



State Council for Educator Effectiveness
June 22, 2012 from 9:00 a.m.–2:45 p.m.
CEA Offices, 1500 Grant, 4th Floor Board Room

Meeting Minutes

Meeting Attendees

State Council Attendees

Matt Smith
Katy Anthes
Jo Ann Baxter
Bill Bregar
Lorrie Shepard
Brenda Smith
Jim Smyth
Sandra Smyser
Tracy Dorland
Towanna Henderson
Dr. Margaret Crespo – by phone

Council Staff

Angela Baber
Alyssa Whitehead-Bust
Micaela Michie

Speakers

Angela Norlander
David Archer
Jean Williams
Jo OBrien

Public

Allison Sampish
Mike Gradoz

Courtney Cabrera
King, Toby
Stacey M. Lestina
Kady Dodds Lanoha
Todd Engdahl
Bill Jaeger
Annette Fante
Dawn Pare

Welcome and Announcements

Matt Smith called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone. He also requested a briefing for the Council and for the Governor's Education Leadership Council Integration Sub-Committee on Colorado Legacy Foundation (CLF) supports to districts in implementing Senate Bill 10-191 (SB 191).

Overview of Meeting Objectives

Alyssa framed the meeting. New CDE and CLF staff were introduced.

- Micaela Michie, CLF, administrative support to the Council
- Dawn Pare, Educator Effectiveness Team, CDE
- Courtney Cabrera, Educator Effectiveness Team, CDE

Overview of North Carolina's Lessons Learned in Developing Standards for Other Licensed Personnel

Jean Williams presented on the North Carolina process of developing standards and rubrics for support personnel (designated as other licensed personnel in Colorado).

- Jean responded to RFP to develop a principal evaluation rubric for North Carolina several years ago. Therefore, she has been through this process before and has learned some lessons.
 - North Carolina looked at 5 different models, wanted McRel, asked Jean to do the work.
 - There were no models to take a look at so she needed to develop standards from scratch.
 - She developed 5 rubrics, and developed one for pre-serviced as well.
 - Principal and teacher rubrics were rolled out at the same time, but in phases to address capacity limitations (only for about 20 % of the teachers the first year, 30% the next year and the remaining 50% the final year).

- North Carolina developed an online evaluation system.
- Last year, Jean was contracted to work on developing standards and rubrics for ‘other licensed personnel’ known as support staff in North Carolina in the following areas.
- The initial idea was that these should be based primarily on the teacher rubric with minor modification made depending on the category of license. This ended up being too cumbersome and the work groups decided to start from scratch in building out standards, elements and rubrics for different categories of support staff.
- Initially there were 6 groups, then decided to refocus the effort and base categories on licensure requirements.
- They broke licenses into three groups to organize the building of rubrics which were built out across 9-10 license categories.

Break

Review OLP Work Group Report and Recommendations

Sandra presented the OLP work group recommendations (see OLP Work Group Recommendations). The major area of concern and debate was focused on the recommendation of a ‘hybrid’ category of OLP that included special education teachers. Many Council members stated that special education teachers should be treated as teachers and should be evaluated on the quality standards for teachers. Sandra clarified that in many cases, critical components of a special education teacher’s job may not be captured using the existing teacher rubric and that adding additional language or an addendum might assist in ensuring that the important elements of a special education teacher’s job be captured via evaluation observations. There was concern that providing special considerations for groups of teachers would result in too much direction for districts and would result in numerous versions of standards and rubrics for teachers.

After much discussion, the Council agreed to these next steps and made the following recommendations.

1. CDE is to form one work group with two major categories of personnel: medical and social emotional. These two groups are to focus on specific categories of licenses.
 - a. Medical; which includes the following license areas:
 - i. School Audiologist
 - ii. School Nurse
 - iii. School Occupational Therapist
 - iv. School Physical Therapist
 - v. School Speech Language Pathologist
 - b. Social/Emotional; which includes the following license areas:
 - i. School Psychologist
 - ii. School Social Worker
 - iii. School Counselor
2. The work group is charged with identifying how each of the license categories of OLP listed above align to the quality standards for teachers; to articulate how they do not align; and to provide a thoughtful rationale for any changes that need to be made to the quality standards (including draft language) for review of the Council at the September 28th meeting. At this time, recommendations are to be made at the standards and element level, not at the practice level. However, the Council requests example practices for performance levels if they come up naturally in the workgroup work.
3. The two major sub groups are also charged to articulate similarities between the categories of licensed personnel (outlined above) for the purpose of developing a single set of standards – if possible – for all of the licenses within the sub group.

Further, the Council decided not to focus on the category that the initial OLP work group designated as ‘Hybrid’, but suggested that CDE capture information from the pilot districts on how special education teachers (Early childhood

teachers, etc) are being evaluated using the quality standards for teachers and the evaluation rubric. The Council recognized that special education teachers might need differentiate at weighting, professional practices and appendices level, but left this to CDE and to districts to decide.

Lunch

The initial OLP work group recommended the following process be followed in making recommendations for evaluating specific categories of OLP.

1. Use the basic framework of the teacher quality standards as the organizing framework for any new standards for categories of other licensed personnel.
2. Review and use national standards for specific categories of OLP to inform new and hybrid standards for OLP.
3. Review and ensure that state licensing and preparation program requirements for specific categories of OLP inform the development of new or hybrid standards for OLP.
4. Assign work groups for every type of license listed above (11 work groups), but coordinate the work by broad categories (or clusters) of OLP (Medical, Social/Emotional, Hybrid).
5. Work groups develop/align quality standards for each license category and also recommend the 'practices' that should be measured within each category.
6. Work groups make preliminary recommendations for how or what types of Student Growth or outcome measures could be incorporated into evaluations.
7. The work groups meet between the June and September quarterly Council meetings and deliver recommendations to the full Council at September quarterly meeting.
8. Identify key groups of stakeholders to vet quality standard recommendations for OLP.

The Council charged CDE to move the work group forward as appropriate to meet the three recommendations outlined above. The Council is not committing at this time to develop unique standards for OLP, but wants the deep thinking of the work groups to inform their decision-making process.

CDE and Governor's Office Updates

David Archer provided an update from the Governor's office.

- The Council will sunset in 2014
- The Governor will appoint 2 members to fill the two vacancies; student and charter representatives.
- The state is now anticipating \$279 Million above expected forecast in terms of state revenue.
- The governor's budget included support for CDE to implement SB 191 which translated into \$6.2 million in support for 2012.

Jo O'Brian presented on the Content Collaboratives.

- See Power Point presentation for detailed information.

Public Comment

No members of the public signed up to speak.

Closing Thoughts and Next Steps

Additional Recommendations/Actions of the Council include the following.

1. CDE needs to generate a list of questions in collecting information from pilot districts which includes a focus on how pilot districts are using the teacher standards and rubric to evaluate special education teachers.
2. CDE needs to add alternate education as a fourth category under the 'hybrid' category.
3. TOSA and instructional coaches - CDE needs to develop some guidance in allowing districts to select the best rubric for their TOSA's, but should not develop a rubric in these initial implementation years.