



Commission on Educator Leadership & Compensation

Meeting Notes

Date: February 18, 2014

Time: 10:00 AM to 3:00 PM

Location: School Administrators of Iowa (SAI); Clive

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- Van Auken, Denny Wulf, Jeff Anderson, Mary Jo Hainstock, Patti Fields, Victoria Robinson, Ryan Wise

MEMBERS ABSENT: Georgia Van Gundy

STAFF PRESENT: Peter Ansingh, Byron Darnall, Marietta Rives, Jobi Lawrence, Janice Kuhl

AGENDA ITEM: Welcome and Feedback from Commission Members

Expected Outcome	Lead	Follow Up
Reflections on Scoring Share Common Experiences	Peter Ansingh	Peter will compile the feedback.

Notes: Welcome

- Peter Ansingh thanked the Commission members for their time commitment these past two weeks on reviewing and scoring the Teacher Leadership and Compensation applications. On top of their normal job and family responsibilities, many had to devote an equal amount of time to complete the task. Thank you.

Notes: Feedback from Commission Members

- Peter asked the Commission members to divide into groups of four with people other than their scoring partner to share feedback about the review and scoring process focusing on what worked well, what could be improved and any issues that might need to be addressed to assist in their role of recommending districts to the DE for entry into the Teacher Leadership and Compensation System
- Peter then asked each group to share some of what they talked about. Some of the comments included:
 - There was a general sense the rubrics worked well;
 - Having the Abstract/Executive Summaries were helpful; but, perhaps guidance could be given to districts in the future on potential required information; and
 - There were questions about how much information school districts would have regarding what scores and comments individual Commission members assigned to their application

Peter collected their feedback and will have it collated for the meeting in April.

AGENDA ITEM: Partner Work - Finalizing Scores

Expected Outcome	Lead	Follow Up
An agreement between scoring partners on their final score for each school district's application.	Peter Ansingh Ryan Wise	Peter will enter each team's scores onto a master spreadsheet.

Notes:

- Peter divided the Commission members into their scoring pairs with the directions to reconcile their scores by the end of the day. Guidelines were as follows:
 - if score is the same that is the score that is recorded as the final score;
 - if scores are one different, the higher score is recorded as the final score;
 - if scores are two different, then avg. score is recorded;
 - if scores are three or more apart, then conversation until consensus is reached or scores are within two.
- Scoring pairs worked on completing the spreadsheet for their part of the application. They were to submit those to Peter by the end of the day.

AGENDA ITEM: Group Discussion - Selection

Expected Outcome	Lead	Follow Up
Commission members understand the process to recommend school districts to the DE for funding.	Ryan Wise	Options will be made at the February 25 Commission meeting.

Notes:

- After lunch, Ryan Wise reviewed the process the DE would use to present a summary of the scores to the Commission at the February 25 meeting. A cut score and demographic characteristics (i.e. AEA, school district size) will be used to create different scenarios that will be shared with the Commission. School districts names will not be included in the information.
- Commission members were free to leave if they had completed their task; those that needed additional time continued to work in their scoring teams until they were finished.