



Commission on Educator Leadership & Compensation

Meeting Notes

Date: January 21, 2014

Time: 10:00 AM to 2:30 PM

Location: Grimes State Office Building, Room B100

MEMBERS PRESENT: Tom Downs, Mary Jane Cobb, Paul Gausman, Todd Louwagie, Mike Beranek, Donna Lee Huston, Diane Pratt, Kevin Ericson, Dan Smith, Paula Vincent, Molly Boyle, Ray Feuss, Brenda Garcia, Denny Wulf, Jeff Anderson, Mary Jo Hainstock, Georgia Van Gundy, Ryan Wise

MEMBERS ABSENT: Patti Fields, Victoria Robinson

STAFF PRESENT: Peter Ansingh, Phil Wise, Byron Darnall, Larry Bice, Marietta Rives, Rhonda Ketels, Melissa Schnurr, Isbelia Arzola, Penny Milburn

AGENDA ITEM: Welcome and Review Norms
Feedback from Commission Members

Expected Outcome	Lead	Follow Up
	Peter Ansingh	

Notes: Welcome and Review Norms

- Peter Ansingh asked Commission members to reintroduce themselves and to share “One Word” that describes how they are feeling about their role in the Teacher Leadership and Compensation System now that the application deadline is about two weeks away (January 31). Comments were generally positive with “apprehension,” “excited,” and “anxious” (all in a positive sense) expressed most frequently.
- Ansingh shared the results of the group’s last review of the Commission Norms. He asked them to work in small groups to share thoughts about the Norms that had been identified to monitor. There was some concern expressed that the Commission members needed to continue to speak with one voice, especially to legislators and policymakers.

Notes: Feedback from Commission Members

- The Commission members continued to work in small groups to share feedback from the field regarding the Teacher Leadership and Compensation System.
- There was some apprehension about whether the promised funding would continue to be provided, but an acknowledgement that the subject was beyond the role and purview of the Commission.

- One group thought the Commission needed a research partner. Hearing some concern from the field about sustainability; the application assumes the money will be there in perpetuity.
- Not everyone in the field understands the limitations for what the funding can be used for.
- Because the number of characters are limited in the application, there was some concern that the applications might not be as complete as possible. In the application, there is no reason to repeat the same thing in the narrative and in a table/chart/graph. The system does not allow for links within the application. A number of concerns were expressed about the specific details and processes of the application.

AGENDA ITEM: TLC Application Review and Scoring Process – A Scoring Practice Session

Expected Outcome	Lead	Follow Up
An agreement of how Commission members understand the rubric.	Peter Ansingh Ryan Wise	Ansingh needs a copy of the drop-down menu document from each of the scoring teams ASAP.

Notes:

- Ansingh divided the Commission members into scoring pairs and provided samples from their part of the TLC application. Commission members worked in three rounds to review, score, and discuss the sample TLC application parts and developed the drop-down comments that will be shared with applicants.
- Most pairs felt comfortable with the review and scoring process. Most teams were comfortable with the drop-down comments.
- Need to make sure any clarifying comments to a district reflect the rubric that was used to score an application; it would be problematic if comments were added that were not connected to the scoring rubric.
- Districts need to be able to understand why they received the score that they did; what they get back should help them improve an application that was not approved and funded.

Notes:

- Ryan Wise reviewed a proposal for finalizing paired scoring; the goal is to get the scores from the two partners to a single score reported to the district.
 - If an application comes from a district that the Commission member is affiliated with, then they cannot be involved in the scoring. In that case, only one person will do the scoring.
 - The Commission will use the IowaGrants system to score; each group will send their spreadsheet a day before the next Commission meeting.
 - In the mechanics of the scoring system, the Commission is doing work that is unique to the IowaGrants system.

AGENDA ITEM:

Expected Outcome	Lead	Follow Up
Commission members consider a process to recommend school districts to the DE for funding.	Ryan Wise Peter Ansingh	Final plans will be made at the February 18 Commission meeting.

Notes:

- Wise presented a proposal to the Commission on how they would make the final selection of school districts to be funded for the 2014-15 school year. As has been previously discussed, it involves a cut score to qualify and then a geographic/ demographic distribution to ensure representation from across the state and representation of various size school districts.
- The consensus of the Commission members was to make the final determination on the selection process at their February 25 meeting. This will allow the DE to share a final summary of the scores received by the school districts that applied and what different scenarios regarding location and size might look like.

AGENDA ITEM:

Expected Outcome	Lead	Follow Up
Commission members understand expectations for the February CELC meetings.	Ryan Wise	

Notes:

- The focus of the February 18 meeting will be to resolve any discrepancies between the scoring pairs on the final score for their respective part of the application.
- The February 25 meeting will focus on selecting the school districts recommended by the Commission on Educator Leadership and Compensation to the Department for funding.