



# Commission on Educator Leadership & Compensation

## Meeting Notes

**Date:** April 22, 2014

**Time:** 10:00 AM to 3:00 PM

**Location:** SAI (12199 Stratford Dr; Clive)

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mary Jane Cobb, Paul Gausman, Todd Louwagie, Mike Beranek, Donna Huston, Diane Pratt, Kevin Ericson, Dan Smith, Paula Vincent, Molly Boyle, Ray Feuss, Brenda Garcia- Van Auken, Denny Wulf, Jeff Anderson, Mary Jo Hainstock, Victoria Robinson, Patti Fields Ryan Wise

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Tom Downs, Georgia Van Gundy

**STAFF PRESENT:** Byron Darnall, Brad Buck

**AGENDA ITEM:** Welcome and Updates on System Implementation

Expected Outcome	Lead	Follow Up
Reflections on TLC System Implementation	Ryan	Peter will compile the feedback.

**Notes:** Welcome and Updates

Ryan Wise welcomed the Commission members and began the meeting by sharing a PowerPoint with overview of the TLC process to date and current data update.

- Statistical analysis of applications by districts (size by enrollment)
- Why were smaller schools less likely to apply and less likely to be accepted?
- What about the larger districts that scored above the cut score but did not get selected?
- We expected there to be noise, natural outcome.
- The DE has received more concern about the lack of selection of smaller districts.
- However, the Commission’s process was extremely fair.

**Notes:** Feedback from Commission Members

- I feel our process was fair, but it was interesting to hear the local districts around me provide feedback on the districts selected.
- Ultimately disappointing that some districts became competitive with their neighbor districts.
- Would like to be pushing for more funding and compacting the 3-yr legislative timeline.

- It would be interesting to know how many districts just did not feel qualified to apply or if they did not apply because the timing was not right.
- Some blowback about level of assistance provided by AEAs. Seems to be a sentiment that Heartland's assistance exceeded others.
- Some smaller districts felt the money was not worth the effort it would take to write a competitive proposal.
- Mathematically they should at least double the number of districts from this year.
- Probably need to do a better job of marketing on our end.
- Just want to get at the issue of implementation; maybe not right now, but important issue.
- Do we know how many districts used grant writers? Probably misguided thoughts about districts that did or did not and any connection to using a grant writer.
- How do we help get good things happening for kids and avoid the negative feedback?
- Let's make sure we maintain our identity as defined in legislation.
- Is it even our role to be advocates for changes in the process (i.e., changing the funding mechanism)?
- There is a set avenue for input in the annual report due by September 15, 2014. It says the taskforce shall recommend changes, improvements, etc.
- Might behoove this group to get more active with legislators (example of Iowa Reading Research Center)

Ryan added:

- Support to school districts in planning and implementation.
- Really working to be transparent and keep information on DE web site up-to-date (scores on applications, districts' applications, exemplars)
- Planning FAQ & Implementation FAQ
- Districts are asking for feedback on their applications if they were not chosen; topic of discussion later today.
- Formed an on-going working group with major stakeholders to work on creating a system of support.
- Are all districts able to participate in professional development around TLC?
  - Yes, it is open to any district.
  - We need to make this clearer.

**AGENDA ITEM:** Review of the Scoring Process

Expected Outcome	Lead	Follow Up
A recommendation from the Commission to the Department possible changes to the TLC selection process	Ryan	Ryan will share the recommendations with Director Buck.

**Notes:** Engaged in table discussions about the Timeline:

- PPT has 3 options of timing (table discussions over timeline options)

- Four table groups (2 tables=option 1; 2 tables=option 2)
- If we are to learn from the Round 1 districts, will Option 1 really allow for this?
- Option 1 is difficult for a teacher's schedule with parent conference schedule.
- It will be either Option 1 or 2; if we cannot get consensus, will do it through the survey following the meeting.

Engaged in table discussions about the Scoring Process:

- How will the scoring process work?
- Will Commission score the same part of the application?
  - Groups say "yes" to keeping same parts
- Will cut score remain at 73?
  - Minimum should be 73, never go below, might go up, and probably should rise over time
  - Re-norm cut score because it will probably be higher
  - Think that it will probably raise itself; focus on quality not a number.
  - What about the district that makes the cut score twice and does not get in?
  - We can communicate that the cut score will not be lower than 73, but we will recalibrate the cut score for the next round.
  - You have to at least get a 73 to be considered.
  - Fist to Five vote shows support for the cut score of 73.
- Will the application and/or rubric change?
  - Improve the rubric based on what we know now
- If the question stays the same, will it be scored the same (i.e., Will a question that received a 7 in this round receive a 7 next time?)
  - Do we have to take former applications and next year's applications and review them to see if they are similar or different?
  - If we tweak the rubric then we might avoid this issue...improve the rubric.

Returned to the topic of timeline and took second vote on options:

- 4 for option 1, 7 for option 2 and 5 for other.

Engaged in table talks to discuss the questions around training and support:

- Talk turned to how long members are required to serve. Conversation around 3-yr term but not specified yet. Does not prohibit anyone from excusing themselves from the Commission.
- How can the DE best support you as you prepare to review applications and make recommendations?
  - Not looking for a lot of training, but want rubric to be tweaked and tightened with scoring expectations
  - Clarify rubric criteria
  - Very satisfied with partner process, consistent practice, bigger concern will be consistency and fairness leading into next scoring session
  - Take five random apps from last year and re-score and look for consistency and then re-norm
  - Place application from Year 1 on site with the score for comparison when reapplying
  - From a management of the process linking back to former scores and apps might be problematic
  - Group raised concerns about remaining consistent with partner and need

- to prepare
  - What if we score differently for apps from the 1<sup>st</sup> round?
  - Have at least some connection to 1<sup>st</sup> round apps (touchstones for monitoring)
  - Should we allow first round districts that did not get selected the opportunity to lock in their score? Or rather keep the highest score?
  - We're talking about 1<sup>st</sup> round districts locking in individual parts, not the whole application.
  - What is the acceptable score for locking in; 7, 8, 9, 10?
- What type of training would be most helpful?
  - Largely approach to training last year worked well.
  - Let us get fresh eyes on old apps/scores and see if we are still scoring consistently.

Engaged in table talks to discuss the questions around district feedback.

- What type of feedback will districts receive in Round 2?
  - The ones that really need the feedback are those that do not meet the cut score.
  - Could the DE/AEAs provide some assistance to those districts?
  - How come you did not give us more details (comments from districts)?
  - What if a district scored a 5 or below gets feedback?
  - You have a volunteer Commission here; no time to provide the feedback, limited timeline; have a rubric.
  - Commission's role is not analogous to teacher-student role.
- Should the Commission provide individualized, written feedback?
  - Seems to be clear consensus to stick with how we have designed the process
  - Need to align the question and the rubric to ensure it comprehensible and consistent and then the drop-downs go away.
  - We know a lot more now so we can improve the questions and the rubric.
- Should the Commission use drop-down comments but align on the comments?
  - Part of our drop-down issue involves tech issues with number of characters.

Engaged in table talks to discuss the questions around System Evaluation:

- What are your ideas for how the Commission can fulfill this charge?
  - Section 8 required districts to have an evaluation plan.
  - How do we measure districts on the five main goals of TLC?
  - Are we to monitor what they said they would do in the plan? Or are we monitoring them for effectiveness/quality?
  - Are you doing the plan?
  - But with this big of an investment, we have a duty to examine impact
  - Should not we track any amendments to the plans that have been accepted?
  - Nothing in legislation that provided funding around evaluation
- How can the DE support this effort?
  - How much would it cost to RFP out the evaluation process?
  - If we do not do this well we will be missing a tremendous opportunity.
  - What does the law require in the evaluation?
  - Is it the Commission's job to judge quality or effectiveness?
  - Whose job is it to think about the quality piece?

- We are still grappling with the outcome?
- What is progress and what is not progress? Define progress; define ultimate outcome
- Are we plugging in Teacher and Admin prep programs into this process?

**AGENDA ITEM:** Next Steps and Timeline

Expected Outcome	Lead	Follow Up
Commission members understand the process that follows.	Ryan	Commission members will be given opportunities for feedback and will receive notifications as decisions are made.

**Notes:** Timeline and Next Steps

- What do you think are the big ideas and how much time do need around them?
- What do you need in order to get the Annual Report done?
  - Get it done early before November; September or early October

Group finished the day talking about completing the day’s agenda online. Ryan will send out items for group response.

Questions about whether or not face-to-face meeting is necessary for some of the scoring calibration activities.