

**State Council for Educator Effectiveness (SCEE)
Holiday Inn Select
March 11, 2011
9am-5pm**

Attendees: Bill Bregar, Lorrie Shepard, Amie Baca-Oehlert, Nina Lopez, Matt Smith, Shelby Gonzales-Parker, Jo Ann Baxter, Jim Smyth, Nina Lopez, Towanna Henderson, Sandra Smyser, Kerrie Dallman

1. CDE Educator ID System Update (Attachment 1)

Led by Lisa Medler, CDE

Educator Identifier Project:

- Lisa works at CDE and staffs the Quality Teacher Commission (QTC). She gave an overview of the Educator Identifier Project. The Educator Identifier system will link student data to teachers for the purpose of improving teacher quality and effectiveness.
- The Educator identifier is a bridge between data variables. Educators are assigned a number, which provides the ability to find common attributes amongst educators (such as institution of higher education attended). Then, there is an idea that we can ensure that teachers who are most effective are being assigned to the kids who need them the most. There are many other uses and purposes for the Educator Identifier system as well.
- Is this being set up in a way that it's not restrictive in terms of what types of data can be added down the line (student survey data, evaluation outcomes, etc.)? Yes.
- The data is housed in CDE's warehouse and is very protected. They are also discussing tiered levels of access to the data.

Defining Educator of Record

- The Educator of Record is the main person or people who are providing the instruction.
- Contributing professionals are adding to the student or group of students' learning.

Remaining Issues

- Balancing local control with implementing this work.
- Sometimes the district doesn't have the ability to link students to contributing educators.
- Other complexities

Questions

- LORRIE SHEPARD – It's been frustrating to Deans of Ed that the project is centered in K-12 and allows district HR reps to link back to higher ed information. How far out are we from being able to get data that is actually linked to educators' specific licensure program?
 - The identifiers were assigned in June, 2010, so now we're in the first year of linking them to the data collections. Licensing is supposed to have the identifier in there by the summer. It's a slow process of integrating into the data systems. The ideal place to link data is at the point of fingerprinting, but we haven't been able to do that yet. Now we're trying to work with the Department of Higher Ed in figuring out how IHEs will find out information.
- MATT SMITH – Is there a presumption that we know what the patterns in the data are?

- It's hard to predict. The QTC has spent a lot of time trying to think about the potential variables and analyses that could happen.
- There is probably a collaborative group that would be helpful if you could get their input on the current list of parameters and data variables that are being looked at to make sure the database is populated in the right way with the right markers.
- SANDRA SMYSER – This system is, at least, set up to track licensing; our work will eventually provide information about the effective teachers and where they are teaching. The real question is are all of our poverty kids being given ineffective teachers?
- TRACY DORLAND – As we think about how we structure the 50%, how will districts be able to use the data from this system in their own systems? We don't want to strive for the growth model being the 50%. Will we be able to extract data from the system and use it as part of the 50%?
 - It's being discussed, but we don't yet know how it's going to happen. Lisa will talk to them more to get more details.
- LORRIE SHEPARD – Individuals in a current year won't have growth until past that year. Is there an understanding with the use of the Growth Model that's helping people use it at the right level?
 - That is the vision, but there are limitations to the information the state has and what's been gathered. It's definitely been the intent of the state to provide guidance on what this can be used for and what it cannot be used for.
- SANDRA SMYSER – This Council is strongly in favor of none of this information being available to the public. Confidentiality is important.
 - The Commission would agree with that.
- JO ANN BAXTER – Is there a particular type of district who are not giving the information you'd like to have?
 - Small districts don't have the personnel to do large data collections. Some of it's a technical thing, some of it's a capacity issue.
- SANDRA SMYSER – When you attribute kids to a teacher, the children stays whole. It's the portion of the teacher's time that is divided.

Attribution Issues/Values

- SCEE is addressing all teachers with multiple measures, CDE only CSAP
- Assigning process – who? How? Parameters?

The Council agreed to have a continued conversation with the QTC. Lisa will take back some of the Council's questions.

2. Public Comment

3. Teacher Framework Recommendations (Attachment 2)

The Council reviewed this document and commented on edits.

- SANDRA SMYSER – Regarding 13a, the process of evaluating someone under this law requires the 50% AND an evaluation determined. I can't see doing that whole process more than once a year. What happens in reality is that you're concerned about someone and this is the value behind that statement. You can go in and collect data on someone as much as you want. It's the collection of the data that you would normally put into the system that could

put into the system. Evaluation is a process, not an event, so you can do the process with more intensity, but not more than once. **Recommendation to delete 13a.**

- **Recommendation to make sure, in framing language, that evaluation is a process, not an event.**
- LORRIE SHEPARD – With 13a gone, do you want the detail to only be about ineffective? It has to be read with consistency. I agree with eliminating a, I just think we have to work on the consistency.
- TRACY DORLAND – The first sentence in 13, is that sentence saying that not all teachers are rated every year?
 - No, in 9, we say that there are people that can be exempted because statute says that districts can make the choice to evaluate teachers less frequently.
 - TRACY DORLAND – I think that disclaimer clause right before a shall is problematic. Should say “districts may choose not to evaluate every teacher every year”. I think it’s unclear that that’s a may. So, I object to 9.
 - SANDRA SMYSER – Suggestion that we recommend that it be with the teacher’s consent. Highly effective teachers would never consent.
 - LORRIE SHEPARD – The thing I care about more than leaving highly effective out is that we allow for the principle of more data for some categories. There are some semantic problems with the order. I think we have to say where we have to do it more deeply. I don’t think there will be that many that are deemed highly effective if you make it based on growth. I think that we should put our money into the more data, but in terms of what “to evaluate” means, it could mean that it’s too expensive to do it by peers for some measures.
 - TRACY DORLAND – For highly effective teachers, maybe put them in a cohort, give the principals a break.
 - LORRIE SHEPARD – The amount of data is where it’s varied as opposed to an excuse from evaluation.
- ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – Let’s go back to 9b. The Council is good with that.
- BILL BREGAR – I think there’s a semantics issue. Are we going to call them “marginally effective” or “minimally effective” or “approaching effective”. I like the word “minimally”.
- ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – We’ll revisit that after lunch.
- JO ANN BAXTER – A concern about that category, if you’re “minimally effective”, how does that effect your non-probationary status? Is it “effective”?
- LORRIE SHEPARD – On page 4, I can’t tell whether weighing is consciously different from weighting or not? Weighting is adding up scores with an assigned weight. It’s a numeric result. Weighing is considering. 20 seems like it’s still weighting.
- LORRIE SHEPARD – I’m having trouble with 10 and 11. It sounds like one is meant to be how you judge effectiveness for purposes of the final evaluation category. The other is the same list of measures, not meeting rigorous standards for the purpose of feedback. By putting it as two separate things, you’re inviting two conversations. Within 10, give this as an additional caveat (the list). Or have a technical bullet that draws the distinction.
- JO ANN BAXTER – Does 11 mean that every district must use those measurements?
 - If we take 11 out, it means that you shall use data using one of those things in the list.

- JO ANN BAXTER – I’m concerned about 14a. I don’t have a concern about districts doing that, but to say that they shall is prescriptive in certain situations and more prescriptive than would be meaningful.
- ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – We’ve already reached consensus on this.
- JO ANN BAXTER – I’ll concede.
- JIM SMYTH – On 14, is there a way to go add “for experienced teachers” to the “weighting policies recommendation language”
- TRACY DORLAND – On 10a, DPS doesn’t currently have a pre-conference. Doing that every year adds another step. I’d rather pre-conferences not be a shall.
 - KERRIE DALLMAN – I would be opposed for doing that for all teachers in the system. I think a preconference is about setting the stage. A principal can still have an unannounced visit, but it’s about having that conversation about the pedagogy, philosophy, etc. I think that’s very valuable. I think you still require those pre-conferences especially for novice, but I’d like to see it for all teachers.
 - ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – Is your concern addressed in 7?
 - KERRIE DALLMAN – To me, 7 could be the whole staff sitting in a room, so no, 7 doesn’t capture it.
 - AMIE BACA-OEHLERT – I think there’s value in that professional dialogue and that can be the number one missing piece/disconnect.
 - LORRIE SHEPARD – The problem is it’s a clause that comes after observations because it sounds like I have to do that every single time.
 - ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – Is what’s missing a sentence about a professional dialogue? That’ll be crafted over lunch. Then, we can eliminate the reference to the pre and post observations.
- JIM SMYTH – Page 2, 9ai, this statement is confusing, because I thought novice was just a two year term.
 - ULCCA HANSEN – I think it’s because we’ve used novice in two different places. For the purpose of the matrix, we wanted to include teachers in their first two years of service, but here the intent is to say that these are teachers who haven’t yet earned non-probationary status, so this would be a chance for them to have less intensive process.
 - ***There was agreement to take out the novice teacher reference.***
- JIM SMYTH – On 9ai2a, should it say experienced teacher?
 - ULCCA HANSEN – Yes, I’ll go back through this and do a scrub to pull out the definitions.
- JIM SMYTH – Pg 3, 12, fix section numbers.
- JIM SMYTH – On 13b, can we change to “whenever there is evidence than an educator is in need of additional support”. There was agreement on this change.
- JO ANN BAXTER – On 22, is that referring to a conflict between the two 50%?
 - ULCCA HANSEN – It could also happen within.
 - LORRIE SHEPARD – 22 is the one in this whole list that’s more about weighing.

4. Consensus issues that came up in the morning

Council reached consensus that local districts can choose to emphasize any one standard up to 40% and cannot weigh any standard less than 15%.

Council agreed on new language in 10a: “Prior to and throughout the evaluation process, supervisors shall engage annually in a professional dialogue with individual teachers focused on their professional practice and growth for the course of the year.”

Council agreed that “districts shall collect information on teacher performance against Teacher Quality Standards”

Council agreed to delete majority of weighing policies. The one policy left was that districts shall develop weighing policies that explicitly address the issue of how to handle issues of conflicting teacher performance data.

LORRIE SHEPARD – we want to say that the way you get to a final score is strictly numeric, but that’s not the only way to do it. You have to have a policy as to whether there will be a strict policy or judgment when the data is conflicting.

5. Teacher Framework Recommendations (Continued)

Are Council members now comfortable with this document as it is? The only thing that will change are the weighing/weighting categories. **Council came to consensus that this document is good as is.**

6. Measuring Student Growth for the use of Teacher Effectiveness (Attachment 3)

At the last meeting, we came to consensus on using Student Growth Objectives (SGOs) as part of the pilot. Staff will revise the conversation from yesterday and the language that suggests that this is part of the pilot. Are there other red flags or omissions that might be in this document?

- TRACY DORLAND – Would like to hear from Austin.
- NINA LOPEZ – We think there’s reason to believe that using SGOs has promise and it’ll be investigated in a pilot. We could also gather more info prior to the fall.
- JO ANN BAXTER – The terminology, technical guidelines, is confusing. Do we really mean research-based best practices? I don’t think the meaning is clear what we mean by technical guidelines.
 - ULCCA HANSEN – It captures the idea that there are ways to make things valid and ensure reliability and CDE will determine what those are.
- KERRIE DALLMAN – In 2 and 3, the reference to representatives from teacher association is in parentheses. Why?
 - ULCCA HANSEN – We’ll delete the parentheses.
- NINA LOPEZ – Is it not appropriate to also have principals collaborate in the growth measures?
 - AMIE BACA-OEHLERT – It’s assumed that they’re included in “district” reference.
 - TRACY DORLAND – Principals sometimes feel left out of this whole thing, so I’d be in favor of adding that.
 - LORRIE SHEPARD – Can we just add a clause about who should be involved to cover the whole document? The structure is getting in the way.
 - ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST - So, does district include central office and building leaders?
 - **Council agreed to add a clause about “district” meaning central office and building leaders.**
- NINA LOPEZ – 5 feels overly prescriptive. I don’t know what the state will do in terms of creating rules. It’s fine.

- LORRIE SHEPARD – Shared attribution is potentially politically controversial because you are making everyone the same.
 - ULCCA HANSEN – For teachers in non-tested subjects and grades, you might want the flexibility to have a higher proportion of their score be shared attribution. That’s why we went to this number, but we can have a qualifying statement about the reasons you’d do more for shared attribution.
 - LORRIE SHEPARD – This would mean that a teacher wouldn’t want to go into a school because of their low growth rating. Supposedly, this is all about incentives.
 - ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – Are you questioning the notion or the percentage?
 - LORRIE SHEPARD – A little bit of both.
 - KERRIE DALLMAN – It’s a concern to teachers also. The way we got to shared attribution is because of the notion of collaboration.
 - TRACY DORLAND – If we have teachers and principals at the table building the system, does that take into account teacher voice?
 - SANDRA SMYSER – We can say that it’s important to collaborate and pull out individual teachers’ impact.
 - NINA LOPEZ – As educator ID rolls out, we’ll know how shared attribution impacts things.
 - LORRIE SHEPARD – I think you can encourage districts to be self aware, not aggregate it up and come up with a quantitative analysis.
 - ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – Do we want to say that we don’t have the knowledge or expertise to do this at this time?
 - AMIE BACA-OEHLERT – It has huge climate implications as well.
 - ***Language was changed to “when making decisions about shared attribution, districts shall take into account incentivizing collaboration against the need to identify individual teacher’s contribution and performance. Decisions should reflect local priorities and needs.”***
 - AMIE BACA-OEHLERT – I think the statement in 12 says what a says, so you can merge them both.

Staff will revise language around SGOs and the development of additional measures. ***Council agreed on this document as is with an expectation of these revisions.***

7. **State Matrix and Novice Matrix (Attachment 4)**

This document was revised from yesterday. Comments?

- JIM SMYTH – Don’t like 6, change language from “want” to “expect”.
- LORRIE SHEPARD – I’m not completely comfortable with norm-referenced. The average of all of the novices is not how to track whether they’re making appropriate progress. It’s really compared to an expected trajectory for novices. [That language was changed]
- NINA LOPEZ – In 4a, is there solid evidence that those are the two that should get weighted differently?
 - SANDRA SMYSER – I’m still uncomfortable with a separate scoring framework for novices, but I would propose that the way that a district decides to weight the standards, they could weight them differently for novice teachers and that would take care of my problem.

- NINA LOPEZ – So, are you proposing that districts shall weight quality standards differently for novice? Or is it a case by case basis.
- BILL BREGAR – One of the dangers in having a separate matrix is that we could send the wrong message and tell a novice teacher that they’re doing a better job than they actually are.
- LORRIE SHEPARD – This whole thing is because the law says we have to do this.
- ULCCA HANSEN –The separate matrix is to allow them to be called effective against what we’d expect of them in their first two years.
- LORRIE SHEPARD – I like the “in progress effective” label. It’s a way to say you’ve fallen down if you’re an experienced teacher, pay attention or you’re a novice coming from the other direction. Semantically, it’s in the effective range. It’s not an ineffective rating.

Labels

- TRACY DORLAND - Do we want to grant non-probationary status to a new teacher who’s approaching?
- ULCCA HANSEN – They couldn’t earn their third year of effective without being effective on a normal panel.
- TRACY DORLAND – so we’re assuming that they’re not going to get there on the third year?
- KERRIE DALLMAN – We’re leaving open the possibility.
- LORRIE SHEPARD – We should look at what’s out there and what’s our capture rate of our good teachers and keeping them.
- TRACY DORLAND – So, you only need one year of effective on the experienced panel and two years on the novice?
- LORRIE SHEPARD – I don’t want to make it longer for new teachers because you’ll drive people out.
- JO ANN BAXTER – Analogy to CSAP labels.
- SANDRA SMYSER – Novice teachers are effective “enough”.
- TRACY DORLAND – I think there should be a difference in the supports and the time that it takes to get them where they need to go.
- ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – Is the Council trying to signal that we’re okay with the “minimally effective” teacher? Or that they’re ready to exit?
 - KERRIE DALLMAN – It’s different depending of they’re minimally effective on the way down or on the way up.
- LORRIE SHEPARD – Effective with a warning to a veteran teacher who slipped there and supports to the novice that gets there. We’re not surprised that a novice is there.
- ULCCA HANSEN – If a veteran teacher slips there, they’re ineffective. For a novice, if they’re there, they’re effective.
- LORRIE SHEPARD – So, we have two matrices with different implications.
- ULCCA HANSEN – For a veteran teacher who’s there, it’ll be effective with a warning in the first year, but if it happens for a second year, they’re converted to ineffective.
- LORRIE SHEPARD – We have to demonstrate that this is a gray area.
- ULCCA HANSEN – It feels more arbitrary to say that this is a gray area, but two panels would be much more clear.
- JO ANN BAXTER – We have to allow for the gray with some direction.
- Is the gray area the start of ineffective or effective?
 - SANDRA SMYSER – It makes sense that they’re different for novice and experienced.

- LORRIE SHEPARD – That argues for two different matrices that get labeled differently in those gray boxes.
- LORRIE SHEPARD – I want to call it “in-progress effective”.
- SANDRA SMYSER – On the novice, want to call it “effective novice”.
- BILL BREGAR – It’s defined in the same way on both panels, but called something different. I think it ought to be marginally ineffective for experienced teacher and ineffective novice.
- KERRIE DALLMAN – I don’t like “ineffective novice”. I still think there should be a novice panel.
- LORRIE SHEPARD – How about “below effective”?
- LORRIE SHEPARD – We need a “highly effective” on novice panel.
- ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – So, panels look identical, but there’s a set of cells that are labeled differently (in the middle/gray area) and have different meanings.
- TRACY DORLAND – We now have different matrices, different labels that mean different things and I’m struggling.

Continued

- NINA LOPEZ – the presentation of the panels is not intuitive.
- ULCCA HANSEN – We won’t be able to create the panels until the pilot.
- NINA LOPEZ – The panels will reflect a relative level of performance not absolute.

What is your thought about where this gray box falls when you’re referring to novice educators vs. experienced educators?

- TRACY DORLAND - For a novice teacher, it means that they’re given time to stay there. I feel like we have an opportunity to raise the bar around what it means to have non-probationary status.
- AMIE BACA-OEHLERT – I am not comfortable with adding a gray area that has the same consequences as ineffective (on experienced panel). I’m not good with having two boxes that mean that you could lose non-probationary status. I think that a good system does offer supports. The reality is that it doesn’t happen.
- LORRIE SHEPARD – I would be very happy with one matrix and three categories. There’s a lot of belief that bad teachers are to blame for teachers doing badly. Why would there be discrepancies between the student growth and quality standard scores? There are a number of reasons. I just think we need to simplify it.
- TOWANNA HENDERSON – How does this all affect the student in the end? That’s why I’m trying to understand the probation and two-year thing. I’m lost right now.
- KERRIE DALLMAN – I think if you have a teacher who’s been teaching for 15 years and they’re ineffective, there’s nothing that says you can’t terminate and move to non-renew the teacher in the year that the 15 year veteran is ineffective.
- TOWANNA HENDERSON – But since this is a new system, do we not allow them two years?
- KERRIE DALLMAN – The only entitlement in the two years is who has due process. A non-probationary teacher has due process, but a probationary teacher does not.
- KERRIE DALLMAN – I like the idea of the novice educator scoring framework. If it’s ineffective, call it ineffective.
- BILL BREGAR – We were going into this with the mindset that the evaluation process is some kind of exact science, but it’s anything but. The whole process hinges upon whether you’re accurately measuring student growth and correctly reporting it. It also hinges upon the quality of the evaluator. To try to split hairs with the categories is kind of a futile effort. I

think you ought to call effective effective, ineffective ineffective. I think novice and experienced should be on the same matrix, but at the end, the novice is given somewhat of a break in terms of what you're going to do with that evaluation.

- SANDRA SMYSER – The purpose of having three is to make it easier than having to decide between the two. So, for me, most are effective so I want three effective categories and one ineffective. The three effective all count toward non-probationary status.
- JO ANN BAXTER – We can get so prescriptive that we can disincentivize experienced teachers. If we have something that we're going to call effective 1 or 2, that has to be effective. I want to honor the novice teacher in giving them some slack, allowing them to have grace/time to grow.
- NINA LOPEZ – I'd like to propose that our recommendation language be clear about effective is effective is effective and let the data speak for itself. The corollary is what do you do when you get that information? If someone's effective, what are some good questions to ask? I think we can be explicit about the thing we're trying to get at.

The Council will take this conversation to make sure that we're not disincentivizing educators, not maintaining the status quo and better reflect the values.

8. The Role of the State Model System (Attachment 5)

This document was reviewed yesterday and has been edited since. The Council read it for red flags, omissions, concerns.

- BILL BREGAR – Does the last paragraph mean we're kicking the opt in/opt out notion down the road? Yes
- TOWANNA HENDERSON – We're giving it 4 years? Yes
- AMIE BACA-OEHLERT – What four years are we talking about? Intended to start at the beginning of pilot, so wording should be changed to initial four years of piloting. We'll add the dates.
- LORRIE SHEPARD – I don't like the word "versions" because they should only develop one model and could have variations on it. It's not clear to me that a Mapleton needs something different from a Boulder. The tiniest districts need something very different. I don't think you need three whole versions.
- SANDRA SMYSER – Do we have to come up with multiple systems? NO
- TRACY DORLAND – I'm wondering about the last sentence in the last bullet and if we can end it at system.
- LORRIE SHEPARD – I agree that maybe we need to be more explicit. There would have to be a more compelling statement about whether or not there be a state system. There would have to be a formal process if we're even going to recommend it be the default.
- AMIE BACA-OEHLERT – We need to be clear that that debate is yet to come and it's so important that we learn in the meantime.
- ALYSSA WHITEHEAD-BUST – Staff will add another bullet that is explicit about that.
- JO ANN BAXTER – Regarding the sentence about Council recommending that waivers not be granted for critical elements, does that include charter schools and innovation schools?
- NINA LOPEZ – I think if we have an opinion, we ought to voice it.

9. Policy Recommendations (Attachment 6)

Were there any objections to the changes in red font?

Council reached consensus that the Policy Recommendations are officially done.

10. Adjourn