



Commission on Educator Leadership and Compensation (CELC)

Meeting Notes

Date: March 1, 2016

Time: 3:30-5:00

Location: Zoom (Virtual) Meeting

MEMBERS PRESENT: Paula Vincent, Jeff Orvis, Paul Gausman, Mary Jane Cobb, Kevin Ericson, Roark Horn, Brenda Garcia Van Auken, Dennis Wulf, Jeff Anderson, Mary Jo Hainstock, Molly Boyle, Diane Pratt, Lisa Bartusek, Ryan Wise

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mike Beranek, Ray Feuss, Patti Fields, Donna Lee Huston, Victoria Robinson, Georgia Van Gundy

AGENDA ITEM: Welcome

Expected Outcome	Lead	Follow Up
Welcome and thanks the Commission members.	Ryan Wise	<u>None</u>

Notes:

- Director Wise welcomed the Commission members.
- Director Wise thanked the commission for their hard work and dedication, including reading and scoring approximately 500 applications and spending hundreds of hours in the process.
- The Governor will attend the April 14th CELC meeting. He would like to extend his thanks and listen to the group.
- Director Wise reviewed the agenda.

AGENDA ITEM: Update on Final Scoring

Expected Outcome	Lead	Follow Up
Update on scoring for the current round and provide recommendations.	Ryan Wise	<u>None</u>

Notes:

- Current State of TLC Applications:
 - 39 districts applied
 - Their average score was 78.4 – up from 73.5 in the last round.
 - The range of scores was 65-84 – narrowed from 52-81 in the last round.
 - Most districts appear to have taken advantage of the extra time and support provided by AEAs and the Department to revise and improve their plans.
 - Three districts were not at 73.

District Name	CE	Part 1	Part 2	Part 3	Part 4	Part 5	Part 6	Part 7	Part 8	Part 9	Part 10	TOTAL SCORE	Improvement from Last Round
District A	240	7	8	8	5	7	8	8	8	8	5	72	+18
District B	200	8	8	7	6	8	7	7	8	7	6	72	+11
District C	300	8	8	8	6	6	6	6	8	6	3	65	+14

- For districts A and B parts 4 and 10 were the lowest but both made significant improvement.
- District C had several lower scoring sections but also made strong improvement.
- Questions and Reactions from Commission Members:
 - Happy that so many did so well and that even those below the cut score improved so much.
 - What gets a district a three on Part 10?
 - Response: Lack of aligned funds, unallowable use of funds, and lack of clarity. Districts that scored a five or six tend to be missing some details and connections
 - It is clear many of the districts used the feedback they received in making their revisions.
 - How many times have these three district applied?
 - December was the first time for all three.
- Possible Paths Forward:
 - Recommend approval of districts A and B (provided they submit an acceptable plan change request for parts four and ten by the end of March).
 - Require resubmission of sections that are scored seven or lower for district C prior to approval. Submission could be to the Commission or directly to the Department.
- Questions and Reactions from Commission Members:
 - All present Commission members were in favor of these recommendation. For recommendation 2 they would like submissions to go to the Commission.
 - These districts may need coaching in order to improve their scores.
 - The Department is willing to provide this coaching and is confident the AEAs will continue to work with these districts.
 - Is it possible District C will still not make the cut score?
 - It is possible. The Commission would then need to reconvene to determine next steps.
 - What will be the timeline?
 - All revisions/changes would need be submitted by March 31st.
 - Will Districts A and B be included in the list of approved districts? Will they have an asterisk?
 - Yes they will be included. No they will not have and asterisk.
 - Do we risk undermining the inclusive nature of the process with this path forward?
 - In the established change process districts have to make clear how they included multiple groups in the decision making process.
 - Districts will have a month to make revisions which provides time be inclusive with the changes/revisions.
 - The Department can include a specific reminder/recommendation to ensure the process remains inclusive going forward.

- Director Wise reviewed the decision of the Commission to ensure consensus.
- Consensus was reached.

AGENDA ITEM: TLC Evaluation Update and Discussion

Expected Outcome	Lead	Follow Up
Review the current state of the outside evaluation of TLC.	Becky Slater	<u>Bring follow-up questions to AIR.</u> <u>Include on April's agenda.</u>

Notes:

- An overview document was provided to the Commission members in the pre-meeting email for questions and feedback.
- Becky Slater acknowledged that the group requested additional information on the outside evaluation of TLC at the previous meeting and said that that will be an agenda item on the next agenda. However, she wanted to provide an update since progress had been made.
- Discussion:
 - How will districts be selected-for the site visits?
 - Selection will stratified based on AEA and size.
 - Who will take the survey?
 - The survey will be open to all teachers and administrators throughout the state, even if they have not yet begun to implement TLC. Will allow AIR to examine potential differences in perceptions. Incentives will be provide and outreach is being planned to increase the response rate.
 - Is this evaluation too reliant on perceptions? Can you tell us more about the outcomes design?
 - It will use existing student achievement data (Iowa Assessments).
 - The research designs are very strong. The description of them as “quasi-experimental” doesn’t mean they are not valid or reliable methods. In quasi-experimental designs the subjects are already in pre-existing groups. In “true experiments” subjects are randomly assigned to treatment conditions. Because participation in TLC has already been determined quasi-experimental approaches will be used.
 - Could changing the statewide assessment might impact our ability to determine the impact of TLC?
 - This could present a challenge. AIR has thought about how to approach the study in this situation.
 - Becky Slater will ask during the next meeting with AIR and share their response with the Commission.

Next Meeting: April 14, 2016 from 10:00-2:00