

Kentucky Teacher Effectiveness Steering Committee
March 26, 2012
Capital Plaza Tower Ground Floor Auditorium

Attendees Present: *Kim Banta, Pete Galloway, Sandy Anderson, Shirley LaFavers, Kathy Donaldson, Kandie McDaniel, Eddie Campbell, Merry Berry, Brenda McGowan, Dara Bass, Rick Jones, Mary Ann Blankenship, Ronda Harmon, Carolyn Witt Jones, John DeAtley, Robert Brown, Dot Perkins, Alan Young, Amanda Ellis, Tammy Berlin, Susan Weston, Stephanie Winkler, Cindy Heine, Amanda Ellis, Nancy Wilson (CELT), Tom Jones, AdvanceEd, Deborah Nelson, OEA*

KDE: *Felicia Smith, Michael Dailey, David Simpson, Renee Scott, Jeff Stamper, Robin Chandler, Olivia Willoughby, Bart Liquori*

Facilitator: *Jenna Mullins*

Welcome and Overview of the Agenda

Jenna introduced herself and went over the agenda for the day:

- Student Growth Data: Ken Draut, Office of Assessment and Accountability presentation.
- Presentation on the field test training.
- Update on regulations and cross state collaboration meeting.
- CIITS demonstration.
- Teacher of Record.
- SC members share new learning and information.

Michael welcomed individuals to the meeting and invited participants to introduce themselves.

Michael expressed appreciation to members for the contributions to the work of the department even during the recent storms that passed through the area affecting school buildings and loss of life.

Several members commented and expressed the overwhelming support received from across the state.

Student Growth Data

Michael introduced Ken Draut. Ken thanked members for the invitation to present to the group again on student growth data.

Kent stated he wanted to frame the data from the OAA perspective. He stated it will be the job of the steering committee to determine how much growth percentile data counts toward

teacher effectiveness and how all the pieces fit together. He stated it is his job to show you the data.

The presentation will be posted to KDE's website in addition to a WebEx presentation that IDT members attended last week.

Points from Ken's presentation included:

- Remember growth data is pulling double duty. It has three main components
 - Next Generation Learners
 - Achievement
 - Gap
 - Growth
 - College/Career Readiness
 - Graduation Rate
 - Next Generation Instructional Programs and Support
 - Program Reviews
 - Arts/Humanities
 - Practical Living/Career Studies
 - Writing
 - Primary/World Languages
 - Next Generation Professionals
 - Teachers and Leaders
- Stated there was time to figure out how the data will be used in Program Reviews.
- Explained the areas of concern with traditional growth.
 - Beginning with a score, teaching the student and re-testing the student.
 - Traditional growth works wonderfully with interim and formative assessments.
 - Traditional growth begins to break down when summative testing is administered.
 - Summative tests cover a broader set of objectives.
 - Uses fewer items.
 - Only administered once a year.
 - Difficult to determine what items measure growth; how is it more grade appropriate as it moves to higher grades?
 - Difficult to determine what growth should have the most weight or emphasis.
- SC member: In the 2nd year, do you recalculate the growth?
 - Response: You start with your new group of academic peers.
- SC member: How would you determine 100 % growth in year 3 and 100% growth in year 4?
 - Response: It would depend how everyone else in the group did.
- SC member: Do you have enough data available to look at the next year?
 - Response: No

- SC member: Is it possible that there are other things that factor in to the scores other than academic?
 - Yes – there are other pieces. We can only control the academic side. There could be other things that change that score or alter that growth. Any researcher will say that there are other variables.
- SC member: We need to ask what kind of data we need to show professional growth. This should be a conversation point. What kind of things did we (teachers) do to address the (desired) outcomes? Kids may not make gains we hoped for, but here is what we did. What did we provide to assist these struggling students?
 - Response: It is a piece of data that goes into a bigger set of data. What will the weight be? There will be formative data and it will be a big part of the system.
- SC member: What if children don't outpace their peer group?
 - Response: We know from 50 years of data that we will not see growth in every single child.
- SC member: Who will receive student growth data? Is it the districts participating in the field test?
 - Response: The districts participating in the field test will receive the SGP data this week. KDE will share these data with all teachers in the state when it is available. The field test districts will receive a hard copy only. IDT members will meet face-to-face with the teachers and principals. They will receive the data and a cover letter of which you have a handout.
- SC member: How do we capture transient students?
 - Response: This will not be captured in Phase 1. Phase 1 will focus on where these students/courses associated with the lead teacher. Phase 2 will focus on how we capture the flow of the day. Do we have the right teacher of record?
- SC member: There must be a strong state level appeals and recourse process for the system.
- KDE question: Are you speaking of an even stronger process?
 - SC response: Yes

Handwritten note:
 Review
 Judgment

Michael Daily stated that the IDT is working in collaboration with Ken's office. Teachers need to see what this will look like. Sharing of scores during the field test will help with the communication of what student growth will look like at the state level. Data will not be shared publicly. IDT members will hand deliver the data. This will give us feedback from the field. Ken's office is also preparing a video.

Felicia Smith stated that eventually it will be shared with all teachers. We have worked to get a better timeline in place. Ken has worked with a couple of districts so that we can learn from them. The next thing to do is share with a larger group of districts and these are the districts participating in the field test. She stated "We are moving slowly to go fast." We need to have smaller conversations and learn a little bit more about the release of the growth data.

- SC member: What about non-tested areas?

**All action items are underlined and recommendations are bolded.*

- Response: It needs to be our next discussion.
- SC member: Will the data go through CIITS?
 - Response: For now, it is a hard copy.

Michael reminded individuals that districts will receive two reports – one for the teacher and one for the school. The teacher will see a report for each course and the principal will see a report for the school. There are 55 districts in the field test and they are going to tell us what is working and what is not working. The field test districts will inform the process.

Keep in mind that the field test districts have 1 or 2 select schools participating. Next year's conversation will be about starting with the same 55 districts in the fall of 2012. They will scale up to all their schools. Then we begin conversations with all of the state in January 2013. ~~By fall 2013, we anticipate all districts to be ready to begin the process.~~ In April 2012, we will begin a more intense conversation with superintendents. We will ask field test districts to share and begin the communication campaign with leadership.

- SC member: How do you keep the scores from going public?
 - Response: We are in a working draft state.
- SC member: Is there any communication going on with the other superintendents and other teachers from across the state?
 - Response: KDE will ensure this is part of the next agenda. We will be walking you through the steps of making a communications plan. It is incumbent to us to get the message out accurately.
- SC member: We are trying to create something that will replace a system that is not tied to PD. If you compare this system to what they are using, this is far better than what most districts are using. The system has to include student performance.
 - Response: This committee is charged with the weighting. We have to have data. We want to learn from research. Weights discussion will not be part of the steering committee agenda until after Dec. We will gather data so that you can make informed decisions. We have time to figure this out. Superintendents are represented on this committee. They are having conversations with their peers and colleagues.
- SC member: Brenda Landry wrote a report on teacher evaluation systems. Overall she gave evaluation systems a B and administrators gave it a B-. A teacher's view of evaluation systems is built upon trust.
 - Response: The report was shared with SC members earlier. I will share that link with you again.

Felicia stated that she and Ken will communicate and follow-up with the Commissioner.

Presentation of Field Test Training

Michael presented a high-level overview of the field test training sessions. The purpose of the field testing process is to determine in authentic settings the usability, feasibility, and appropriateness of the various measures and instruments designed to implement the PGES.

The purpose of the field test is NOT to determine actual individual teacher effectiveness. This system is composed of multiple measures of teacher effectiveness each having unique instrumentation tracking to the various standards in the Teacher Growth and Effectiveness Framework.

Michael indicated that there were 11 training sites and stated that one site was interrupted due to the severe weather. He stated that IDT members would provide one-on-one training sessions with those districts.

He stated that 21 districts participated in student growth, 29 districts participated in the professional growth planning and self-reflection and that 13 participated in the student voice component of the system. There were 137 teachers and 3,900 students involved in student voice.

He reviewed the learning objectives and reported the following results of the training surveys based on a Likert scale of 1 - 5.

- **Student Growth**
- The highest score given - 4.5
- The lowest score given - 3.8

- **Professional Growth Plans/Self-Reflection**
- The highest score given - 4.7
- The lowest score given - 4.0

- **Student Voice**
- The highest score given - 4.8
- The lowest score given - 3.8

Michael stated that the IDT was responsive to the district suggestions and made changes based on the first training session. He stated that districts really wanted to spend more time on understanding the goal setting process.

- SC member: Are these satisfactory scores?
 - Response: Yes. We are satisfied with the scores. I was most interested in the components and then discuss how to make the adjustments we need to make. For example, how do we improve training or what else needs to be addressed for principals, etc.
- SC member: Could you share the median and mean score with us?

- Response: We are still in the process of analyzing the data and will use the data to inform our next steps. Michael will send to members.

Michael introduced Bart Liquori who is a data fellow hired by the department recently. Michael explained that the Commissioner created the Delivery Unit. This unit is designed to monitor and track our progress for SB 1 and to ensure all children graduate college and career ready. Bart is a member of this unit and will focus on the data we need to inform our practice.

Bart explained that a survey will be sent to all teachers participating in the field test asking such questions as was the training effective, is the multiple measure a good way to measure effectiveness, are the instruments adequate and more. The data will be analyzed. Eight focus groups will be conducted to collect the data in addition to an online survey. Focus groups will be used to dig a little deeper into the online survey responses. A separate meeting will be held for teachers and principals. By June 30 a report will be generated for the department. The data will be used for instrument refinement prior to the summer training sessions.

- SC member: Will the survey be in paper and pencil?
 - Response: No. It will be an online survey.
- SC member: Would you consider asking what multiple measures you were trained on instead of asking what district?
 - Response: Yes. That is a good idea.
- SC member: No one has field tested the teacher observation. Will all teachers be involved in the teacher observation?
 - Response: All measures will be implemented with the field test sites this fall.

Michael reviewed a high-level timeline indicating that training will occur over the summer and the extended field test will continue in the fall.

- SC member: Will it be streamlined?
 - Response: Yes. We are looking at data to see how the system can be streamlined.
- SC member: I was really impressed with the training materials. Things that we wanted emphasized were emphasized over and over again? I was very pleased with the way things were presented.

Bart did not hand out copies of the survey today because the questions are still being refined. Felicia stated she did not want the questions to get out to the field test districts.

- SC member: Will the capacity and infrastructure needed at the district level be asked? Will there be open-ended questions?
 - Response: We are working with the superintendents in April. We have this on the agenda.

- SC member: There is an article written by the Aspen Institute, Means to the End that is designed to help school systems and states design evaluation systems that support teacher growth and development. In this resource, there is a tab that speaks to developing local capacity.
 - Response: It is downloadable online.
- SC member: After participants attended training, what was expected of them?
 - Response: They were instructed to talk about their experience with their schools and the instruments they were completing. Data will be collected from the instruments for data analyses. Instruments will be reviewed confidentially.
- SC member: Will the SC have a chance to review the questions before they go live?
 - Response: We will share the questions with the SC, but they must be kept confidential. We will collect your feedback. Your feedback may or may not make it into the survey. You may reply through the teacherleader@education.com mailbox.
- SC member: Is there anything we are going to do on non-tested areas as far as a test.
 - Response: We are using program reviews. How we use them is still up for discussion.
- SC member: How is it fair that some teachers are evaluated on a test score and others from a program review?
 - Response: These are the real difficult discussions that are yet to come. We will not make decisions in isolation and all conversations are informed by other states and our learning from resource reviews and more.
- SC member: Special Education growth is different than other children. How is that going to be taken into consideration?
 - Response: We may need to figure out a better strategy to bring other people to the table. We know that we have not done that yet.
- SC member: Since 70% of teachers are in the non-tested areas. Can we put together a small group to research this?

Recommendation: Create a subcommittee to focus on the non-tested area. Extend to members here and others.

Recommendation: Create a subcommittee to focus on special education issues. Include someone from OAA. Extend to members here and others.

These subgroups should work in parallel. Both groups should include representatives from the steering committee and from field test districts. All feedback will be presented to the Commissioner.

- SC member: There is concern that guidance from the state is needed as to test questions.
 - Response: Before we convene a sub-group on this, let me take this back to the Commissioner.

- SC member ~~Have we signed off on the Danielson observation tool?~~
 - Response: ~~We will use the Danielson observation tool.~~

Teacher of Record (Phase 1)

David stated the purpose of his presentation is to update the SC on the progress of the work of the Teacher of Record (TOR) committee. He introduced Dr. Nancy Wilson from Connecting Education, Leadership and Technology (CELT).

She stated she has been working with Ohio, Arkansas, Florida, Louisiana and Georgia on TOR. She stated that the Bill and Malinda Gates Foundation have given supplemental funding to work with the states of Kentucky and Colorado. She stated we have about 15 other states that we are working with also.

Some states have not had teachers at the table. It is difficult, but I encourage you to keep going.

Promising practices include:

1. Data governance.
2. State ID for students and educators.
3. Statewide course codes including LEA options.
4. Scheduling K-12 including elementary school.
5. Roster verification programs.
6. State definitions for teacher of record and contributing professional.
7. Teacher access to longitudinal data.
8. Statewide student information system.
9. Courses with no standard assessment or performance measures.
10. Inability to include multiple teachers of record or contributing professionals in one course-section.
11. Alternative delivery models such as online virtual self-paced/non-seat time, dual enrollment/community based courses.
12. Data quality and timeliness issues for changes in student enrollment and/or teacher assignments.
13. Connecting not just who taught but what standard and with which instructional practice.
14. Expanded use of teacher student data link (TSDL) for evaluation of teacher preparation programs of which Institutions of Higher Education are accountable.
15. Statewide instructional improvement learning management system as the future source of this information.

Felicia stated that as the group continues to work through TOR, it might be a good idea to post the progress on the KDE website.

David stated that the work began with a team in January and that we were harnessing the power of technology to create data links. He stated that as we create these links, we will make it effective so all teachers will be able to see their students. He stated that the SIS is the network piece that holds student and teacher data.

David reviewed the purpose of connecting teacher and student data links. He stated the Phase 1 TOR definition is:

A Teacher of Record in a Kentucky public school is a certified teacher who has been assigned the lead responsibility for the student's learning in a subject/course aligned to the Kentucky Core Academic Standards or Career and Technical Skill Standards documents.

- SC member: When the collaborative, special education teacher and teacher are working together, is one or the other considered the TOR?
 - Response (Nancy Wilson): This is how it has happened. It takes place at the school level. 20 students could have TOR and special education for five of the students will be TOR. It depends on the level of responsibility assigned.
- SC member: I am HQ for all content, but also for special education. I want to make sure that the special education teacher is not the only teacher. Do you share all students?
 - Response: The sub-group special education committee will delve into these issues.
- SC member: Social Studies may be teaching literacy and standards, but it could be that what I am teaching is not being evaluated and yet I am contributing to the subject area being counted.
 - Response: We know that summative assessments cannot do that. Student learning also occurs from speaking and listening. We have new standards that have this component. We have not made that a part of summative assessment. What we most care about is what is on the end test. We are hopeful these conversations will occur in the non-tested conversations. Ohio has a process in place and we are looking at how we capture this.
- SC member: What is the end number for teachers?
 - Response (Nancy Wilson): There are several business rules you will need to grapple with linking all teachers to all students. What happens with this data? You will need to look at the end number, duration and assignment. There will be business rules built around your accountability. I would recommend not putting these rules into your business rules for TOR. New York breaks TOR down into minutes; some states have them set at 10 or more hours per year.
- Felicia Smith: How many days really matter?
 - Response (Nancy Wilson): Think about percentages. You don't want to limit teaching.
- SC member: Does this include absenteeism?
 - Response (Nancy Wilson): You are getting into the rules of evaluation and accountability. Absenteeism is a huge one. I would recommend it be handled at the school level. There are already protocols about truancy although they may not

always be followed. Business rules should protect the students and not the system. Consider having the ability at the local level.

David reviewed the timeline with participants. He explained that Phase 1 (lead teacher) will be field tested this spring and IC functionality implemented in summer 2013.

Update from KDE on Policy Discussion

Robin Chandler presented a new version of 704 KAR 3.345 to the SC for review. She stated that a staff note would be presented to the KBE in April. She stated the purpose of this regulation is to ensure that KDE addresses the waiver requirements.

Senator Rollins legislation had the waiver language in it. If content is included in the existing statute, it is not included in a regulation also. Senator Rollins bill may not pass the legislative body.

Robin pointed out changes to the regulation since the last SC meeting in January.

- New definitions have been incorporated into the old definitions because the existing regulation will need to stay in effect to cover roles other than teachers and principals.
- Delete bullet number 3 on page 2 for waiver provision.
- Added definitions for TOR; Contributing Professional will be added at a later date.
- Language on page 12 "includes but is not limited to" has been removed. This type language is not permitted in regulations.
- The word "Significant" on page 12 will be replaced with the weights when those are defined.
- Stated peer observations will not be conducted for principals.
- Stated peer observation for teachers is for feedback and comments only.
- Pointed out at the bottom of page 17, there is language on the Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) process.
- SC member: Add a definition for privacy.
- SC member: A principal observing a teacher is currently in existing regulation.
- SC member: Inter-rater reliability is not there, should that be added?
 - Response: It will be added later.
- SC member: How will interns fit into the system?
- SC member: The KTIP process is tough enough. Interns should not have to undergo two evaluations.

Recommendation: Remove PAR process from this version of the regulation. It will be added later.

Members were asked to submit additional comments to the teacherleader@education.gov mailbox.

10

**All action items are underlined and recommendations are bolded.*

CIITS Demonstration

There was not enough time left to view the demonstration. It will be reviewed at the next SC meeting in June when EDS functionality has been added.

Framework Discussion

- SC member: I have concern regarding the teacher framework. I feel it would not be as effective as the 2011 Danielson framework. The 2011 Danielson framework has been validated in hundreds of school districts.
- SC member: Charlotte Danielson's 2009 framework was not intended to be an evaluation. It was a starting point for teacher growth. Her domains 2 and 3 can be observed. The 2011 Danielson framework is excellent. The document can be downloaded off the Danielson website.
- SC member: In Iowa, Danielson has been used since 2001. It may not hit everything you expect. I think it was conceived as a way of growing teachers and learning.
- SC member: When considering inter-rater reliability and certification based on the Danielson, it just makes sense to use one package.
- SC member: This is a big decision. I would like to see a comparison of the document.

Felicia reminded the group of the new regulation that was just presented. The KY framework is based on different domains than the Danielson. I am hearing that you would like to use the 2011 Danielson framework. SC members need to learn more before a decision is made. Felicia stated it is about defensibility also. We want to make sure that we've created a system that is defensible. If this is on your minds, we want to work through it. It will be discussed at the June meeting.

Next Meeting Date

Michael stated that the next meeting is scheduled for June 12 and June 13. We would also like to generate a list of dates for the upcoming school year. We will issue a calendar of dates based on your feedback. Please provide feedback to the teacherleader@education.gov mailbox.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.