Council on Educator Development Minutes

February 10, 2016

Meeting Outcomes:

- Orient Council members about efforts during the CED survey period.
- Analyze quantitative and qualitative data/information from the CED survey.
- Determine future plans for data gathering (if needed), Council actions, and meeting plans.

Council Members in attendance:

- Elaine Baughman, Special Education Teacher, Harlan CSD, Harlan
- Tom Buckmiller, Professor, Drake University, Des Moines
- J.D. Cryer, Field Experience Coordinator, University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls
- David Fox, Waverly-Shellrock CSD
- Roberta Hass, MFL MarMac CSD
- Joel Illian, Deputy Director, PEI
- Joe Judge, Teacher, Albia CSD
- Josie Lewis, IASB Policy/Legal Services Director, Iowa Association of School Boards
- Darren Reade, Teacher, Monticello CSD
- Derek Schulte, Business Education Teacher, Montezuma CSD, Montezuma
- Billy Strickler, Principal, Albia CSD, Albia
- JoAnne Tubbs, Licensure Consultant, Iowa Board of Educational Examiners, Des Moines
- Dave Versteeg, Superintendent, Montezuma CSD, Montezuma

Others in attendance include: Linda Carroll, Matt Ludwig, Jon Sheldahl, Jennifer Woodley (recorder), & Ryan Wise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity &amp; Content</th>
<th>Materials &amp; Resources</th>
<th>Who?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:00 – 10:40</td>
<td>Welcome</td>
<td>Name tents</td>
<td>Linda &amp; Jon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review Council Meeting Outcomes</td>
<td>Agenda</td>
<td>Linda &amp; Jon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Share the CED Survey – Quantitative Data</td>
<td>Presentation of Electronic version of the Summary of Recommendations Survey Data</td>
<td>Matt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Efforts to gather data from the field</td>
<td>Note-taking tool for Council Members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Quantitative data picture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Demographic Data – Who is in the data?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The six recommendations – Clear and concise?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Essential to the educator development system?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Council members note/record (Individually, partners, or small groups) – What do these data tell us? Other points for consideration?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Share reactions and questions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Director Wise welcomed Council members and thanked them for their participation and effort.
Dr. Sheldahl reviewed the agenda and charge of the day, “What does the data say?” He explained that the Council would break into small groups to review and summarize the feedback. After small group discussion the Council will outline next steps, “What do we do with the data? Is it enough? What is the next level of work?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Supporting Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:40 – 10:50</td>
<td>Set up for Qualitative Data analysis</td>
<td>Electronic version of the Summary of Recommendations Survey Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structure small groups (3 total) by recommendation</td>
<td>Recording matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish focus question to analyze open-ended responses – What key themes/categories can be identified from the open-ended responses to assist the Council in enhancing the recommendations?</td>
<td>Comment strips, chart paper, post-it notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Share possible ways for sorting with qualitative data and how to use the recording matrix</td>
<td>Note-taking Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Linda, Jon, &amp; Matt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Matt Ludwig provided an overview of the data. He reported that 2259 Teachers, 623 School Administrators, and 29 Board Members provided feedback last fall. He asked Council members to discuss each recommendation in a small group and report findings.

**Initial Feedback Take-aways (large group)**

Members felt that much of the feedback reflected discussions that the Council has held. The concern about specialty areas feeling that this will be difficult to apply to them; negative feedback about how it will actually be implemented and the connection to TLC; and the general feeling that the recommendations are positive and key components of a successful system.

There was concern about the breakdown of survey participants, one member felt that veteran teachers were not well represented and worried that support is not going to be as high as feedback indicates once implemented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Supporting Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:50 – 12:20</td>
<td>Engage in the Qualitative Data analysis:</td>
<td>Electronic version of the Summary of Recommendations Survey Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read through qualitative data statements for the assigned recommendation</td>
<td>Recording matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organize the comments into at least three themes based on the focus question - What key themes/categories can be identified from the open-ended responses to assist the Council in enhancing the recommendations?</td>
<td>Comment strips, chart paper, post-it notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Record themes and other points for consideration on the Recording Matrix.</td>
<td>Note-taking Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Share themes/categories with the whole group.</td>
<td>Linda, Jon, &amp; Matt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three small groups each took a Recommendation and recorded their findings in a matrix. Below is a summary, original may be found at https://docs.google.com/document/d/1zTxw1rsW8bHcb89av2JG64Y7SOoHxoay-3htcRwL7T4/edit?usp=sharing.

**Recommendation 1** - Continue to support collaboration, reflective practice and ongoing constructive feedback in the educator development system.:  
Themes:  
- General Support for Recommendation  
- Related to many parts  
- Implementation Issues/Challenges  

Points for consideration  
- Update the recommendation to be clearer about the balance of development (growth) v. evaluation (accountability)  
- TLC comments related to the feedback systems - feels/looks more evaluative than formative for many  
- Revamping of evaluator training in needed  
- All parts of the system affect the others - changes to teacher development system have repercussions, intentional and unintentional

**Recommendation 2** - Formally certify and support evaluators to ensure fidelity of implementation of the existing system and statewide initiatives in tandem with the recommendations in this report.:  
Themes:  
- Interesting Facts  
  - Teachers and admin on the same evaluating time frame  
  - Core Aligned App for Walkthrough  
  - Needs to be meaningful  
  - Using TLC for eval?  
- Fidelity  
  - Consistency (how to ensure it will be the same)  
  - Subjectivity  
  - Clearer wording - simplify definitions  
- Evaluator Training  
  - Accountability of following through - currently dissatisfied  
  - Does it need to be a certification?  
  - Who & how often will people be going to take this training? (Support)  
  - Amount of time needed to make it possible  
- Learning Progressions  
  - Lack of understanding of what they are  
  - Wanting to use some that are already in place  
  - Is everyone covered by this - non-core (PE, Art, Music…)/non-teaching staff (counselors, nurses, etc..)

**Recommendation 3** - Articulate and support the continued use of multiple measures, which may include an array of indicators of student learning outcomes related to a targeted goal(s):.  
Themes:  
- Clarifying Questions  
  - How to ensure consistency/fidelity
- Who to choose measures?
- How to get community input & what does that mean?

- **Pro/Multiple Measures (focus on Growth)**
  - emphasis on Growth
  - more than just test scores
  - qualitative & quantitative
  - consistency
  - chosen by both teacher & administrator
  - much agreement w/ concept based on an accurate reading of committee intent

- **Ranting**
  - factors outside of my control
  - trained evaluators
  - data manipulated
  - teaching hard to quantify
  - busy work
  - no different just new lingo
  - current growth plan can be manipulated

- **Non Core Teachers**
  - evaluations relative to job assignment
  - many non classroom teachers
  - spec ed/IEP concerns
  - tests not fair
  - evaluate based on what taught

- **Concerns**
  - what are they
  - more test
  - who picks them
  - what defines student outcome
  - student data misleading
  - too many variables
  - too many standardized tests

12:20 – 12:50

| Lunch |

| 12:50 – 2:20 | *Repeat the 10:50-12:20 process with the three other recommendations – Engage in the Qualitative Data analysis:*
| | ● Read through qualitative data statements for the assigned recommendation.
| | ● Organize the comments into at least three themes based on the focus question - What key themes/categories can be identified from the open-ended responses to assist the Council in enhancing the recommendations? |
| | Electronic version of the Summary of Recommendations Survey Data
| | Recording matrix
| | Comment strips, chart paper, post-it notes
<p>| | Linda, Jon, &amp; Matt |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record themes and other points for consideration on the Recording Matrix.</th>
<th>Note-taking Tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share themes/categories with the whole group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three small groups each took a Recommendation and recorded their findings in a matrix. Below is a summary, original may be found at [https://docs.google.com/document/d/1zTxw1rsW8bHcbB9av2JG64Y75OoHXoay-3htcRwL7T4/edit?usp=sharing](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1zTxw1rsW8bHcbB9av2JG64Y75OoHXoay-3htcRwL7T4/edit?usp=sharing).

**Recommendation 4** - Use a balanced evaluation system that includes annual accountability in the form of the Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP) and a comprehensive multifaceted three-year review for all educators (including all certified teachers and administrators).

Themes:

- **Issues with IPDP**
  - implementation issues of IPDP
  - use of system is viewed as negative
  - misunderstanding of IPDP and 3 year process
  - Not using IPDP

- **Issues with Peer Review**
  - Misuse of terms (review, evaluation, observation)
  - Implementation issues
  - Question about purpose
  - Not using peer review

- **Overall distrust of educators and the educational system**
  - Punishing the good teachers to weed out a few bad ones
  - Distrust by administrators, legislature
  - Micromanaging educators
  - Teacher evaluation process is not similar to administrator evaluation process

- **Clear support for the recommendation**
  - Be careful of the vocal minority in the comments

**Recommendation 5** - Continue to use and refine the Iowa Teaching Standards (ITS) and the Iowa Standards for School Leaders (ISSL) to ensure that Iowa educators are able to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

Themes:

- **Learning Progressions**
  - Unsure of specifics and what it will look like
  - Use one that is already implemented
  - Add “exceeds expectations?”

- **Dispositions**
  - Don’t know what dispositions are
  - How will they be evaluated
  - How to measure
  - A lot of misconceptions around this recommendation

- **Standards**
  - Almost 50/50 breakdown of getting new ones/changing them vs. keeping the ones we already have

- **Non-Teacher/Specialty Teachers**
  - What will be used for people who don’t actually “teach” on a regular basis
Should we use other standards for these teachers that are more related to their job/title?

Recommendation 6 - Identify and implement learning progressions aligned to the Iowa Teaching Standards (ITS) and Iowa Standards for School Leaders (ISSL) that define best practices and that specify clearly differentiated levels of performance.

Themes (84% Support):

- **Clarifying Questions**
  - What are progressions & why? Who decides?
  - What are “clearly differentiated levels of performance”?
  - Start at a prep level?
  - A lot of confusion

- **General Support**
  - Love this
  - Differentiation helps educators grow
  - would strengthen
  - glad that context is taken into account
  - many expressed favor
  - will make better after disagreeing about 5 (a few people mentioned that this should have come before 5, b/c they wouldn’t have disagreed with 5 after reading this first)

- **Ranting**
  - this person has never been in a classroom
  - about content standards
  - support national Board
  - prepare teachers then let them teach
  - local control
  - no more TLC
  - best policies are a fad
  - too much demanded of us already
  - what happens w/ these comments
  - evaluate administrators
  - confused about core

- **Non Core Teachers**
  - non public has different expectations
  - same concerns about applying to non core
  - different levels of administrators

- **Concerns**
  - too wordy
  - stick w/ meet/not meet for simplicity
  - administrators currently to fine
  - no merit pay
  - progressions will be used as a rating scale
  - no examples
  - same across districts - statewide both sides
  - why not score progressions
  - starts with good standards - reused
  - differentiating standards
  - local control
Determine next steps – Do we have a robust enough data picture to finalize recommendations? If so, how should we proceed? If not, what processes and tools need to be employed to gather data?

Dr. Sheldahl asked the Council if they felt that they had enough data - the consensus was yes and they can move forward with next steps.

A suggestion was made that a smaller group (made up of Council members & external guests) reviews the order and language of the recommendations based on feedback. The Council agreed this was the best way to move forward - a Writing Sub-Committee.

2:50 – 3:00 Future meeting dates Chart paper Linda & Jon

- March - Writing Sub-Committee w/ external guests
- April - Large Group Council on Educator Development

3:00 Adjourn

Council on Educator Development Google Site: https://sites.google.com/a/gpaea.org/ee-council/home

Council Members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>Baughman</td>
<td>Harlan</td>
<td>Special Ed Teacher</td>
<td>Patty</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>Parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad</td>
<td>Buck</td>
<td>Cedar Rapids</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>Darren</td>
<td>Reade</td>
<td>Monticello</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Buckmiller</td>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>Drake University</td>
<td>Derek</td>
<td>Schulte</td>
<td>Altoona</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>Bureau Chief - DE</td>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>Sheldahl</td>
<td>Ottumwa</td>
<td>AEA Chief Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.D.</td>
<td>Cryer</td>
<td>Cedar Falls</td>
<td>UNI</td>
<td>Bev</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Farver</td>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Billy</td>
<td>Strickler</td>
<td>Albia</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Fox</td>
<td>Waverly</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Joanne</td>
<td>Tubbs</td>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>BoEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberta</td>
<td>Hass</td>
<td>MFL MarMac</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Versteeg</td>
<td>Montezuma</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roark</td>
<td>Horn</td>
<td>Clive</td>
<td>SAI – Exec Director</td>
<td>Tammy</td>
<td>Wawro</td>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>ISEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>Illian</td>
<td>Windsor Heights</td>
<td>PEI – Deputy Director</td>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Koester</td>
<td>Ankeny</td>
<td>State Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>Albia</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Kraayenbrink</td>
<td>Fort Dodge</td>
<td>State Senator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Lettington</td>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Herman</td>
<td>Quirmback</td>
<td>Ames</td>
<td>State Senator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josie Lewis</td>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>IASB</td>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>Winckler</td>
<td>Davenport</td>
<td>State Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eriece Colbert</td>
<td>Cedar Rapids</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>