August 17, 2012
10 a.m. – 3 p.m.
Room B100, Grimes State Office Building

MEMBERS PRESENT: Teresa Bellinghausen, Molly Boyle, Margaret Buctun, Mary Jane Cobb, Mike Cormack, Jason Glass, Brodget Godes, Jessica Gogerty, Justin Gross, Julie Heller, Kent Henning, Angie Jandrey, Ann Lebo, Duane Magee, Mike May, Isaiah McGee, Kent Mick, Diane Pratt, Carl Smith, Daniel Smith, David Stoakes, Jill Urich, Phil Wise, Denny Wulf, Don Zuck

Ryan Wise welcomes participants, extends special thanks for those sacrificing time away from students and districts in order to meet today. He emphasizes that the “rubber is hitting the road now” with task force assignment. Today the group will create top line recommendations so that Ryan can draft a report. Then group will get a consensus for report to submit in October.

Staci Hupp and Josh Pronk reviewed W-9’s and travel log mileage reimbursement procedures.

AGENDA ITEM: Member Reflections on Symposium, SAI Convention

- Ongoing interest and critical concern for teacher prep programs. So far, seems to be minimized or excluded. Need a coherent system that does focus on teacher prep.
- We have gotten past the question, “Do we need to change?” People are starting to buy in and are curious about implementation
- People in the field are already going great things.
- Concerned that one model will not fit all schools regarding career pathways. We need a system that is available to all teachers.
- Class size is a lightning rod issue. We need to find creative ways to fund reduced class size.
- There is a lack of discussion about teacher prep programs and the role of higher education in advancing professions. Noticed negative, pejorative tone about higher education. Concerns about some fast, cheap college degrees and the affect on student learning.
- Tough conversations and hurdles around issues like taking the best teachers out of the classroom for administrative or mentoring duties. We need to be more strategic with the resources we have and develop partnerships. We need to get going
- Teachers need to be valued and empowered. Interested to see how task force work will honor individual districts. As leaders, we can make all the decisions we want, but teachers must be valued.
- The work cannot wait. We cannot keep saying that we have already done this. We need to build systems and the capacity of staff. We need leadership and formal structure. How do we form teacher leadership opportunities that will meet the needs of students and teachers of Iowa?
- Goals are different now for degree programs. Graduate degrees need to require us to be leaders that meet the needs. We need to educate the community that children should not be satisfied with the same education previously offered. How will legislature interpret and prioritize the work done by the Task Force?
- Be careful not to be too heavy handed with a one size fits all approach to change. Need to recognize the need for individual differences between districts.
- We are struggling to devise a model that teachers will embrace and embody. We need to send ambassadors to connect teachers with successful models. We need to structure contract time to allow teachers to feel that collaboration time is a priority and valued. We need to have a relationship piece between coach, administrators, teachers, TAP model with performance based feedback.
- Mark Tucker had a huge influence on thinking. It’s hard to create system when no system is in place. We need to come together and have discussions in the spirit of cooperation, and be prepared to communicate a positive message and move forward. Now is the time.
• Many changes in priorities, dollars, and legislation are required. Two camps exist in Iowa. One camp is producing ideas and the other camp is saying “no”. We can improve. We need real tools that can help students learn better. We must find easy to put dollars to use in that way.

• The naysayers are rooted in semantics. When using the term “Master Teacher”, communities fear that the best teachers will be removed from the classroom. We need to pitch the ideas as educational supports to great teachers. Master teachers serving in an instructional support role.

• We can discuss policy change, be we are also taking about a huge culture shift that is necessary to be successful. Policies cannot change without the culture changing. Learning this summer was more of a reminder. Educators are feeling stressed. It is important to honor the good work that is being done by teachers.

• We are looking at a cultural issue and a whole different way of looking at problems and ideas. We need to be careful about how we discuss what we envision changing. How do we view our organizations operating? It cannot be done quickly. Changes need to be based on capacity building in a cultural system.

• Need to emphasize a state system, not just local district control. We have a responsibility and a job to do once information is on the streets. We have a duty to sell it to local school boards.

• There has been a profound shift in public opinion. It’s time for leaders in state government to move into position to lead as opposed to just follow the public. Legislators do respond to constituents if they hear from them. Constituents have an effect. However, there is still a significant percentage of legislators that have not internalized the imperative need for new recommendations and policies. We can have policies that avoid micromanaging but meet the needs of rural and urban districts.

• It’s important to always keep learning. Where do we start? We need good administrators and teacher prep programs. Confident that the group will do this together and do this right. The small things that we are all doing will make a difference.

• Does our work pass through the 4 lenses of quality control regarding teacher leadership roles and adjusting compensation? Evidence says it will have an impact. There will be resistance due to ignorance and not doing their research about what we are discussing and doing. Some response is intentional distortion from both sides of the political spectrum. We need a cultural shift relating to how we use our resources. We need the education and business community behind it. Folks on both sides of the political aisle need to push for it. Maybe there is no conspiracy – maybe there are good ideas whose time has come.

• Excitement is building about the momentum and the environment that has been created. As we move forward, we will consider the evidence and have understanding and empathy. We must make decisions but we need to consider both evidence and empathy in considering the interests of communities and stakeholders. We need to show that we can move forward together, standing with and next to one another. Work continues following recommendations made to legislators.

• It is a shock at the beginning of the year to see the work that needs to be done with the new students. How do we embrace excitement when the state says “now we are going to do this and now we are going to do that”? We can no longer teach to the middle and expect the top students to help the low students. That is not fair.

**AGENDA ITEM: Whole group working session**

Ryan Wise notes huge sense of urgency with work of the Task Force. Ryan distributes a draft based on prior Task Force work, of Compensation and Career Ladder Design Principles that could be adopted by the Task Force. The draft reflects conversations that have occurred up to this point. Eleven principles are displayed on poster paper on the wall for modified gallery walk. The group will have opportunity to add additional principles.


Ryan distributes second handout that reflects ideas from 7/27/12 meeting subgroups that was used to prepare first handout.

Remainder of morning spent working on overarching, well-rounded set of guiding principles that should guide decisions about teacher leadership and compensation.

Participants place sticky notes on 11 poster paper principles. Sticky notes reflect What I like, Questions, Concerns about each principle.
Note: Principles listed below reflect discussion phase only, and have NOT been adopted by the committee.

Principle 1 – Make the case for change clear. The development of a state-wide career ladder and improved compensation system will...: Subgroup thought the principle was promising for recruiting and keeping valuable staff. With all the principles, the devil is in the details. All principles should not use language that is value laden.

Principle 2 - Focus on getting base pay “right”: Look at starting salary with respect to other professions. Where do the salary numbers come from? Maybe tied to another index like CPI.

Principle 3 – Address labor market issues: Could labor market issues be pulled into the base pay issues?

Principle 4 - Create a sustainable and scalable model that is integrated with existing legislation and leadership structures: Create something that is accepted by both parties. Have flexibility with tension between local and state. What has been done before is just a starting point. Scalability is a non issue if there are statewide issues.

Principle 5 – Provide ongoing implementation support, such as a standing commission on teacher leadership and compensation: General agreement with concept. Major questions were structural regarding implementation. Responsibilities of the Commission would need to be specifically delineated to provide feedback to the districts. Stress importance of fair representation on the Commission. Commission may take sole responsibility off of the Department of Education and spread it around.

Principle 6 – Set the boundaries, allow districts to design systems with those boundaries and encourage and support districts that seek out opportunities for innovation (such as TAP system): This is a balancing act. One size does not fit all. Models are in place but consistency is needed while still addressing the needs of a particular community. Need an evidence based system.

Principle 7 – Provide time for local planning and implementation inclusive of teacher in the center of the process: Needs to be teacher driven and support local input of state directives. What need to change from the status quo to make this happen? Concerns with shared responsibility. Teachers need to actually make decisions in addition to participating in the planning process. Concerns with the changing role of administration. If there is failure in the process, how will administrators and legislators react to failure. Will reaction be “I told you so” or “What can we learn in order to move ahead”?

Principle 8 – Put in place intentional structures that encourage and promote teacher collaboration: Condense the principles list to 10. Questions and concerns about details of structures and time allotments for teachers.

Principle 9 – Recognize professional growth, leadership, and effectiveness through expanded career opportunities: A positive because it ensures a mechanism for growth and advancement. Concerns about terminology like “pathways” and “ladder”. Concerns about hierarchy and required graduate degrees.

Principle 10 – Create multiple, meaningful and well-designed career paths: Where is the group that will suggest strategies? Whose goals? Statewide, district or teacher goals? There is little consensus in Iowa about what professional development actually works.

Principle 11 – Pay for professional development/growth that aligns with strategic goals or that evidence suggests improves student learning: Ladder must be tied to evidence based learning. Not everyone is motivated by evidence and though necessary, is not the only driver. Current system rewards longevity and continued learning which may or may not be aligned with the needs/desired outcomes. Graduate work needs to reflect and align with teacher leadership goals to prepare teachers as leaders. Iowa has no research and development department to sort and help choose initiatives.
Subgroups (Compensation, Teacher Leadership and Career Development, Stakeholders/Scalability, Sustainability/Implementation) discuss draft of Mandated Legislative Recommendations handout.

Director Glass shares information pertaining to a new Harvard study that shows some results from performance based pay.

**AGENDA ITEM: Subgroup share-outs**

*Note: Recommendations listed below reflect discussion phase and have NOT been adopted by the committee.*

**Duties and responsibilities of Apprentice, Career, Mentor and Master Teachers:**
Stakeholders/Scalability/sustainability/Implementation group:

Apprentice -- Design a practice teaching year in partnership with institution teacher prep program, not just a semester of student teaching. Have measures for standard of performance. Have teacher leader standards. Part of job of mentor teacher is to induct teacher in new profession.

Mentor -- Have application process before training. Have training and performance objectives. Eligible to be a mentor teacher when career teacher status is attained. Spend no less than 30% of time in the classroom. Several goals: professional learning community teacher, peer coach, demonstration teacher, curriculum specialist, instructional technology. Include collaboration and growth feedback. Preservice teachers in classroom must have a relationship with faculty. How can we get feedback to the universities to retain the best qualities in teachers? Did not address career or professional teacher.

Teacher Leadership and Career Development group:
We need to be respectful with our terms in the way that each pathway is defined. Maybe use teacher residency concept. Terms like teacher emeritus. Be specific regarding the responsibility each college or university would have. Apply some pressure for continuity with pathways for teachers.

**Compensation group:**
Be respectful with the labels and names applied to those entering the various roles. Is Master Teacher the right word? Could we consider this a kind of instructional role? Should there be step and lane within each level? Recognize that we cannot just pile on more responsibilities without release time. Need opportunities to grow as a base teacher, Master teacher, etc. Did not address compensation level for each role.

**Retired teachers:**
Retired teachers are an untapped resource. Most are utilized now as field supervisors. They could be a bridge with prep programs in schools. Currently, retired teachers have no insight into daily functioning of districts. We need to incorporate them more. They have a wealth of experience, knowledge, patience and expertise. There can be benefits pertaining to confidentiality when utilizing someone outside the district.

**Strategic use and realignment of resources:**
What are we doing with base pay? Where will monetary resources originate? How will determination of resource distribution be decided? Implications exist relating to the size of the districts. Larger districts are able to make different choices to raise base pay through combination of new money and different choices with bargaining, taxes, grade sharing, etc. This can be an emotional, difficult issue. Equity problems arise and when the money runs out we are right back to where we began. We have tried to address this with a phase system and we need to learn from what happened when that was tried.

**Standardizing implementation of recommendations across the state:**
Can this be taken to scale and maintained? What needs to happen to sustain leadership and compensation. Generate a variety of constituencies that could be tied to the commission and have statewide oversight in the process. Need to identify the key ingredients of the TAP system. Initially, sustainability is more important than scalability. It is a work in progress that needs to be tried with fidelity but subject to changes if necessary.

**Peer coaching:**
We need to find out what is going on and what is working and investigate the commonalities.