



Commission on Educator Leadership & Compensation

Meeting Notes

Date: September 24, 2014

Time: 10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Location: Grimes State Office Building Room B100

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mike Beranek, Molly Boyle, Kevin Ericson, Mary Jo Hainstock, Donna Huston, Diane Pratt, Dan Smith, Georgia Van Gundy, Paula Vincent, Denny Wulf, Ryan Wise

AGENDA ITEM: Vision and Norms

Feedback from the Field

Expected Outcome	Lead	Follow Up
	Peter Ansingh Ryan Wise	

Notes:

Peter had Commission members introduce themselves and share the highlight of their summer.

Vision Statement

Commission reaffirmed the Vision Statement.

Through the development and support of opportunities for teachers in schools and school districts statewide to learn from each other, we will positively impact student achievement, staff moral and school culture by ensuring quality instruction in every classroom.

Norms

Commission reaffirmed the Norms.

As members of the Commission on Educator Leadership and Compensation, we will ...

... make what is best for kids as the first priority.

... create an environment of trust and respect that values all opinions on the Commission by practicing active listening.

... try to stay open and balanced to different thoughts and ideas.

... speak with one voice based upon consensus reached by the Commission; clarity on messaging; develop talking points after each meeting.

... be an advocate for the teacher leadership and compensation system.

... focus on the long-term impacts (since the results may not be immediately evident).

... be a respectful Commission member by coming prepared, by being present while we are here, by being open to new ideas and by using technology to facilitate conversation (i.e. do not let technology become a distraction).

... stay focused on the whole system of public education.

... stay focused on our vision and our role as a Commission.

... start and end meetings on time.

Commission Responsibilities.

Peter led review of the four key responsibilities of Commission members.

1) Monitor implementation: "The commission shall monitor with fidelity the implementation of the frameworks and comparable systems by school districts pursuant to this section [284.15] and sections 284.16 and 284.17."

2) Evaluate and make recommendations on applications

3) Review the use and effectiveness of supplemental assistance to high need schools

4) Develop and submit an annual report by December 15

Feedback from the Field

The Commission broke into three groups to review the Iowa Teacher Leadership and Compensation System Evaluation Plan draft dated 09/23/14. The groups reported out the following points.

- Concerns expressed by some teachers about the highest performing teachers not being in the classroom.
- Some misinformation and lack of clarity exists on the sustainability of TLC funding.
- Difficulty in some districts in filling leadership positions. This experience varies by district with some districts unable to fill positions and other districts having competition for the leadership positions.
- The TLC System is still very new and districts are early in the implementation process.
- Question of how much an approved TLC plan can be modified before it has to come back to the Commission or the Director.
- Potential need for additional resources for the Department and the AEAs to facilitate the implementation of TLC.
- Need for demonstration of best practice among districts with approved TLC plans.
- Important that districts build cohesion among all initiatives and that teacher leadership is leveraged to ensure coherence and effective implementation.
- There are still challenges in the implementation of the new leadership positions. What is described in the approved plan does not automatically translate into what the roles look like in practice.
- Need clarity on how we are going to evaluate the effectiveness of the TLC system.
- Still some grumbling that enough small districts did not get selected in the first round.
- Concern among small districts that when larger districts hire additional teachers as part of its TLC plan it becomes more difficult for small districts to hire top candidates.
- Overall the attitude about TLC is very positive, but there are some very small districts that still don't see how they can become a part of the TLC system.
- There have been challenges with the timeline both for selecting and training teacher leaders for districts implementing TLC plans in year one.

- Extended planning time in year two has been helpful for school districts that did not have an approved plan in year one.
- Some teachers who were already in leadership roles see the rigorous selection process as a “hoop” to jump through, which may make some teachers less likely to apply for leadership positions.
- Districts have found it helpful this year to have the additional planning resources provided by the Department (i.e. all of the approved plans and the “exemplars” for each section of the application for both large and small districts).
- Some small schools are concerned that the requirement to raise the minimum salary to \$33,500 will make it difficult to implement the other components of the plan. Solutions for very small school districts in addressing challenges aren’t readily apparent.
- Overall very positive feedback in the field toward TLC; viewed as an opportunity to increase capacity.
- Iowa’s adoption and implementation of the TLC system makes a strong statement about valuing and supporting teachers and good teaching.
- Districts have to make choices in using their TLC funds; “you can do anything you want [aligned with the goals and requirements of the system] but you can’t do everything you want.”
- Initial concerns about how teachers not in leadership roles would react to working with teachers chosen for leadership roles have not proven to be a major issue.
- Very rigorous selection process has resulted in some districts not being able to reach the goal of having 25 percent of teachers in leadership roles. That is major reason for requests for changes in an approved plan.
- Some districts have indicated that the statutory requirement that all teacher leader positions must include three years of teaching experience and at least one year teaching in the district is too restrictive and makes filling the leadership positions needlessly difficult.

TLC Evaluation Plan

Ryan led discussion of the evaluation plan draft that was distributed to the Commission. Indicated that the three areas of Teacher Collaboration, Instructional Improvement, and Student Achievement are proving to be beyond the Department’s current capacity and will require assistance, perhaps through a Request for Proposals (RFP) process.

AGENDA ITEM: Potential Recommendations for the Annual Report

Expected Outcome	Lead	Follow Up
	Peter	There will not be closure on this topic today. It will be revisited during the Commission’s October meeting.

Notes:

Peter led discussion on what potential recommendations the Commission would like to include in its statutorily required annual report. The three small groups engaged in discussion and then reported out. Following are potential recommendations for the annual report.

- A “front-loading” of the funding of the TLC system.
- A concern was expressed that the TLC system might actually produce a teacher shortage situation in some areas because additional teachers will be needed due to teacher leaders being out of the classroom. It was suggested that there might be some nexus between the deployment of TLC and the Teach Iowa Scholar Program administered by the Iowa College Student Aid Commission.
- There needs to be additional resources provided to the Department and the AEAs for the implementation of TLC. This should also include a better articulation of the role that AEAs play in TLC.
- School districts need additional guidance on monitoring and evaluation of their TLC plans at the local level.

AGENDA ITEM: Training on Reviewing Plans

Expected Outcome	Lead Peter	Follow Up
------------------	-------------------	-----------

Notes:

Commission members individually reviewed exemplary sections from the TLC applications submitted. They were looking for commonalities and patterns. Commission members then worked to “rescore” their section of the applications without the benefit of knowing the previous score. The point was for Commission members to “reground” themselves on the scoring process.

After the rescoring process, Peter shared with Commission members the scores from the previous scoring of application sections. There will then be discussion of why scores might vary. Following are some of the conclusions after the rescoring.

- The rescoring results were more critical than the original scores.
- Expectations seem to be higher.
- The previous scores were composite scores, not individual scores.
- The differences in the scoring resulted in a conversation about the impact of “locking in” scores from last year’s applications.

AGENDA ITEM: Discussion of Selection Process

Next Steps

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

Notes:**School District Selection Process**

The Commission will set a cut score of 73. The Commission tentatively planned to address the selection process (i.e. how many districts will be selected from each AEA and size tier) at the December 12 meeting (which will allow them to see the overall data in terms of scores by geography and size tier before making a decision). There will be further discussion of this at the October meeting.

There will be no drop-down comments for the scoring.

Next Steps

The October 21, 2014, Commission meeting will be a continuation of the work from today. The meeting is changed from an in-person meeting to a Zoom/teleconference meeting from 9:00 – 11:00. Commission members will, however, also have the option of attending in-person at the Department of Education.

The December 5, 2014, is also likely to be a teleconference to finalize the review of school district plans.

The December 12, 2014, meeting will be an in-person meeting. Peter will check-in with Commission members unable to attend today's meeting.