specific BEDS formatted information. CELC would find this information beneficial.

Turnover information is valuable for decisions around professional development and content new teacher leaders would need.

Also valuable as an element of a fluid system as opposed to a ladder structure; many people do not leave positions, which deflates the purpose of the fluid system.

Visiting around state; focusing on how TLCs are going; met with several who have said they would not apply for the leadership if they knew that they had to return to the classroom; also interested in how many people move to administrator positions because of this.

School Administrators of Iowa (SAI) talks to programs throughout the state; they see districts growing their own from the leadership. SAI will ask about teacher leadership background of new administrators in January.

At the University of Northern Iowa administrator preparation programs, a large majority of candidates are in some type of teacher leadership role, fully or partially released.

Transition and turnover may be the result of those going on to administration programs.

Reminder to consider complexity of people moving in and out of leadership roles; consider a focus group to become informed about what may be asked to gather data points.

Plan change data

Lora Rasey reviewed data; chart (2015-present).

Teacher leadership roles need to be celebrated; as they are changing to meet district needs.

Need to focus on improved goals/measurements of success (part 8).

Group Discussion:

Good to see that districts are doing things differently than just the original models in the legislation. Great that districts realize they can do things differently; make it their own.

Love creativity; highlight innovative roles that districts have created in the CELC report; great to use money to meet real needs in their schools.

Processed 981 requests for change. Most of these are plan refinements and are positive as they indicate more that districts are thoughtful and resources are focused (i.e., curriculum) to meet local needs. Increase in teacher leaders with targeted roles such as curriculum, behavior, at-risk, literacy, etc.

Districts are not using money the same regardless of effectiveness; districts are striving for improvement over time.

Any data we did not cover that we should look at?

Group Discussion:

Data piece they would like is percentage of teacher leaders that are self-identified ethnic minorities; what do our teacher leaders look like; is there an equity issue that we need to look at?

Possibly on BEDS as per folder number, may need to see what that collection could look like.

Going back to changes, a district had two instructional coaches; one left and the teachers were told they lost money/funding and must reduce instructional coaches from two to one; took three teachers and gave stipend to make up instructional coach position that one position left. Wondered about that example.

Clarified based on open-enrollment out or declining enrollment the district could be losing TLC funds. A question on requests for changes is that if the district has worked on the change request with their TLC site-based team.

Some discussion continued regarding the evaluation element and assuring that coaching is not teacher evaluation.

3:15 p.m. Review of State End of Year Report from 2018-2019

Lora Rasey highlighted the End of Year Report.

CELC will submit one report that combines 2019 and a summary of three years or more of data.

CELC wants the reports to be simple to understand but still have depth and use meaningful data.

On overall findings, student achievement continues to improve but if a legislator looks at this year's Iowa Statewide Assessment for Student Progress (ISASP) scores, will they understand that finding?

The Department of Education (Department) will focus on overall findings; ISASP is whole new test; entire bar has been reset; framing must be clear.

3:40 p.m. Review of the CELC 2018 Annual Report

Ideas/feedback for the CELC Report

[Report](#)

The group addressed question about content and style. A team google doc was completed around these questions. The responses will be used to write the report.

What works well?

Idea for changes?

Strength areas?

Continuing the work?

4:10 p.m. School Administrators of Iowa update on Administrator Support Program

Roark Horn shared background with the group, and history over years of the program.

Overtime around 750 administrators have been served.

Now this is the final year. It is time to focus on different work at SAI, around equity. SAI has done a great job with this work.

The Department will discuss how we could possibly share the curriculum content that was developed by the Department along with New York City Leadership Academy, with principal preparation programs.

4:20 p.m. Update on Iowa Instructional Framework

[Information](#)

Lora Rasey updated the CELC on the ongoing work of the Iowa Instructional Framework

4:30 p.m. Next steps and next meeting

Lora Rasey will send out a Doodle Poll to look for a late February date.

4:45 p.m. Adjourn