# Council on Educator Development Minutes

**Date:**
Tuesday, April 15
10 am – 3:30 pm

**Location:**
Iowa Department of Education,
East 14th Street, Des Moines, IA B100

**Task Force Members:**
Tom Buckmiller, Drake University; Dave Versteeg, Montezuma CSD; Byron Darnall, Department of Education; Michelle Lettington, Waukee CSD; JoAnne Tubbs, Board of Educational Examiners; Thomas Downs, Iowa Association of School Boards; Jon Sheldahl, Great Prairie AEA; Tammy Wawro, Iowa School Education Association; Dan Smith, School Administrators of Iowa; Bev Smith, Urban Eight Network; J.D. Cryer, University of Northern Iowa; Jimmy Casas, Bettendorf CSD; Carol Farver, Newton CSD; Elaine Baughman, Harlan CSD; Joel Illian, Pekin CSD; Derek Schulte, Southeast Polk CSD; Billy Strickler, Fairfield CSD; Patty Link, Parent Robin Trimble-White, Grandview University; Joe Judge, Albia CSD; Patti Roush, Dennison CSD; Herman Quirmbach, State Senator, Ames*; Amy Sinclair, State Senator, Wayne*; Ron Jorgensen, State Representative, Sioux City*; Cindy Winckler, State Representative, Davenport*

*Non-voting member

**Overall charge of the Task Force:**
A Council on Educator Development is established to conduct a study and make recommendations regarding the following: a) a statewide teacher evaluation system and performance review requirements, b) a statewide administrator evaluation system. The goal of the study shall be 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 shall receive input from teachers, administrators, and evaluators regarding educators’ personal experiences with evaluations.

**Chairperson:** Jon Sheldahl
**Technical Assistance:** Byron Darnall
**Recorder:** Jennifer Woodley

**Intended Outcomes of this meeting:**
By the conclusion of the meeting we will:
1. Link past evaluation experiences to current and/or future evaluation experiences
2. Construct a basic understanding of Evaluator Approval Training in Iowa
3. Analyze data regarding previous Evaluator Approval Training
4. Examine national literature around evaluation systems
5. Consider work team options
6. Preview May 27th meeting & future meeting dates
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity:</th>
<th>Time:</th>
<th>Person(s) Responsible</th>
<th>Materials Needed</th>
<th>Need to do:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Connector:** Welcome and Overview  
Review of charge to the group; role of guests and observers.  
Protocol: Introduce any new members joining for the first time; positive reflections from Iowa’s work in education  
Assess effectiveness of Google site, minutes, documents, communication etc.  
Housekeeping—restrooms, reimbursement forms, future meeting dates. | 10 – 10:15 | Byron Darnall |  | 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. |
| **Presenters:**  
Matt Ludwig  
**Topic:**  
Qualified Evaluator Training | 10:15 – 10:45 | Byron Darnall | Chart paper  
3x5 cards  
Markers |  
**As an evaluatee, evaluator, or an observer of the evaluation process, identify the components of the evaluation process that you value or valued the most?**  
• Write on a 3x5 card  
• Share components using the Save the Last Word for Me protocol  
• Generate a public list to be referred through this session  
What is in Chapter 284 (Teacher Performance, Compensation & Career Development), Chapter 284A (Administrator Quality) & Chapter 83 (Teacher and Administrator Quality Programs)  
-Use a Talk-Aloud strategy |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:00 – 11:20</td>
<td><strong>Handout – Timeline, participants, content, practices, etc.</strong></td>
<td><strong>A Framework for Understanding the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SAI Framework</strong></td>
<td><strong>Iowa Professional Development Model</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Note-taking for Think-Pair-Share</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:20 – 11:40</td>
<td>Data sets&lt;br&gt;Data Analysis Template:&lt;br&gt;1. What do you notice when you look at these data?&lt;br&gt;2. What additional questions do these data generate?&lt;br&gt;3. What additional data is needed?</td>
<td><strong>History of Evaluator Approval in Iowa</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Where did evaluator approval start?&lt;br&gt;• Whose work/study supports these evaluation practices?&lt;br&gt;• Level I training – What did it involve?&lt;br&gt;• Level II training – What did it involve?&lt;br&gt;• Level III (Assessing Academic Rigor) – What did it involve?&lt;br&gt;• iEvaluate – What did it involve?&lt;br&gt;<strong>Think-Pair-Share</strong>&lt;br&gt;What comparisons did you note? How does it fit with what was identified in the beginning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:40 – Noon</td>
<td><strong>Data Study</strong>&lt;br&gt;A. Evaluator II (June 2008)&lt;br&gt;B. Evaluation Survey – Principals (2009 &amp; 2014)&lt;br&gt;C. Evaluation Survey – Superintendents (2008 &amp; s2014)&lt;br&gt;<strong>Work in small groups and lead Council participants through various data points.</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Professional recommendations – Cognitive coaching, instructional coaching, re-think the conventional model – collaborative inquiry approach (Marshall’s article) &amp; continuation of an online approach</strong>&lt;br&gt;Question &amp; Answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Matt Ludwig walked the committee thru an activity aimed to create consistency and direction around valued components of an evaluation system.
  o Discussion (pre-evaluation conversation – professional conversation)
  o Goal Setting (next steps, monitoring, continuing discussions)
  o Planning (on part of teacher & evaluator)
  o Self-Reflection
  o Providing Focus
  o Culture (safe environment)
  o Feedback (authenticity, rapport)
  o Shared Learning
  o Trust & Confidence in Evaluator
• Another activity compared a sampling of Iowa teachers & administrators who participated in the 2009 & 2014 Evaluation Survey
  o Annual review of Individual Plan
  o 2014 – Felt student achievement data should be included
  o Law changed for summative evaluation annually
• A-ha’s
  o Evaluator Training needs to continue to become more differentiated for each group
  o 13 percent of evaluators to get summative evaluations
  o Professional conversations is a recurring discussion – currently, principals write the plan and give it to superintendent
  o Feedback to Principals is minimal compared to Teachers
  o Level of understanding – need to make sure the basic understandings of standards is consistent
  o Based upon Principals saying what changed their practice the most was conversations and coaching – continue to enhance skills around coaching and feedback.
  o What do administrators need to do this with more fidelity?
  o Does is really matter what system it is? It still comes down to district decision and fidelity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lunch</th>
<th>Noon - 12:30</th>
<th>Lunch on-site</th>
<th>Refuel/Calibrating/Housekeeping Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion over readings:</td>
<td>12:30-2:00</td>
<td>Jon Sheldahl</td>
<td>Articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Document:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creating a Comprehensive System for Evaluating and Supporting Effective Teaching (Darling-Hammond &amp; Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Documents from Hanover Research Reports:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Best Practices for Including Multiple Measures in Teacher Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lunch
Noon - 12:30
Discussion over readings:
Primary Document:
  • Creating a Comprehensive System for Evaluating and Supporting Effective Teaching (Darling-Hammond & Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education)

Lunch on-site
12:30-2:00
2:00-3:00
Refuel/Calibrating/Housekeeping Items

Articles
Group A-Executive Summary, Sections 1, 2, & 3
Tom Buckmiller
Dave Versteeg
Michelle Lettington
JoAnne Tubbs
Tom Downs
Tammy Wawro
Bev Smith
Robin Trimble-White
Joe Judge
Amy Sinclair
Cindy Winckler
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What would be a “now what” for Iowa’s Evaluation System?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Continue to move/change as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Find system to bring new people on board with foundation of skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Need better data – no systematic, longitudinal view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Create continuum around leadership standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pay attention to alignment and TLC/MTSS assessments in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Are these things being set into administrator training programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Periodic 360 piece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Academic Rigor – coaching piece for superintendents (Leadership Development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Differentiation for teacher evaluations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Educator Development**
- Standards – ITASC & INTASC
  - Formative & Summative
    - What are they talking about?
    - Rubrics
    - Evaluation
    - TLC
    - Reflection
    - Performance
- Training? Evaluating? Teachers?
- Talent Development – training?

**Linda Darling-Hammond Discussion**
**Group 1**
- Learning goals align for students
- What are the standards that we agree with to move forward
- Tiered System of Evaluation (three tier system might be more appropriate)
- National Board Certification Assessment – would like a presentation/more information
- Peer review

---

**Group B-Executive Summary, Sections 4, 5, & Conclusion**
Dan Smith
J.D. Cryer
Jimmy Casas
Carol Farver
Elaine Baughman
Joel Illian
Derek Schulte
Billy Strickler
Patty Link
Patti Roush
Herman Quirmbach
Ron Jorgensen
- Not supportive of value-added measures
- Pg. 29 – Massachusetts system (possible Skype/distance presentation – new system) JoAnn Tubbs will make a connection

**Group 2**
- Standards History
- Value-added measures
- Spoke about components, just haven’t pulled them together
- What might happen if we change the standards?

*Volunteers for the smaller committee to create a Structural Framework for the report in late June:*
- Joel Illian
- Dave Versteeg
- Elaine Baughman
- Michelle Lettington
- Tammy Wawro
- Dan Smith

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>BREAK if Necessary</strong></th>
<th>2:00 – 2:10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future Agenda Planning</strong></td>
<td>2:20-2:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clear Next Steps:</strong></td>
<td>2:45-3:00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Next meeting is May 27 at School Administrators of Iowa
- Fall Dates – we will send a Doodle out for dates