



Commission on Educator Leadership and Compensation Meeting Notes

Date: November 12, 2013

Time: 10:00 AM to 2:30 PM

Location: Grimes State Office Building

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jeff Anderson, Molly Boyle, Tom Downs, Kevin Ericson, Ray Feuss, Patti Fields, Paul Gausman, Mary Jo Hainstock, Donna Huston, Todd Louwagie, Diane Pratt, Victoria Robinson, Dan Smith, Paula Vincent, Denny Wulf, Mary Jane Cobb. Georgia Van Gundy

AGENDA ITEM: Welcome and Reintroductions

Expected Outcome	Lead	Follow Up
	Peter and Ryan	

Notes: Peter and Ryan reviewed the Commission Meetings and Topics Timeline.

Peter led Commission members in an “ice-breaker” activity that had five small groups focusing on what things a favorite teacher did to most influence them. Reporting-out resulted in consensus on the following characteristics: building relationships and having high expectations.

AGENDA ITEM: Feedback from Commission Members

Expected Outcome	Lead	Follow Up
Feedback on what Commissioners are hearing in the field	Peter	Peter took possession of documents from each small group relative to needed additions to the FAQs. Those suggestions will need to be evaluated and incorporated. Please see below.

Notes:

Teacher Leadership and Compensation (TLC) Planning Process: consensus feedback was that the planning grant application process was easier than had been expected. Commission members also shared themes/issues that they were hearing in the field. These included:

1. The importance of having a solid selection and review process.
2. The concern that good applications may not be funded during the first year.

3. Question about whether or not technology is a legitimate use of TLC funds.
4. Concerns about impact on small districts.
5. Lack of clarity on what the Department is doing to help those smaller districts in the planning process.
6. Concerns about the details of the planning process and the selection criteria.
7. Being equipped to manage the push-back that will certainly occur when Commissioners made judgments about which districts are selected and which districts are not selected in the first round of applications.
8. Concern that the timeline is not long enough.
9. Concern that the rubric will give enough guidance to districts.
10. Concern that there may not be enough qualified people available for hiring for TLC coverage purposes.

TLC System FAQs: Each small group reviewed the FAQ document and provided additional questions for possible inclusion in the next iteration of the FAQ.

Potential additional FAQs generated by the small groups:

1. What kinds of support can I expect from my AEA?
2. How can districts build these leadership positions into their staffing structure?
3. What are the deadlines for this process?
4. What information have legislators been given to follow the TLC process?
5. Modification to TLC plans: Can the plans of early implementers be modified? If so, how would districts do so?
6. Can/should a district give preferential treatments/placements to bargaining unit members?
7. Provide additional clarification of the last FAQ dealing with TLC funding being used to pay for administrative positions.
8. Provide additional specificity about how TLC funds may be used, e.g., a specific list of what can be spent on what. Can TLC funds be use to pay for mileage?
9. Provide additional clarity on the hiring of a teacher leader into a shared position and how the requirement that the teacher must work for the district for one year applies.
10. Will districts be given feedback if TLC plan is not accepted?
11. What are the responsibilities of the planning committee and the selection/recommendation committee?
12. May a teacher leader serve more than one school building?
13. Who will be the trainers for AEAs and institutions of higher education to provide the knowledge and skills to help build teacher leader capacity?

AGENDA ITEM: Review of and Feedback on Teacher Leadership and Compensation (TLC) Application Review Process

Expected Outcome	Lead Ryan	Follow Up
------------------	--------------	-----------

Notes: Ryan distributed the following documents: (1) *Changes to Application and Rubric Following September Commission Meeting*; (2) *Teacher Leadership and Compensation (TLC) Plan Application*; (3) *TLC Scoring Rubric*. He then reviewed the content of the documents.

Questions and Feedback from Commissioners:

Question regarding the final date by which no further changes will be made to the Application Scoring Rubric; early December thought to be likely date

Commission Scoring of Applications: Options suggested to the Commissioners who were ask to focus on the integrity of the process

Option 1 – Scoring teams that would score holistically entire application; applications would be divided up and assigned to a team

Option 2 – Scoring pairs of Commissioners assigned one specific aspect of each application; have expertise in specific area but perhaps loose the holistic overview

Additional options suggested by small groups:

First small group – “Lean” is toward Option 1 over Option 2 because of holistic nature

Option 3 from first small group – Divide Commission into three groups of scorers

Second small group – “Lean” toward Option 2 if there are a large number of applications

Third small group – “Lean” toward Option 2; make it explicit that each section has to stand on its own and not reference another section; addition of an application abstract available to each pair would be helpful

Fourth small group – “Lean” toward Option 2; would want an abstract for each application available to each pair of Commissioners.

Additional Concern – Two Commission members suggested that the rubric should suffice and providing for additional comments might weaken the imperative to have completely shared standards.

All commission members agreed that each scoring pair have access to a one-page abstract of each application, which Peter agreed to add to the application.

AGENDA ITEM: How do we assure diversity of districts in first year implementation?

Expected Outcome	Lead Ryan	Follow Up
------------------	------------------	-----------

Notes:

Ryan reviewed the three potential options outlined in a previous meeting of the Commission.

Option 1 – Let the scores determine which districts are selected in the first year. The top-scoring districts representing one-third of the state student population would be selected.

Option 2 – After scoring of applications, the Department would make judgments to assure balance by district size, district demographics, geography, etc.

Option 3 – After scoring of the applications, a cut score would be established to identify the districts that are qualified and those qualified districts are placed into a lottery. The lottery would be implemented until one-third of the student population is reached.

Group 1 – Could not reach consensus; some “lean” toward a variation of Option 2

Group 2 – Also difficulty in reaching consensus; some “lean” toward a variation of Option 2

Group 3 – “Lean” toward a variation of Option 2

Group 4 – Selected Option 1; wants the “top” scoring districts to be selected no matter what

AGENDA ITEM: Preparing the Annual Report

Notes:

Peter led discussion of expectations for the annual report to the General Assembly.

Suggestions from the Commissioners on what to highlight in the annual report:

- All districts applied for the initial planning grant. (cited by more than one group)
- Commission anticipates a high number of districts submitting an application for the 2014-2015 school year.
- The timeline was a challenge for the Commission.
- The Department has done a great job of working within the timeline.
- The scoring rubric was of very high quality.
- Look for legislative support to frontload funding if there is a high number of quality applications in the first year.
- Highlight the grant application questions and the rubric used to assess those applications.
- How the Department and Commission worked with the AEAs and how the AEAs are supporting the work.
- The need for training for teacher leaders and principals.
- The Commission’s struggle with equity, diversity, and fairness in granting TLC awards.
- The General Assembly needs to know that without an assessment that aligns with the Iowa Core, it will be difficult or impossible to know if the TLC structure is positively impacting student achievement.