



# Commission on Teacher Leadership & Compensation

## Meeting Notes

**Date:** September 24, 2013

**Time:** 10:00 – 3:00

**Location:** School Administrators of Iowa (SAI) Headquarters

### **MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Molly Boyle, Diane Pratt, Georgia Van Gundy, Paul Gausman, Ryan Wise (ex-officio), Brenda Garcia-Van Auken, Kevin Ericson, Todd Louwagie, Mike Beranek, Mary Jane Cobb, Ray Feuss, Dan Smith, Patti Fields, Donna Huston, Jeff Anderson, Denny Wulf, Peter Ansingh (facilitator)

### **MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:**

Tom Downs, Mary Jo Hainstock, Victoria Robinson

### **Non-Commission**

Byron Darnall (DE), Phil Wise (DE), D. T. Magee (BoEE Executive Director), Bridget Geodes (Senate Democratic Caucus Staff), Dave Epley (House Democratic Caucus Staff)

### **AGENDA ITEM: Welcome and Reintroductions; Vision and Norms for the Commission**

#### **Notes:**

Dr. Ansingh welcomed the Commission members and thanked them again for their service. Asked the group members to once again introduce themselves to the other members of the Commission. He then asked the members to work in their table groups to review the DRAFT CELC Vision Statement. They then reviewed the DRAFT CELC Norms and were asked which to keep, which to amend, and which to delete. The groups shared the following feedback:

Group 1 – a lot of need for defining terms; the vision is probably correct; vision must be inclusive of all schools in Iowa, i.e., even those schools that choose not to participate even though think all schools will want to be involved

Group 2 – wants “leadership” to be up-front; wants to know how Commission measures whether or not the vision statement is adhered to

Group 3 – wants collaborative part of this to involve everybody, not just the “teacher leaders”; how does the Commission define “student achievement”

Dr. Ansingh will send the next draft of both documents to the Commission members with the minutes from this meeting.

## **AGENDA ITEM: Feedback from Commission members on Planning Grant Process**

### **Notes:**

Dr. Ansingh outlined the planning grant process and shared updated information, including that 103 completed applications had been approved with another 100 in progress as of Monday.

Kevin Ericson inquired if it would be appropriate for Commissions to reach out to districts that have not started the process of applying for a Planning Grant; it was deemed to be appropriate, but the DE will lead that process of reaching out to nonresponsive districts

Mary Jane Cobb brought up the issue of whether or not there would be a conflict of interest if a Commissioner was personally involved in putting together a Planning Grant Application;

Superintendent Gausman made the point that the process must be so transparent that no one could raise a conflict of interest complaint. There was consensus that there would be no inherent conflict for a Commissioner to be on a district's local Planning Committee. There was also consensus that no Commissioner would be involved in evaluating an application from his/her own school district.

## **AGENDA ITEM: Review and Feedback of Draft Teacher Leadership and Compensation (TLC) Application/Rubric**

### **Notes:**

Dr. Wise reviewed the Key Components of the Plan (40%) and the Planning and Implementation Criteria (60%). He wanted to demonstrate the connection between the components and criteria.

As they reviewed the DRAFT document, he asked the Commissioners to focus on the first seven parts of the application and answer the following questions:

1. What are the strengths?
2. Are there items that are unclear?
3. What modifications or additions are needed?

Reporting-out of the small groups on Teacher Leadership and Compensation Plan Application:

**Part one** – was straight-forward and provided needed flexibility.

- Needed clarification that if people fit multiple roles on the planning committee
- Suggestion that the weighting was too great.

**Part two** -- Saw overlapping of part two and part four

- How does one define the "local context"? Describe the local context and how it will be factored in.

**Part three** – review each of the items in part three

- Item A – seemed fine to the groups
- Item B – define what is meant by "coherent instructional improvement strategy"
- Will we need a separate rubric for each of the three possible models, or should one

rubric suffice for all three?

-Item C – How do we define “effectiveness”?

-Want to make sure there is a rigorous selection process; people already in existing leadership roles in a district should not automatically slide into a new leadership role

-Item D – Some overlap with Part four

-We don’t want this to turn into a new “Phase III”

-Should this be linked to the Iowa Professional Development Model? Imbed a link.

**Part four** – this one connects back to Part two

-Should this be included into Part three, item D?

-The examples listed are not all required initiatives; make sure it is understood these are examples.

**Part five** – Make sure the roles are used professionally and not for any other reasons or purposes

-Needs to tie together state-level evaluation and local evaluation of effectiveness

-Are there things that we want to see measured? Are there measures other than student measures? (e.g. How does one prove that an instructional coach model works in improving student achievement?)

**Part six** – See if how we score this through the rubric can get us to sustainability in other ways?

-Does sustainability equate with available dollars? Sustainability should be more than merely funding, i.e., professional development.

-Should we substitute capacity for sustainability?

**Part seven** – Do we need to get into budget specifics? The plan, and not the budget, should be what the plan is judged upon.

-Is this merely an assurance, or do we want to get into the specific numbers what the district spends as part of the scoring process?

-The Commission should be able to track differences in implementation between districts that use a lot of the TLC money for minimum salaries as opposed to those who use little or none of the TLC money for minimum salaries.

### **AGENDA ITEM: Review of the Scoring Rubric**

**Notes:** Comments for Commission members regarding the Teacher Leadership and Compensation (TLC) Plan Application Scoring Rubric:

**Evidence Item 1:** There needs to be greater alignment between this line of the rubric and the corresponding part of the TLC Plan Application; thinks the last paragraph of the second column could be eliminated; shouldn’t there be some reward for districts that put in the time early in the planning process? Change “enthusiasm” to “support.”

**Evidence Item 2:** No change

**Evidence Item 3:** Why should there be more points be given if there were major overhauls to an application than merely tweaks? Should we try to “push” districts that already have good plans to develop even better plans? Should there be some credit for doing what a district is already doing?

**Evidence Item 4:** Are we looking for innovation for the sake of innovation? “Exemplary” is more important than “innovative;” this item is designed to reflect the legislative intent that there be “multiple” leadership roles; do the roles fit the “local context”? How do we understand and define “local context”? How well defined are the roles? They should be well defined.

**Evidence Item 5:** There should be an alignment of the measures of effectiveness with the goals of the plan; we should be measuring what the district said it was going to do; the district should be able to demonstrate how it supports the teacher leaders.

**Evidence Item 6:** The district should be able to demonstrate how it supports the teacher leaders through professional development; how do teachers’ Individual Learning Plans fit into this? Should they?

**Evidence Item 7:** Take out the number of district initiatives as articulated in the third column.

**Evidence Item 8:** In column three use “limited description” rather than “general description.”

**Evidence Item 9:** The question about sustainability remains. The joint partnership piece is not considered in the rubric. Should it be?

**Evidence Item 10:** Should this be included as an assurance or as a part of the scoring of the application? The Commission was evenly split on that question.

### **Additional Issues/Questions**

Dr. Wise led a conversation around the following questions: Should we intentionally factor location/geography, size, and student need (i.e., percentage of student on Free and Reduced Price Lunch) into the selection process? Do we make intentional scoring decision to assure diversity of those districts chosen? Or should we let the diversity come out as it comes out without any special consideration in scoring?

The Commissioners were asked to consider these questions and options for a future decision.

### **AGENDA ITEM: Next Steps**

#### **Notes:**

Dr. Ansingh outlined the next steps for the TLC System Application. After considering the Commissioners’ input, it will be released to the State as part of a webinar scheduled for Friday, October 4.

For our next meeting, the conversation will focus on how we will measure the effectiveness of the TLC System and what we will include in our CELC Report to the Legislature. We will also again be soliciting feedback from the field regarding the planning process. Meeting adjourned at

3pm. The next meeting of the Commission on Educator Leadership and Compensation is scheduled for Tuesday, November 12.