

**Minutes of the Meeting of the  
TEACHER AND LEADER EFFECTIVENESS COMMISSION  
HODGE EDUCATION BUILDING  
2500 NORTH LINCOLN BOULEVARD  
OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLAHOMA**

**August 23, 2011**

The Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Commission began its regular meeting at 1:00 p.m., August 23, 2011, at the Hodge Education Building, 2500 North Lincoln Boulevard, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. The Agenda was posted at 1:00 p.m., Monday, August 22, 2011, in accordance with 70 O.S. § 6-101-.17.

The following were present:

Mr. Michael Toth, Chief Executive Officer, Learning Sciences International  
Ms. Kerri White, Assistant State Superintendent of Student Support, Oklahoma State  
Department of Education

Members of the Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Commission present:

Dr. Janet Barresi, State Superintendent of Public Instruction (Chair)  
Secretary Phyllis Hudecki, Secretary of Education  
Mr. Ed Allen, American Federation of Teachers  
Dr. Phil Berkenbile, Oklahoma State Department of Career and Technology Education  
Representative Ed Cannaday, Oklahoma House of Representatives  
Ms. Linda Reid, Oklahoma Commission for Teacher Preparation  
Ms. Susan Harris, Tulsa Chamber of Commerce  
Senator Richard Lerblance, Oklahoma State Senate  
Dr. Jeff Mills, Oklahoma State School Boards Association  
Mr. Joel Robison, Oklahoma Education Association  
Dr. Cynthia Ross, Cameron University  
Mr. Robert Ross, Inasmuch Foundation  
Ms. Ginger Tinney, Professional Oklahoma Educators

Attendees from the Oklahoma State Department of Education and other guests:

See Attachment A.

## **CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

Superintendent Barresi called the meeting to order at 1:10 p.m.. Ms. Holland called the roll and ascertained there was a quorum.

## **WELCOME, COMMENTS, AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Superintendent Barresi welcomed the members of the Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Commission.

## **MINUTES FROM THE AUGUST 23, 2011, REGULAR MEETING APPROVED**

Superintendent Barresi requested approval on the July 27, 2011, minutes. Mr. Ed Allen moved to approve, Ms. Harris seconded. The motion carried with the following votes: Mr. Allen, yes; Supt. Barresi, yes; Dr. Berkenbile, yes; Representative Cannaday, yes; Ms. Harris, yes; Senator Lerblance, yes; Ms. Linda Reid, abstain; Mr. Robison, yes; Dr. Ross, yes; Mr. Ross, yes.

## **REVIEW OF THE CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF A FRAMEWORK FOR TEACHER AND LEADER EVALUATION**

Ms. White gave a brief review of the criteria that was discussed at the last two meetings, to remind the commission of what to have at the front of their minds as they hear the presentations today. Remember that you are looking at the overall model that includes the qualitative and quantitative measures, but today we are just looking at the qualitative portion. The requirement in law is that the qualitative portion be either a 5 tier system or something that can be transferred to a 5 tier system when combined with the quantitative, provide feedback to improve student learning, include comprehensive remediation plans and instructional coaching, be evidence-based, include observable and measurable characteristics of personnel and classroom practices, be correlated to student performance success, include the following 5 domains; organizational and classroom management skills; ability to provide effective instruction; focus on continuous improvement and professional growth; interpersonal skills and leadership skills; and lastly, it must be based on research-based national best practices and methodology. Which leads to the question, what is research-based national best practice and methodology, and those are; assessments that account for years of service since teacher expertise develops over time; be granular enough with thin slices of instruction to support deliberate practice, because teachers develop expertise through engaging in focused practice and focused feedback; identifying instructional contexts or lesson type or segment for when it is instructionally appropriate to use certain research-based strategies; include scales or rubrics to identify the level of implementation for the strategies; reflect the elements for a research-based common language of instruction that accurately reflects the complexity of teaching; clearly define and articulate teacher and student evidences; be both research-based and have validation studies. An additional layer of robustness would be if a model or framework has direct research for the instructional elements for a causal link.

In relationship to the leader requirements for the leader qualitative assessment you will see that many of these are very similar. The primary differences are in the six domains as opposed to five. The assessment for the leader must include organizational and school management skills, including retention and development of effective teachers and dismissal of ineffectiveness teachers, instructional leadership, professional growth and responsibility, interpersonal skills, leadership skills, and stakeholder perceptions. Again the law does require that it be based on research-based national best practices and methodology, and at this point we make a distinction between the best practices for teacher models and leader models. Teacher models that really emphasize the instruction of students, whereas, the leader models emphasize teacher development, as well as, the student achievement practices. Ideally they would be aligned to one another. The teacher and leader evaluation models would be aligned so that evidences from implementation of the teacher growth development and evaluation models roll up into the leadership evaluation models. These are the components that you want to keep in mind today.

At the next meeting we will be providing you with an analysis of all of the presentations of all of the models that you have seen in regard to these criteria.

## **PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF MODELS**

### a. Vanderbilt Assessment for Leadership in Education (VAL-ED)

- Hardin Daniel, Vice President of Assessment, Discovery Education Assessment/Val-Ed

Presentation on the qualitative measure of leader effectiveness.

Quick Summary - It is a simple concept of a survey instrument, a 360° survey instrument of the principal self evaluation, the supervisor, and the teachers in the building, those who are most closely associated with the role of the principal. It is based on foundational skills and standards that serve to inform development of national standards across the country.

There are 72 items on this survey for the principal and supervisor, which takes about 30-40 minutes per principal to complete and there are 36 items on this survey for teachers which takes about 15-20 minutes to complete. There is a 1-5 effectiveness rating which matches the 5 levels of the Oklahoma model. When responding to this they have to respond to sources of evidence that you are using in order to consider and to respond to the question. There are multiple forms so that it can be used twice during the year, one for informative purposes or self-reflection, or if you wanted to administer it twice. It is fully online and is intended and built for a wide, statewide, or large district rollout, in order to facilitate and gather and collect information effectively and efficiently.

Core Components: High Standards,  
Quality Instruction,  
Cultural Learning and Professional Behavior,  
Connections to external communities, and  
Performance Accountability.

- Brad Weir, Sales Manager, Discovery Education Assessment

1) Q: Joel Robison - Do you have any feedback from teachers about their willingness to participate in the evaluation system and the amount of time or burden that it might have on them?

A: Mr. Daniel - From the teachers, it's critical that they understand the role and purpose of this and they see it as just another survey that they have to fill out and complete, then there is usually some push back there that it will take up more of their time. About 20 minutes allows them a voice into what's going on in the building itself, because of the role that the principal has. We've seen extreme variables, reception from teachers. What is critical is that they are trained, not only for the principal's sake, but the teachers' sake about what are the expectations of a leader. That they understand the standards themselves and begin to participate, and set high expectations for why they could lead or if they have the ability.

2) Q: Rep. Cannaday - You stated in your presentation considering VAL-ED, that assuming a quantitative Student Academic Performance index or ability. Is this characteristic of every state that you've worked with?

A: Mr. Daniel - That actually includes a 50% quantitative measure? Yes.

Q: Rep. Cannaday - Then what you are saying is that you can establish a correlation between the assessment here in terms of the qualitative aspect of leadership and the quantitative aspect of student performance.

A: Mr. Daniel - What we are able to demonstrate is, from the research around the foundational standards themselves, that these are the characteristics that need to be present within a building. The characteristics that are within a building, that research has demonstrated actually drives student achievement, drive those desired student outcomes. The behaviors we can also identify, that the validity of the instrument measures the principal's ability to impact those characteristics within a building. One of the IES longitudinal studies, which is ongoing now is a 7 year study and in a few more years we'll be able to produce some results on that, is actually trying to identify whether VAL-ED can predict the eventual improvement in those scores. And so that it is a prediction of student outcomes, sort of an indicator of the principal's role in making those changes. But what we do know is that the connection between the behaviors themselves and the validity of VAL-ED in actually measuring those behaviors.

3) Q: Sen. Lerblance - Who takes the evaluation form and plugs it in to make the sort of chart you have here?

- A: Mr. Daniel - That's all ours, it is within our system, it's an online tool. The survey codes that are distributed is completely and absolutely anonymous to the teachers so that there is no way to track back to the teacher responses. That is also a critical component to communicate to the teachers. We need to have a minimum of 50% participation of the teachers within the building in order to ensure the validity of the measure, but once it goes into the system you have a minimum number of teacher participants, and the principals and the supervisors have completed that, it is automatically generated and the results are available online with a secure password. The supervisors or contact administrator would manage and maintain that. There is a way for the principals to have their own log in and would be able to view their own results. But, we recommend that be a part of a coaching model that state would provide.
- Q: Sen. Lerblance - Is there backup to verify that the numbers put in will come out correct? And how is that done.
- A: Mr. Daniel - Yes. It is our internal process, it's a secure network that we are able to review the results of that and we can work with the different districts to ensure the validity of that.
- Q: Sen. Lerblance - So, we would have to buy into your program to make this effective?
- A: Mr. Daniel - That's correct, it is an instrument that VAL-ED is a tool that we have developed and it is sold on a per building, per year basis.
- Q: Sen. Lerblance - Does that have to be statewide or can it be different districts?
- A: Mr. Daniel - No, it can be different districts, up to statewide. It was intended at \$360 per building and it could be rolled from the building level to the district level.
- 4) Q: Dr. Berkenbile - When you issue a report do you have a way to put out a descriptive measure that correct some of the behaviors that you said are observed?
- A: Mr. Daniel - So the "What Now" aspect, is actually what we look for as partners whether it is locally, universities or within the state department or other organizations that we've worked with in the past. There are groups like the National Institute of School Leaders, SREB, a variety of groups that we work with that actually implement more of the training and coaching models. Our skill is in evaluation assessment and the administration of it, making it cost effective and efficient, and viable and reliable. We work with the analysis of the data

b. McREL Online Teacher & Principal Evaluation Systems

- Dr. Tony Davis, Senior Director of Educator Effectiveness, McREL

McREL believes strongly that the adoption or adaption or development of educator evaluation systems, it is critical for states local education agencies to have a real clear definition about what they want principals and teachers to know and be able to do.

McREL believes you start with a set of premises and everything evolves or develops around that set of premises. The most critical element in our education system across this country is the teacher. The teacher has the most significant impact on student achievement than any other factor that we provide; transportation, service, or technology. We believe strongly that teachers must apply research-based instructional strategies consistently and effectively.

Questions or comments:

- 1) Q: Sen. Lerblance - In your presentation you had “teacher may” and “administrator shall” what is the difference in “should align with best practices” and “leader must align”. What is the difference?

A: Dr. Tony Davis - With “leader must align” our leadership evaluation tool is built on research-based practices. We conducted a meta-analytic study, using 5,000 research publications, dissertations, 69 of those met the criteria for inclusion in our meta-analysis. What we found were 21 leadership responsibilities, behaviors if you will, that are statistically significant and correlated to higher levels of student achievement. Those 21 leadership responsibilities then, are the behaviors that leaders must attend to if they want to have higher levels of student achievement. It’s the difference in the work. In the teacher evaluation system, since it is not our evaluation tool, it isn’t directly connected to our instructional framework. We built it that way on purpose. We do have a teacher evaluation system that is built specifically on the McREL’s instructional model. But we know in our work across the country that states local education agencies have invested a significant amount of time, resources, and energy in defining quality practice. What McREL helps those agencies do is to connect those models of professional practice to a standards-based teacher evaluation system.

- 2) Q: Rep. Cannaday - Looking through your 5 standards for teacher evaluation, in quantitative order of student performance. And as you are indicating if this is done and you score exceptional or whatever on this, you’re are going to have better student performance. But in the system you actually have a factor for student performance.

A: Dr. Tony Davis - Those factors for student performance can be added to it. Our 5 standards for teacher practice are: teacher leadership, culture, pedagogy,

content knowledge, etc. Within the descriptors or those distinguishing categorical behaviors, there is no place for actual student achievement. The behaviors that are captured in each of those categorical ratings are associated with, don't necessarily cause, making causal claims, it might be a little irresponsible. But at least it is associated with higher levels of student achievement. Then we look and work with state departments across the country to combine ratings or some type of a score based on the teacher evaluation ratings, provided by their supervisors, and add that to value-added measures or student achievement measures in order to provide some score to put on a rating for an effectiveness rating. This may meet the top requirements or some other federal, state, or legislative priorities.

Dr. Tony Davis - The principal evaluation system is built on McREL's meta-analytic research on effective leadership. What we have found is that when principals focus, pay attention to, and exemplify, 21 leadership responsibilities, from developing to distinguished, as it is laid out in these evaluation tools, there are higher levels associated with student achievement. There is a .25% standard deviation difference in principals that are perceived as being at the 84% percentile. Evaluation tools take into account perception and performance, they have to, you can't take away human subjectivity in evaluation systems. A .25% correlation to improving student achievement which equates to a 10% percentile point gain in overall schoolwide student achievement.

We currently have the teacher evaluation system as an online application. It does not require any additional cost of hardware or software to the individual district; it's a web-based application; it collects, stores, and reports evaluation data. That data is accessible 24/7, and since it is a web-based application, if you have an iPad, laptop, or desktop computer, you can access all of the forms that are captured in these evaluation tools to provide evaluations for teachers and principals.

3) Q: Ms. Tinney - On the principal evaluation, do the teachers have the opportunity to evaluate the administrators as well?

A: Dr. Tony Davis - They do not. They can provide feedback, but not evaluate.

4) Q: Supt. Barresi - (1) Is there any component of this that takes into account years of experience of the teacher? (2) Have you thought about that and how it relates to student outcome? (3) Same question would be true on the leader evaluation?

A: Dr. Tony Davis - (1) It does not. (2) We've had some conversations about that. And without having to go in and create a different evaluation system and model that, these are the behaviors that McREL believes from the research that we've conducted, is what we expect teachers to know and be able to do, from a developing level to the distinguished level. We capture that data and we can report that data on teacher's years of experience, but we don't have separate

diagnostic tools for beginning teachers versus career or experienced teachers.  
(3) Same answer.

- 5) Q: Sen. Lerblance - (1) On your chart you had orientation on down to professional development, how much time would be involved for the evaluator on that? (2) How much time to evaluate our principals is going to be taken away from other duties to perform this evaluation? (3) So we are going to potentially lose sight of what the principal's job is, he would be a full time evaluator now and not do the other duties that he has?

A: Dr. Tony Davis - (1) The whole cycle is a typical school year, starting in August and finishing the evaluation process in April or June, whatever policy would dictate. (2) It's hard to say. Some of that would depend on the policy, say for example, a particular district has a policy that teachers must have 4 formal observations and those formal observations are 45 minutes to 1 hour long, then that would take the principal at least 4 hours in the course of the year to do a formal observation according to policy. We would recommend 1 hour of follow-up conversation, after the observation and at the end of the year, anywhere from 30 minutes to 45 minutes for a summary evaluation conference. So throughout a typical school year, to evaluate an individual teacher, just estimation, it would probably take around 10 hours. That would be a novice teacher, or a teacher that was on a policy driven cycle, an experienced teacher could take less. (3) No, we want to make sure that they do the other duties that they have to do, but we also want them to pay attention to the evaluations. If they can work closer to improve teacher performance, it's going to impact student performance. That's where we want the principals to really focus a significant amount of their time.

- 6) Q: Secretary Hudecki - In schools where this may be in implementation do you have more than one administrator in the building who might be doing evaluations, such as 2 assistant principals, and how does that work out, because they may not see things the same way.

A: Dr. Tony Davis - Yes, we have flexibility that we try to provide for this. That would be dependent on the district. We have some districts that have a superintendent and 2 vice principals and they will just divide their staff members up accordingly and then conduct those evaluations. We have 29 districts in Wyoming that will be implementing this evaluation tool in the Fall and I have set with their superintendents and they are all over the board on how they want to implement this, some want to divide this up among their assistant principals and some want the principal and the assistant to evaluate the same teacher, so that they can get feedback from 2 sets of critical eyes. There is also, on the teacher component, a place for peer observation. Every teacher in the building can be a peer and they can provide feedback. They can only see the blank rubrics, they cannot see the evaluation data, but they can provide feedback to the teacher in the core content areas.

- 7) Q: Supt. Barresi - (1) In relation to that, is there any way to determine inter-rater reliability, if the district decides to have more than one evaluator to evaluate a teacher or even if one evaluator takes a team of teachers through the year?  
(2) Does that include the development of almost a common language on this?
- A: Dr. Tony Davis - (1) Yes, we can run some numbers for inter-rater reliability and through the training what we would expect to do is to ensure some of that inter-rater reliability through walkthroughs, if you will. So that we can calibrate what individuals are seeing, so we really need to define what that professional practice looks like and ensure that evaluators know in each individual building which could be different from one school district to the next, what that performance looks like. We can run those rater distribution scores and that would give us some data with which we can look at some comparative information around rater 1 versus rater 2 in order to see how far or close they are in observing the same specific behavior through an observation. That training, over the course of time, is going to require districts to calibrate what they are seeing in individual classrooms to ensure that principal A and principal B are actually observing and seeing the same professional practices in the classroom teachers. That would take time.
- (2) Absolutely.
- 8) Q: Dr. Berkenbile - Is this evaluation available and useable for all teachers, not just the academics, for example, career tech teachers (Non-academic)?
- A: Dr. Tony Davis - Yes. Where it is going to have its struggles is OT, PT, counselors. We are currently working on the development of those instruments as well. It works for special education, but not specifically. It would have to be really eyeballed carefully for special education teachers because there is going to be some state and federal requirements for special education teachers. There are some districts using artifacts to support that.
- 9) Q: Ms. Reid - (1) I believe you mentioned that the only avenue for teacher input on the leader evaluation is through the balanced profile. (2) Did I also hear you say that the balanced profile is an option?
- A: Dr. Tony Davis - (1) That's correct. (2) Yes. It is not mandatory.
- 10) Q: Ms. Reid - (1) With your professional development plans you mentioned that their pre-populated if there is a single rating of developing or below. (2) But for a new teacher that ranks at proficient, above developing, on every rating indicator can develop their own plan, just signed off on by the principal.
- A: Dr. Tony Davis - (1) Yes. (2) Yes, they can.

c. Tulsa's Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Initiative

- Amy Polonchek, Acting Chief of Staff, Tulsa Public Schools

They are working with the Gates Foundation on their Teacher and Leader Effectiveness program.

(Video shown)

- Gene Kleindienst, Chief Human Capital Officer, Tulsa Public Schools

Tulsa Public Schools is focused on student achievement in all that we do. This process is a vehicle that will move our students to greater levels of performance and student achievement. This program, this system, this design, that has been in place for nearly 2 years, identified as TLE and, in fact, is having an impact, and with the goals of effecting student achievement. Our program is rubric based which is based on 4 components, coming from the initiating language of SB2033:

- Evaluation;
- Observation;
- Conferences, that relate back to both observation and evaluation; and
- PDP's (Personal Development Plans).

- Ms. Lynn Stockley, President of the Tulsa Classroom Teacher Association

Teamwork is the ability to work together towards a common vision. Our common vision is student achievement. You have heard the word collaboration over and over again, but it is so important that the people who will be most affected by your evaluation are part of the process from the very beginning, because you will have a lot more buy-in if you have been part of it. From the very beginning this was written by teachers with administrators and curriculum specialists.

Additional comments from staff members from Tulsa and Mr. Ky Vu, a member of the BM Gates Foundation.

- Dr. Keith Ballard, Superintendent, Tulsa Public School

Dr. Ballard stated that his district needed to be squarely and solely focused every day on what was in the best interest of the kids. He also stated that collaboration and teamwork was extremely important at the Tulsa Public Schools district.

- 1) Q: Mr. Allen - (1) I would like to hear more about QUEST. (2) So to follow up with that, if I am put on a plan and I have two options, I can try to work through that plan with the administrator of the building or I can get into QUEST and get more intensive help, so you have 2 groups of people moving down path?

- A: Mr. Gene Kleindienst - (1) We soon realized, even though we were 177 PDP into the process, there were those staff members who needed more intense assistance, so we brought together a local consulting firm from the Tulsa area. What it is, is a voluntary program that teachers can opt into based upon a PDP referral system. The PDP is the generating document, so the teacher can go into QUEST. This past year we had 60 participants in the program, 11 continuing into the new school year, because they had not finished the process. It is an opportunity for collaboration with a neutral party coming in to provide feedback and assistance in a specific indicator or indicator areas, that were identified by the evaluator of the building, may it be classroom management, may it be classroom effectiveness, those are the two major areas that we focused on. If a teacher participates in the program, they sign on for 24 half-day sessions over a two month period of time. Why two months, again that's language from SB2033, that you will provide a maximum opportunity or window of a two month exposure. (2) Yes, you have 2 parallel paths, one more intense and one lengthier. And if a person says "no" to QUEST, that does not mean we are going to abandon that person. We will continue the PDP process with a followup. It is a continuing evolving process of feedback and support.
- 2) Q: Rep. Cannaday - As new staff comes on board how much time do you spend inducting them into your culture?
- A: Ms. Amy Polonchek - That was actually something we are changing. This year we are putting in a new teacher induction program, we're using the new teacher center from UC Santa Cruz in California. Quite a few of us are on a planning design team and this is another peer/mentoring opportunity for teachers in their first through third year. We have TFA as part of our school district and one of the things that a lot of us notice is that those TFA teachers were getting quite a lot of feedback and support from that organization and our teachers coming through other ways were not. So this is a really high quality new program that hopefully this time next year we can tell you the great results from it.
- A: Gene Kleindienst - If I may just parallel to that issue, the training component for evaluators is certainly and has been intense. We have trained and spent more than 45 hours with each individual evaluator throughout the course of this past school year, providing them the tech pieces, providing the process pieces, providing them large group venues for presentations, and also one on one assistance in writing PDP's. That will continue because there has been a significant turnover in administrative staff, also the result of PDP's. Administrators within Tulsa Public Schools receive PDP's, and in some cases have been reassigned or are no longer in administrative positions within the district. So it affects all staff members, but training and professional development is a constant process. Tomorrow at 3:00, we will roll out our 1<sup>st</sup> process/training session to the district and that will be repeated probably 25 times in the next 2-3 weeks.

- A: Dr. Ballard - That is a really good question and it just emphasizes the point that a teacher/leader effectiveness initiative is so much more than one teacher evaluation instrument. It's how you induct your teachers, it's how you train your leaders. We've undergone a transformation in starting an extension process of training our leaders. The induction process we're going through is going to be very successful. We also have entered into relationships with the local universities. We want the basics of our evaluation program taught to undergraduate teachers. When they come out with a bachelor's degree, they know full well if they go to work in Tulsa Public Schools what that evaluation is going to be. How you evaluate is being taught in the leadership program in the Tulsa area. So we are working with the universities in that regard.
- 3) Q: Secretary Hudecki - (1) Does this affect the role of the principals in their ability to select their teachers and in the hiring of their own teachers? Are they sent from the central office or does the principal make that decision? (2) And if there is a teacher who is, for whatever reason, is in the medium range in the terms of the evaluation and they want to move, are they moved among schools in the district? And how is that handled? (3) And in a larger perspective in the state, the necessity of and the importance of Oklahoma having a reasonably common, consistent evaluation instrument, because of the mobility of teachers, especially in the urban areas.
- A: Cindi Hemm - The role of the principal, the time constraint that was been placed on them has been enormous. I think that this is the most important work that we've ever done and I want you to know that it is all that I am doing. The instructional leader role has forced us to be in the classrooms more, instead of doing managerial roles.
- A: Stacy Vernon - It would take a lot of time to answer your second question, but we have done a lot of work on our "trim and transfer" process. That is something that we bargain and work together with the union on. But on a 5 point scale, we don't move 2's and 1's around.
- A: Dr. Ballard - It's been a problem in Tulsa for a long time. So we had to say that we're going to have a uniform evaluation process. We're going to determine who can teach and we're going to do all we can to help them learn to teach. And yes, there will be consequences that we don't really like, for those who can't teach. Yes, I absolutely believe that we should have a common evaluation system for the state. After 3 years they met with the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundations and they told them that they thought that Tulsa was doing pretty well in regards to this program.
- 4) Q: Supt. Barresi - Do you see any benefits or any challenges on the application of this to rural Oklahoma, particularly those districts that suffer from isolation, those districts that are small, districts that challenged with human capital challenges?

- A: Dr. Ballard - I absolutely don't see a challenge, any more that we faced. We faced great challenges in Tulsa. We just decided that either we were going to do it or not. It won't be without trial and tribulation. I really do believe that it can be initiated in all parts of the district and it can be done just as successfully. And it's because of the basics of the program, they apply, I believe anywhere. I believe that it can be done anywhere.
- 5) Q: Dr. Berkenbile - You mentioned the teacher induction program and we've been doing that in career tech and we have seen it lower our loss rate of teachers. Are you seeing that too?
- A: Amy Polonchek - Our retention rate is very high right now. And despite the fact that we haven't had a good induction program, we think that is related to the economy, so it is one of our goals in teacher/leader effectiveness, recruitment, retention, development, promotion, all of those things and induction is highly correlated with retention. So we hope to see that resolved.

Ms. White announced that at the Monday, September 12, 2011, meeting, the commission members will be doing most of the talking and discussions regarding what they've heard and what they might want to recommend to the State Board. Ms. White announced that the Commission members will be discussing how they can implement these processes easily. Ms. White announced that there will be another scheduled meeting on Wednesday, September 28, 2011, from 1:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m. At that meeting conversations will begin on the quantitative half of the TLE process.

A request was made, that in the comparison of the models, there be some information provided to show what we have been doing in Oklahoma.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

Supt. Barresi asked if there was any new business. There was none.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Commission, Superintendent Barresi adjourned the meeting.

The next regular meeting of the Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Commission will be held on Monday, September 12, at 1:00 p.m. The meeting will convene at the Hodge Education Building, 2500 North Lincoln, Suite 1-20, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

---

Janet Barresi, Chairman of the Board

---

Kerri White, Assistant State Superintendent

Attachment A

Oklahoma State Department of Education attendees:

Ms. Mary Colvin, Oklahoma State Department of Education  
Ms. Christa Knight for Ms. Malissa Cook, Oklahoma State Department of Education  
Mr. Marty Fulk, Oklahoma State Department of Education

Other guests:

Mr. Lou Barlow, Barlow and Associates  
Mr. Michael Barlow, Barlow and Associates  
Dr. Vickie Williams, Oklahoma Cooperative Council for Oklahoma School  
Administration (CCOSA)  
Mr. Robert Killian, Crutchco Public School  
M. Jimmie Smith, Darlington Public School  
Ms. Karen Patton, American Federation of Teachers  
Mr. Howard Kuchta, Cameron University  
Ms. Talia Shaull, Tulsa Public Schools  
Ms. Jana Burk, Tulsa Public Schools  
Mr. Joe Robinson, Oklahoma State Department of Career and Technology Education  
Ms. Diane Wilson, SAS  
Ms. Gracy Taylor  
Mr. Gene Kleindienst, Tulsa Public Schools  
Mr. Jaared Scott, Oklahoma State Department of Career and Technology Education  
Ms. Linda Hendrix, Oklahoma Education Association / TCTA  
Ms. Lynn Stockley, TCTA / Tulsa Public Schools  
Ms. Julie Fabrocini, BM Gates Foundation  
Mr. Hardin Daniel, Discovery Education  
Mr. Brad Weir, Discovery Education  
Mr. Tony Davis, McREL  
Ms. Teena Nations, Oklahoma Commission for Teacher Preparation  
Ms. Katie Hawk, Oklahoma Education Association  
Ms. Daniela Newville, Oklahoma Education Association  
Ms. Alicia Priest, Oklahoma Education Association  
Mr. Greg Hathcock, Principal  
Mr. Key Vu, BM Gates Foundation  
Mr. Todd Hellman, Battelle for Kids  
Ms. Robyn Hilger, Foundation for Oklahoma City Public Schools  
Ms. Jennifer Pettit, MC3  
Dr. Keith Ballard, Tulsa Public Schools  
Ms. Stacey Vernon, Tulsa Public Schools  
Ms. Erin Boeckman, eCapitol  
Ms. Cindi Hemm, Tulsa Public Schools  
Ms. Jenny Archer, Oklahoma City Public Schools  
Ms. Jolynn Horn, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, GEAR UP  
Ms. Lorri Thomas, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, GEAR UP  
Ms. Amy Polonchek, Tulsa Public Schools  
Mr. Jim Machell, UCO / OACTE  
Mr. Jason Nelson, State House  
Mr. Corey Holland, State House