

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

November 7, 2011

The Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Commission began its regular meeting at 1:00 p.m., November 7, 2011, at the Hodge Education Building, 2500 North Lincoln Boulevard, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. The Agenda was posted at 1:00 p.m., November 4, 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
Ms. Lisa Endres, General Counsel, Oklahoma State Department of Education
Ms. Alicia Currin-Moore, Executive Director, Teacher and Leader Effectiveness, 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. Keith Ballard, Tulsa Public Schools
Mr. Joe Robinson, designee for Dr. Phil Berkenbile, Oklahoma State Department of Career and Technology Education
Representative Ed Cannaday, Oklahoma House of Representatives
Senator John Ford, Oklahoma State Senate
Ms. Sheila Groves, Oklahoma Parent Teacher Association
Ms. Susan Harris, Tulsa Chamber of Commerce
Dr. Jeff Mills, Oklahoma State School Boards Association
Ms. Linda Reid, Oklahoma Commission for Teacher Preparation
Mr. Joel Robison, Oklahoma Education Association
Mr. Robert Ross, Inasmuch Foundation
Mr. Renzi Stone, Saxum
Representative Earl Sears, Oklahoma House of Representative
Dr. Jack Herron, designee for 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 1:15 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. Superintendent Barresi thanked Secretary Hudecki for chairing the October 10, 2011, meeting in her absence.

MINUTES FROM THE SEPTEMBER 12, 2011, APPROVED

Superintendent Barresi requested approval on the September 12, 2011, minutes. Representative Sears moved to approve the minutes. Dr. Mills seconded. This motion was voted on with the following votes: Mr. Allen, yes; Superintendent Barresi, yes; Dr. Ballard, yes; Representative Cannaday, yes; Senator Ford, abstain; Mrs. Groves, yes; Ms. Harris, yes; Secretary Hudecki, yes; Dr. Mills, yes; Ms. Reid, yes; Mr. Robison, yes; Mr. Ross, yes; Representative Sears, yes; Mr. Stone, yes. Representative Cannaday asked if he should abstain since he was not present at the September 12, 2011, meeting. It was determined by the Commission that as a member of the Commission, Representative Cannaday could still vote to approve the minutes.

MINUTES FROM THE OCTOBER 10, 2011, REGULAR MEETING APPROVED

Superintendent Barresi requested approval on the October 10, 2011, minutes. Mr. Robison moved to approve the minutes. Representative Sears seconded. Ms. Harris asked whether Dr. Ballard used the term “mythology” when referring to value added methods during the discussion regarding *Presentation and Discussion of Tulsa Public Schools’ Experience With Student Growth Measures*. Dr. Ballard stated that he actually said “methodology”. This correction was made to the October 10, 2011, minutes.

This motion was voted on to approve the amended minutes with the following votes: Mr. Allen, yes; Superintendent Barresi, abstain; Dr. Ballard, yes; Representative Cannaday, yes; Senator Ford, yes; Mrs. Groves, abstain; Ms. Harris, yes; Secretary Hudecki, yes; Dr. Mills, yes; Ms. Reid, yes; Mr. Robison, yes; Mr. Ross, yes; Representative Sears, yes; Mr. Stone, yes.

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION REGARDING PUBLIC COMMENT ON PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS #1 AND #2

Ms. Currin-Moore informed the Commission that since the September 28, 2011, Commission meeting, there have been additional public comments made regarding the two qualitative recommendations made at the September 12th meeting. Ms. Currin-Moore provided a CD to the Commission with the additional public comments. Ms. Currin-Moore’s presentation

was a summary of the contents of the CD. Since November 2, 2011, there have been 1,107 public comments made. The first survey question asked, *To what degree are you supportive of using qualitative assessments as 50% of an overall teacher and leader evaluation system?* The vast majority of the responders were either supportive or very supportive of the qualitative assessment as 50% of the overall score. The next question, *To what degree have you been following and/or participating in the work of the TLE Commission?* On a 0-3 scale, the average rating was 1.69. This rating is slightly higher than the rating presented at the October 10, 2011, Commission meeting. The vast majority of the responders either agree or strongly agree with having a Framework selected as the default for the state. On a 0-3 scale, the average rating was 2.57. The next question, *To what degree do you agree with selecting the Teacher default from Danielson, Marzano, or Tulsa's Framework,* received a 2.47 average rating. The final question in this section, *To what degree do you agree with approving a limited number of Frameworks that meet the criteria,* received a 2.69 average rating. In regards to the Leader Framework, the majority of the responders either agreed or strongly agreed to select a default, with a 2.42 average rating and the question regarding approval of a limited number of Frameworks that meet the Leader criteria, the average rating was 2.66.

Ms. Currin-Moore then summarized some of the comments made regarding the following questions:

What do you believe will be the most positive outcomes of implementation of the qualitative assessment?

- A teacher stated that she would like to make sure that the qualitative portion still matters. This teacher also believed that the evaluation will create an attitude and climate change in schools.
- Several teachers expressed the need for more training and are concerned about the evaluation accurately showing student growth.

What would you like to see added to the preliminary recommendations?

- There is concern about how the quantitative portion of the evaluation will be calculated for non-tested grades and subjects.
- One teacher expressed interest in an alternative plan for teachers who teach at risk students.
- Many responders would like to see the evaluation take into account entry year teachers and their level of expertise.

Other comments:

- One responder was concerned that good teachers who have chosen to be in at-risk schools will leave the at-risk schools out of fear that the students test scores will reflect poorly on their evaluations. Ms. Currin-Moore explained that Ms. White will discuss how the use of growth models or value added models may alleviate some of these concerns.

Questions:

1) Q: Senator Ford – On your earlier comments, you were talking about the strong approval or strongly approved that there be three models and that one of the three be the default.

A: Ms. Currin-Moore – Yes.

2) Q: Senator Ford – But there was never any indication of which of the three, is that correct?

A: Ms. Currin-Moore – Well, the next question, *If you are familiar with the Frameworks that have been reviewed by the TLE Commission, please indicate which Frameworks you believe should be included in an approved list for district selection.* So, this question, which does not specifically say which one should be the default, Danielson’s Framework received a 56.7% rating to include as an option, Marzano’s received 54.9%, and Tulsa’s received 48.3%. Then the next question goes deeper and asks if that one should be named as the default. Danielson’s received 7.5%, Marzano’s received 22.8%, and Tulsa’s model received 12%.

3) Q: Representative Sears – Would you repeat the first percentages again?

A: Ms. Currin-Moore – Sure. Danielson’s 56.7, Marzano’s 54.9, Tulsa’s 48.3.

4) Q: Representative Cannaday – Could you state the difference between those two percentages very briefly.

A: Ms. Currin-Moore – Sure. The first set of numbers, the 56.7 for Danielson’s, the 54.9 for Marzano’s, that set of numbers was based on this question , *If you are familiar with the Teacher Frameworks that have been reviewed by the TLE Commission, please indicate which Frameworks you believe should be included in an approved list for district selection.* So the first question is just do you think it should be on the list. The second set of numbers is do you think it should be the default.

5) Q: Senator Ford – For those that voted for one of the three as the default, you have given the percentages but what are the absolute numbers?

A: Ms. Currin-Moore – Sure. Absolute numbers on default on Danielson was 30, Marzano 99, and Tulsa 50.

6) Q: Senator Ford – And the total number of public comments?

A: Ms. Currin-Moore – 1,107. So, not everyone responded to that question. That is how the entire public comment is. Not everyone responds to every question.

7) Q: Superintendent Barresi – When did the public comment begin?

A: Ms. Currin-Moore – The public comment began...
Ms. White – September 13th

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF ADMINISTRATORS' EXPERIENCES WITH MARZANO'S CAUSAL TEACHER EVALUATION MODEL, DANIELSON'S FRAMEWORK FOR TEACHING, AND TULSA'S TLE OBSERVATION AND EVALUATION SYSTEM

Ms. White reminded the Commission that at the last Commission meeting, several Commission members requested additional time to review the three Teacher Frameworks. Ms. White informed the Commission that administrators from two of the schools implementing two of the Frameworks will present on their experiences with the evaluation. Ms. White then stated that after the administrators speak she would respond to the Commission's questions at the last meeting regarding cost. Ms. White reminded the Commission that its task is to review the content of the Frameworks and not focus on the cost; however, as will be discussed later, the cost for the Frameworks is comparable. Ms. White stated that one of the Commission members contacted Dr. Marzano directly and requested information comparing the Marzano and Tulsa Frameworks.

Dr. Ballard introduced the administrator who would speak on behalf of Tulsa's Model - Ms. Stacy Vernon, Principal at Will Rogers College High.

Ms. Vernon discussed the implementation of Tulsa's TLE Program. She informed the Commission that Tulsa is in the second year of implementation, but she has been using the instrument for 3 years. The instrument has changed every year in order to increase or decrease the number of indicators used. Tulsa has reduced the number of indicators to 20, which still covers all of the indicators previously used. Many of the old indicators were repetitive. One of the biggest benefits to the Tulsa Framework is that the teachers and administrators are able to come together to have meaningful conversations focused around instructional practices. Previous evaluations were not clear, now this Framework has a rubric to show what effectiveness is. The Framework has also given the teachers confidence in the administrative team. The subjectivity has been removed. Teachers feel that they are evaluated fairly and evenly. All of the instructional practices are able to adapt to the Framework. Because of the Framework, Ms. Vernon's staff has been able to be more collaborative in their teaching. Ms. Vernon stated that this Framework has encouraged the teachers to "go to the next level" and share with other teachers how to become more effective.

Questions and Comments:

1) Q: Mr. Robison – Are we talking qualitative or quantitative?

A: Superintendent Barresi – These are the qualitative. What will be presented to you are the qualitative.

2) Q: Representative Cannaday – Do you have a 5-tier system within that evaluation system?

- A: Ms. Vernon – We do. Within each indicator, there is a rubric with a score of a 1-5. So it would be an ineffective, needs improvement, effective, highly effective, and superior.
- 3) Q: Representative Cannaday – So do you struggle with that distinction between highly effective and superior? Could you share any problems, or how did you resolve any if there was?
- A: Ms. Vernon – Within the indicators, there are guidelines under each. So all of the teachers have it out there in front of them, they know from day 1. There should be no surprises at the end to what their evaluation will be. Especially with the way our system is set up with two formal observations and each being followed up with a face-to-face conference, written and verbal feedback, before your evaluation. So at your evaluation, you should know, or have a pretty good idea of where you are going to rank within each indicator. Now to move from highly effective to superior, that is something that all of the administrators, and teachers, are taking very seriously because within our Framework, if teachers are given a 1 or a 2, which is less than effective, we have to justify that in writing. If they are given a 4 or a 5 which is more than effective, we also have to administratively justify that. So we can't just willy-nilly give a 4 or a 5, we have to justify it in the evaluation. Justify and give evidence as to why they received that superior ranking.
- 4) Q: Dr. Mills – What steps or things do you have in place when a teacher needs remediation?
- A: Ms. Vernon – When a teacher is given a 1 or a 2, it is required that we follow-up with a professional plan for those teachers. So, they are not just given a less than effective rating and then in 3 months we'll come back in again. So there are specific steps outlined for that teacher, those can include professional development, it can include a mentor teacher within the building, observation of teachers that are masters of the skills where they are needing improvement. It can mean having an outside consultant coming in. If it can go to that level if it is more serious and we feel like they really need an outside independent view as to what's going on in the classroom. Then those are reviewed if they have a professional development plan, prior to the next evaluation. So there is opportunity. The goal is to make them effective. So if they receive a less than effective rating either on an observation or on an evaluation, there are avenues in place for improvement and support prior to that next evaluation.
- 5) Q: Representative Sears – Do you have a percentage of those administrators at Tulsa Public Schools that wrote a 1 or a 2?
- A: Ms. Vernon – I don't have access to that. That might be a question for Dr. Ballard, because I don't see the other principals... I don't have that.

A: Dr. Ballard – We do. We track that very carefully, and we track that closely. It is of equal importance that the administrators go through continued training on evaluation practices. In fact, right now we are participating, I think we are one of six schools in the United States that are working with a program with the Gates Foundations on best practices of teachers, reviewing films. It's a very intense highly technical training program. We do keep track, we follow all of that very carefully and very closely. We do talk with principals about their evaluation; how they are evaluating and when they are evaluating.

Ms. Vernon added that the administrators work on inter-rater reliability within our building. All administrators will go into a teacher's classroom and observe, not for evaluation purposes, but to see if they see the same things. In addition, discrepancies are addressed so everyone is consistent.

6) Q: Mr. Allen – For the average teacher, the number of evaluations and the length of those evaluations?

A: Ms. Vernon – We have a minimum of two formal observations for each evaluation. A formal observation has to be at least 30 minutes; typically a whole class period. So before a teacher receives an observation, a formal evaluation from me, I go in for my first observation and within five days I have a conversation with them and give them face-to-face and written feedback on what I saw. Then, after a two-week period, minimum, I will go back in for a second observation, follow the same process, with a conversation afterward. Then have the formal evaluation which is based on those two observations and any other informal walk-throughs or times that I have been in the classroom.

Mr. Robnison commended Tulsa Public Schools on their work with inter-rater reliability. He noted that this is an important issue for whichever system is chosen in ensuring equity around the state.

Dr. Ballard stated that the inter-rater reliability is a system Tulsa has in place to check for consistency. The district has “cross checks” where other evaluators come in and do an evaluation and then the district checks to see if the evaluations are similar.

Superintendent Barresi noted that it is absolutely critical for the success of any of the Frameworks that there is inter-rater reliability through training.

Dr. Ballard added that the MET (Measurement of Effective Teaching) study he referred to earlier is an inter-rater reliability study.

7) Q: Mr. Stone – Is that one period, thirty minutes to an hour, is that enough time? Are we polling the teachers and finding out their thoughts on the system? You said they viewed it as fair, is that data collected?

A: Ms. Vernon – To answer the first part of your question - Is that enough time? That is in conjunction with other things that have taken place. Things that have happened outside, talking to the teacher, informal walk-throughs. In the observations, typically what will happen, is that I will look at the teacher's lesson plans to make sure I am looking for certain areas. It may be that I am not there during that thirty minute block or that forty minute block at the beginning of the class period, to see the opening, or likewise at the end of the class period to see if there is closure or to see how the wrap-up occurs. So then it is incumbent on me, at my next observation if I did not see the end, then I go and make sure that I am in there to see the end of a class period so that I can appropriately evaluate closure and things like that. If it turns out that in two observations I really have not seen enough of this one particular element of a teacher to be able to evaluate fairly and appropriately, then I will go back in for a third observation. And I will have a conversation in my follow-up observation with the teacher to say "I still have not seen you do this, right now I will not be able to evaluate you adequately on that, you will be less than effective because I haven't seen it. So I need to come back in and make time to see this indicator, because I haven't seen enough." So there are a lot of allowances for that. As far as the teachers feeling it is fair, yes. We do have feedback, at the district level I am sure they have more concrete data. I can tell you that in my building I have weekly meetings where we talk about one indicator, what it is that is effective, giving resources within my building so they don't feel like they have to go to another building, they don't feel like they have to get on the internet and find a bunch of help or support for this indicator. We list professionals within our building that are the experts in that area that are willing to share, willing to loan their stuff, give their stuff, come into their classroom. So we have established that. I don't require that of my teachers, but I will tell you that I have about 70-80% show up for each weekly meeting on their own time, on their planning period. That is a way that I get the feedback from them; that they are really understanding what effectiveness is in this area, or where we as a staff need to do more work because the feedback I am getting is that they are not real clear on what I am looking for.

Dr. Ballard – At the district level, we involve all of our teachers as we go through our redesign annually. We do survey, we ask what were the issues, what do you think needs to be done. They are very involved, in fact our President of our Classroom Teachers' Association is here with us today. She and the staff at TCTA were very involved with the design of this program from the very beginning. We do send out a survey every year, we say what are the issues, what are the problems, and we will work to perfect it.

Ms. Vernon added that a lot of the changes made to the instrument were as a result of the survey.

8) Q: Dr. Herron – How many total teachers do you evaluate and do you have an assistant and how many do they evaluate?

A: Ms. Vernon – I do have assistants. To give you an example, the building where I was last year, we had 138 teachers, so it was myself and the administrative team. We were divided evenly. As part of our inter-rater reliability, if somebody was having difficulty evaluating a teacher, they felt like they were having issues, then another administrator would jump in. We also require, I also require our administrative team to do informal walk-throughs and have documentation for them, that they have been in that class, so that we as an administrative team share those. I have opinions from some other people that have also been in that classroom, the teacher sees that as well. So it is really important and a key to success with implementation of a new process, is making sure that the teachers have that confidence in the administrative staff. That it doesn't matter who walks in there. That they are not coming to me saying, "I want you to evaluate me because he doesn't know instruction. He has been pigeon-holed as discipline and he can't do it." So that is very important that you have that. We also get the benefit of having multiple evaluators, so that we can have that option of a couple of different people going in for a formal observation to make sure we are seeing the same thing. I am a former foreign language teacher, so it make sense that I would go into those classes because it is more in my area, whereas someone without that background may not see some of the same things. But we are also very well versed in what is necessary and what we are looking for, so it doesn't matter. I am able to evaluate effective strategies in a foreign language classroom just as well as I am able to do so in a choir room, or in a calculus classroom, or an English classroom.

9) Q: Ms. Reid – Will you give me an idea of about how much time it takes over all of the evaluation process for a principal, for one given teacher, and follow that up with how that varied with the 37 indicator process and now that it is a 20 indicator process.

A: Ms. Vernon – The time it takes to evaluate is the same. That has not changed. What has changed in the amount of indicators is simply how they are grouped. We found from feedback from administrators and teachers and looking at the data at the district level that when we had 37 indicators, they were covering the same things. For example, you had an indicator "the teacher monitors the students for understanding throughout the classroom". And the next indicator is "They adjust based on monitoring". Well clearly, if you score low on the monitoring, then you can't be adjusting for it because you're not doing it. So those can combine to say "monitoring" and "adjusting" in the same indicator. So that is how we got the reduction. You are still assessing the same qualities, it's just how they're grouped. So that time has not changed within the process either, you're still required the two observations to support each evaluation. For a less than three years in the district teacher, that happens twice a year. For teachers that are veteran teachers, that happens once a year, they have one formal evaluation per year. So that, that time has not changed. The first year we implemented the system, it took a lot more time for administrators, because you were used to, if you had a veteran teacher that you knew was great, you would walk through and here you go. So it has increased the time. I will tell you that in the second year,

we have decreased the time and it has become a time saver in a lot of ways because some of the things that we had to look at before with follow-ups and more conversations, and having issues with, now based off of this, after that observation, and getting more constructive feedback, I have seen an improvement in my teachers to the point that a lot of the smaller things, day-to-day things that we had to address now have gone away. They have become better at their practice, they are becoming more effective. They are having those conversations themselves, as to what effectiveness looks like so it has really created that collaborative environment where teachers are helping each other and they are shooting for effectiveness.

10) Q: Ms. Reid – So is it fair to say that the depth is perhaps better with 20 than with 37 because it is 20 clear indicators that you are getting feedback from rather than the 37?

A: Ms. Vernon – Yes, I think that is fair. I think that it's more streamlined, I think it is more precise that what we were doing. Again, if you had a teacher and they were not monitoring in the classroom and the indicator was “adjust the lesson plan based on monitoring”, that teacher, if they were skipping the monitoring step, they got hit twice on the evaluation because they clearly could not do the other step either. So, that may have skewed their overall score, when those items are really related, you can't do one without the other.

Superintendent Barresi added that the MET analysis will be informative in this process. This will give some important data to analyze.

11) Q: Representative Sears – What do you have in place for a person who receives a 1 or a 2, do they have the option? What is the process if they don't agree with you? Do they have an opportunity to respond?

A: Ms. Vernon – Absolutely. They have an opportunity to, as they always have, to respond to the evaluation in writing. There are always avenues in place when I sit down with a teacher and say this is an area that I didn't see, if they don't agree with it, that's fine, but I am still going to put them on a plan of improvement. They are still going to be expected to follow that. There are times when TCTA will step in, we will sit down together and figure out ok, what are we seeing here. A lot of times if we have a teacher that disagrees with their evaluation we may then bring in another administrator. Most of the time when it is to this point, when a teacher in my building receives a 1 or a 2 it is not a surprise. There have been two observations and two conversations along with those that say the same thing has happened. So it shouldn't be a surprise to any teacher at that point.

At the conclusion of Ms. Vernon's presentation, Ms. White introduced Dr. Brian Staples, principal at Douglass High School to present information regarding his school's implementation of the Marzano's Framework.

Dr. Staples reminded the Commission that there is a three-step process in implementing an effective evaluation system. Step one is to select a Framework. He then displayed the resources that accompany the Marzano Framework and explained that the resources are essentially free. There is a minimal cost to the actual Framework, however, the discussion regarding which Framework to choose is very important. Dr. Staples then stated that the next step is Professional Development. Marzano has developed several professional development opportunities to support the Framework. This includes books, videos, and webinars, to actual professional development. Dr. Staples informed that Commission that whichever Framework is chosen must include appropriate professional development in order to achieve the high level of competency needed for implementation. The final step is technology. Douglass has been able to use iObservation which was also used as professional development to build capacity for the teachers. The cost is in the professional development and the technology. Dr. Staples stated that the Marzano Framework is researched based and validated by student achievement, which is a critical element. The teacher is able to complete a self-assessment. The teacher can look at their classroom to find evidence of student achievement. The summative evaluation differentiates for years of service. The expectations are different for a beginning teacher as opposed to a career teacher. The summative evaluation contains a “status” and a “growth” component.

Ms. Greathouse stated that teachers have the same opportunities to view what they will be evaluated on. If the administrator does not have an opportunity to view something, the teacher can provide them evidence. Douglass is in the process of downloading videos of their teachers to add to the Marzano Resource Library. Marzano’s has a student component where the students can provide input on the teacher’s evaluation.

12) Q: Mr. Ross – I have a question on cost. Do you know how much Marzano costs your school every year?

A: Dr. Staples – We are a School Improvement Grant Site so I think last year we spent \$300,000 on professional development. You don’t have to get to that level, but remember we are trying to transform a school so there is a difference.

13) Q: Mr. Ross – Was that all attributed to Marzano?

A: Dr. Staples – No, because we have other components.

14) Q: Mr. Ross – Do you have any idea what would have been specific to that...?

A: Dr. Staples – I don’t know. Sorry.

Mr. Ross – I am just trying to get to, well, we have heard from Tulsa who say it is free, and you know nothing is free. So what you held up at the beginning, that would be free, but implementing any system would cost some money.

Dr. Staples – I would suggest that if you’re going to implement at a high level, any system, if we are going to implement Tulsa’s across the state at a high level, it’s going to take a lot of professional development. Professional development costs money, that’s the bottom line. If you want high quality professional development, I would suggest to you to invest in technology. A

high quality system of data. Seven or eight years ago when we used the Teacher Appraisal System and we went from paper/pencil to the online version it was a huge change in the ability for administrators to be in classrooms. I want to address the issue of how much time - you can't spend too much time as an administrator in classrooms. If you look at the research on formative feedback to teachers, it's just like to kids. The more you assess and provide specific feedback, the greater growth you're going to get. An administrator has to commit to this; that they are really going to commit to improving the quality of teaching.

15) Q: Superintendent Barresi – Can you describe for us the way you establish inter-rater reliability?

A: Dr. Staples – We did that a couple of ways. We spent days, three days, with iObservation staff, our whole leadership team, and we watched videos. We had those discussions, about who rated them. The hardest group to get there were assistant principals. Teachers were really more spot on than the administrative team was on evaluating the teachers. So that shows you the work that we have to do with administrators across the state.

16) Q: Representative Cannaday – Would you elaborate on what you said about “validated on student achievement”?

A: Dr. Staples – Right. It's not just the 41 strategies that have been research based. Also, they went back and, I think Tulsa Public is working on this component right now, they actually went back and looked at those teachers who performed those particular behaviors and looked at what is the student achievement level in those classrooms. So it has been validated by student achievement as well. Not just individual strategies researched based but validated in the classroom.

17) Q: Representative Cannaday – Could you give me an idea of the type of validation that was used?

A: Dr. Staples – I can't, maybe someone else...

A: Michael Toth – I did review the research that you asked Brian about. There are two levels in Marzano's Model of research. One of them is correlational research. Frankly, all the major Frameworks that you are considering have that, and Tulsa is currently going through that. That is my understanding of the MET. This is where they have videos of teachers and they have observers rating those teachers. But, they don't know what the student achievement parameters are for those teachers. And it is really about whether the Framework can identify a high or low performing teacher, and then you see the level of correlation. All of them have to have those, I assume, to be considered at the state level, because if it can't have validated research where it can identify high and low performing teachers, then it shouldn't be considered. That is in the criteria that you're looking at. The next level is whether or not the elements themselves, the 20 within Tulsa's or in this case Marzano's has 60, but there are 41 that you observe in the classroom; whether those elements, with experimental control studies actually raise student

achievement. So I think that is where you were getting with student achievement. With Marzano there were 500 experimental control studies with literally hundreds and hundreds more in the pipeline where they take those specific elements, the teacher evidence and student evidence as detailed in the rubric that has been provided to the Commission, it looks at whether or not those items as actually implemented will raise student achievement. This is a whole other area of validation. So, setting goals and providing feedback to teachers, I'm sorry, teachers to students which has monitoring involved in that, has about a 24% average learning gain for students in the classrooms when teachers put this at a high level of fidelity into implementation. So you can actually get a causal correlation. Tracking student progress and providing feedback which is another one that has a 34% gain. Teachers can have a high degree of confidence in the principals when they do the training with fidelity that the challenge, as Dr. Staples was talking about, is now we are asking instructional leaders, assistant principals, and principals, to be able to give specific advice, feedback if you will, to teachers to improve. Where that is helpful is, is that advice research based, or even researched, and will it help them increase and get student achievement gains.

18) Q: Mr. Allen – Brian, for the average teacher, number of observations and the length of those observations?

A: Dr. Staples – Well, our contract requires, but the more you get in, the better you're off, so.

19) Q: Mr. Allen – So is that more than Tulsa was saying? For the average teacher?

A: Dr. Staples – I don't know, because we're trying to be in every classroom every day. That's our goal. We are trying to fundamentally change, and you can't do it unless you're in there and know, there is no upper limit. I don't know what the minimum would be but, there are contractual minimums, but that's what they are, minimums.

20) Q: Ms. Reid – Is there a difference in the number of observations if a teacher fails to achieve expectations, like a 3 rating?

A: Dr. Staples – Well, they're on a plan for improvement like Tulsa Public Schools describes.

21) Q: Ms. Reid – So they will have more observations the following year than those that achieved a 4 or 5 level?

A: Dr. Staples – In the two month period that they are on the plan, intensive. But, the goal is being in there all the time so you don't end up on a plan.

22) Q: Mr. Robinson – Does the rubric that you're using work just as well for your career tech teachers as your math and science teachers?

- A: Dr. Staples – Yes, it shows good, effective teaching. It's based on thirty, forty years of research. It goes across all subjects.
- 23) Q: Mr. Robison – You mentioned about student input into the process, how does that work?
- A: Dr. Staples – Sure. For every one of the 41 strategies in the classroom, there is a list of teacher evidence and a list of student evidence. One of those is just a conversation with the student. What is the learning goal? And if the student can't articulate that, whatever the teacher is doing is not getting to the student level. So for every one of those strategies, there is a list of student evidence that you can see and questions for you to talk to kids about.
- 24) Q: Mr. Robison – But students don't directly score a teacher or anything like that.
- A: Dr. Staples – No, although that might be one of your other measures you could look at.
- 25) Q: Senator Ford – Dr. Staples, you mentioned the number 41, Tulsa has 20 indicators, is that 41 indicators and are those similar in concept?
- A: Dr. Staples – Similar in concept in Tulsa's? I believe there are going to be a lot of similarities. It's just about effective teaching. It's not anything that is going to surprise you, but yes, there are 41 under Marzano's model.
- 26) Q: Senator Ford – So it's not necessarily that you are looking at more you just grouped them in your observations differently.
- A: Dr. Staples – That is correct. They are really grouped in three areas, routines and procedures on content and on the spot, the art of teaching.
- 27) Q: Superintendent Barresi – Can you foresee a time at which a teacher will continue to develop and you will look for additional findings to this or refinements to this, to help the teacher continue to move on? Maybe adding additional components to it? Is there ever going to be a ceiling?
- A: Dr. Staples – To the Framework? I wouldn't think so. I would think over time the Framework will probably change. That is probably up to the district because this isn't an individual school decision, it's a Framework development of best practice. Frankly, it's been pretty consistent. We've known for a long time what we need to do. So I think it's going to be pretty consistent, but it's possible that research will over time might add some elements to it.
- 28) Q: Representative Sears – Can you give the statistics or data about how many states or school districts where this program is in place?
- A: Dr. Staples – I can't but...

A: Mr. Toth – I can speak personally, that there are implementations in thirty-eight states and literally hundreds of districts. But we believe that there is more. The issue is that you can freely download the rubric off of the website and buy the book and never pay anybody anything and implement. We think that’s where the hundreds are, but there is no way of tracking that.

Ms. White informed the Commission that Crutcho Public Schools was unable to attend the meeting to discuss the Danielson Framework, but if the Commission would like to hear from Crutcho, they can be available at the next meeting. Ms. White discussed the chart created by Dr. Marzano comparing the Tulsa model with the Marzano model.

Ms. Currin-Moore then provided the charts to each Commission member.

Ms. White reiterated that the chart was created at the request of a Commission member and the chart was created by Dr. Marzano and his team’s perspective.

Superintendent Barresi asked whether Tulsa can be given an opportunity to validate the chart. Ms. White said that she would appreciate Tulsa validating the chart.

Dr. Ballard – There are a couple of things, just from a cursory look that I would like to address, but we would like to have that opportunity to do that, thank you.

Superintendent Barresi – Perhaps if you could send it in, we could circulate it to the Commission as well, thank you.

Dr. Ballard – At some point Dr. Barresi I would like to make some comments, and it’s based on what we heard as being research based, whenever it is the right time. If you would let me know, thanks.

Superintendent Barresi – Well, if we have time right now that would be great.

Dr. Ballard – I think there has been some question as to whether our evaluation system is research based and it is. First of all, the MET study which I eluded to a while ago, which is the inter-rater reliability, also they are doing a study based on student achievement as it correlates to our evaluation system. So that will be directly researched through the MET study. We look forward to those results. In the construction of the TPS evaluation system, we relied very heavily on a couple of research based models. Those specifically were Danielson’s Framework of Effective Teaching all of which is steeped in research. Also upon the findings in the ASCD publication, *Schooling Practices That Matter Most*. So we would say, definitely we are based on research. We have a research base in our Model. And in looking at this (the chart) “elements within the Framework have been researched” we definitely believe that ours does meet that criteria.

29) Q: Mr. Ross – One thing that keeps coming up in my mind is the cost. Dr. Ballard, can you speak to that? Is it cost driven by the district or by what is chosen here? Is it going to be the same no matter what you pick? Is yours cheaper, more expensive? Do you have any indication that yours will be less expensive than Marzano’s or any others?

A: Dr. Ballard – I don't think that I am in the position to make that comparison. But I will say this, I made this very clear, that we have our Model developed, we have the technology. All of that is available at no cost. It's all a matter of the training. We are willing to participate in Train the Trainers. We are willing to do that. This is the only cost that we are talking about and I think, I don't know what that cost were to be. If TPS were selected as the default model, we would make all of that available. We would work with the trainers and then the trainers would need to go out and do the actual training. Speaking as an administrator, I would say that it would have to be less expensive than the other model. But I am offering that not as TPS Superintendent or even promoting the TPS model. I like the DeFore work, the Marzano work, the Danielson work. I like it really well, and we're influenced by that.

30) Q: Mr. Ross – It seems to me like we are making this decision without talking about cost pretty much, but what if one is really less expensive? Maybe it needs to be taken out of the equation, all of these are all the same, but to me it seems like a very important question on how much each system would cost to implement.

A: Superintendent Barresi – That is indeed an important question because we here at the Department in preparation to implement this, at least the qualitative component, are looking very hard at the cost of that and all that it will entail. I think the statement that professional development is expensive is an understatement. No matter which way we go, and I think Ms. White might have some numbers for us, we contemplate all the different components of this. Whereas we greatly appreciate Tulsa's experience with this, essentially, one of this we are going to have to do is hire Tulsa as our consultant. Even though they are looking at a Train the Trainer model, we are going to have to be intensely involved with them. First of all, look at their numbers, their experience, have a "red line" to Stacy Vernon and say "ok, in this situation, how did you handle this?", or Superintendent Ballard or whomever he appoints. Well, they have developed an exemplary system that works for them, were going to have to... let's just break it down. Ms. White, will you break it down?

Ms. White suggested to the Commission that there are four categories of cost. The first category is the Framework itself. Tulsa's, Marzano's, and Danielson's Frameworks are free. The second category is training in using that Framework. The training would be for administrators and teachers. Part of the training would include inter-rater reliability. Training of the state's administrators is going to have the same cost for any of the three models. It's a matter of days, time, and location. The state would need to hire trainers for any of the models. The third category is the technology to implement the classroom observations. Tulsa indicated that they could give the state software for free, but they would not be able to give the hardware. Every administrator will need a handheld device, or laptop to do classroom observations. The software for Marzano and Danielson appears to be a minimal cost. At a previous meeting it was suggested that the state develop its own software, but, through research, Ms. White does not believe that this could be done cheaper than purchasing the pre-developed software. The fourth category, where the majority of the cost

comes from is the professional development for all teachers for continuous improvement. This would not be an additional cost over what should already be going on throughout districts. The professional development would be targeted around the particular Framework that has been adopted. Ms. White suggested that looking at Tulsa's entire professional development budget could give the Commission an idea of the cost associated with the model. All districts need high quality professional development targeted around the indicators that increase student learning. Overall the difference will be in the minimal cost in purchasing the software to complete the classroom observations.

Mr. Ross suggested to Dr. Ballard that he include a paragraph regarding cost in his response to the Tulsa/Marzano comparison chart. Mr. Ross also suggested that each Framework provider submit, in writing, a cost estimate.

Ms. White stated that Dr. Marzano has personally stated that he gives away everything that he gets. Ms. White informed the Commission that she did request a cost estimate from each Framework, however, until the Department provides actual numbers regarding the number of administrators that need training, it is difficult to give actual costs. The Framework providers ask that the state not request such information until the state goes through a formal proposal process.

31) Q: Senator Ford – Basically you're saying that the three models that we are looking at, taking the assumption that they are all quality providers, so you're saying from your determination of costs, that it would be essentially the same for any of them?

A: Ms. White – That is my best, good-faith estimate. Right now they are essentially the same cost.

32) Q: Senator Ford – The second part of that question, and I asked that just last week or month, so, say we pick one provider and the total cost for the turn-key package was \$100. If we were to select two providers, the total cost may be \$105 or \$110. We are going to be training two sets of Train the Trainers and I am trying to get a feel of what is the cost of giving the districts more of an option than just one.

A: Ms. White – Based on my experience with professional development strategies and technology assistance strategies, it would be more expensive to provide training on two separate instruments than providing them on one instrument. I could not tell you if that is a 5% increase, a 10% increase, a 50% increase, I honestly don't know. I am quite confident that it would not be a 100% increase, but I can't put a number to what that difference would be. I would say that it would be more, would it be substantially more? I can't answer that at this time.

33) Q: Senator Ford – So the differences are that we would be training the trainers in a different method. The professional development may actually be the same under both providers? Correct?

A: Ms. White – Correct. The building level professional development, the teacher level professional development, I don't know that there would be an extensive difference in cost. It really would be about the training. It's a question of "Can I train 300 people in one room at the same cost that I can train 150 people in two separate rooms at the same time."

34) Q: Representative Cannaday – In Item 4 (referring to comparison chart), and Dr. Ballard may be able to address this, I am thinking of the traditional, or the five day staff development that we had and the issues we wrestled with. That was a local issue. This would do away with the local issue, if I am understanding that, in terms of what we do on those staff development days.

A: Dr. Ballard – I'm not sure it would do away with it. I might just say how we did it in Tulsa. We had a consultant, who is really quite good, we were paying him out of Title II dollars. We used him to develop our evaluation system, it is research based, he developed those rubrics. Then we went in and our regular training, professional development training, we do training every summer with administrators. We do have a professional development program that you eluded to, we have done all of ours through that professional development. And it would seem to me that no matter what model is selected, that is essentially what would happen in this case. Trainers would be trained and it would be carried out through the professional development model. That is what I would do, that's what I did do as Superintendent.

Ms. White added that the Department would use the same training mechanisms currently used throughout the state to train administrators on the model. The difference might be that because the models would be new, the administrators would not be able to train in their building as they might be doing under the current system. This may make the training more expensive, but the training could happen on the traditional five days of professional development.

35) Q: Ms. Groves – When Tulsa Public Schools was deciding on a model, Dr. Ballard, what made you look for a new system? I don't know what you were using previously, but, why was the decision made? Did you look at the other things that were out there like Marzano and Danielson? What was the catalyst that made you go and develop a whole new system? What was lacking in the others that you felt you needed your own system?

A: Dr. Ballard – That is a very good question. There were effective components in every model. But we just thought it would be more effective if we tailored one, if we self-developed it and tailored it to what we thought our needs were. We did look at all of the other models. We also believed it would be more effective if we had everybody inside of TPS involved in that process. So, looking at various components, we decided to write our own.

36) Q: Mr. Allen – So we're talking about under any of these models, we are talking about training principals who are then going to train teachers?

A: Ms. White – There are actually two different ways that we could look at training teachers. That could be done where we first train administrators and then have the administrators to train the teachers. I think that has been a part of the strategy in both Tulsa and Oklahoma City. Then the other possibility or strategy would be to provide training directly to the teachers on those different models. Superintendent, we were just discussing today about rethinking the way we provide professional development from this department altogether. One of the things we want to take into consideration is making sure that the professional development we provide to teachers is tied to one or more of these models.

Dr. Ballard explained to the Commission that Tulsa used Title dollars for training. If districts are creative using their dollars, the district can carry this out. Dr. Ballard reiterated that Tulsa was interested in continuous improvement and they created their model because they did not find a model with a similar focus.

Superintendent Barresi – We do anticipate from this Department, if a default is selected, of developing a training program for administrators. Now, as Kerri said, we are taking a look at all professional development that goes out and trying to make it available to teachers. However, I wonder if Dr. Staples and Ms. Vernon might talk about the collaborative nature of what happens when that training begins with teachers. What I imagine is continued discussions that are rich and based on information between the groups. So there is value in both approaches and our desire is to make sure this is implemented with a high level of fidelity.

Dr. Staples – We trained our Leadership Team. So it wasn't just administrators, it was teachers, counselors, about ten people on our Leadership Team. We delivered, not me, that professional development to our teaches. That's what I would recommend. In fact, Oklahoma City is getting ready to implement that and that is what we recommended to Oklahoma City, not to train administrators in isolation, but as a Leadership Team to go through that training and then there is a lot of discussion if you are able to do that.

37) Q: Mr. Ross – Dr. Staples, what would be the positive and also the negative of you all switching to the Tulsa model?

A: Superintendent Barresi – One of the things if we select a default, and talking about resources from this department going out, it would not take away from any of these districts that are devoted to one. They can continue to run the program they have.

38) Q: Mr. Ross – I was just trying to follow-up with Senator Ford's incremental expense. So, hypothetically, if there was just one, what would it do? Would it be easy?

A: Dr. Staples – I don't know if I could answer because I am not as familiar as I should be with Tulsa Public Schools', but assuming that its research based, I don't think it would be... I don't know if I could answer that.

A: Ms. Vernon – I guess back to Dr. Barresi’s question about professional development and how it is done and what collaboration it produces, I guess to try to clarify, the training that we do in Tulsa for the administrators and Leadership Team is on the rubric and how to evaluate. That then in turn is translated down at the building level where those administrators discuss the rubric, engage in conversations with teachers, begin those conversations and then a site team takes that rubric and determines the needs for that building. So the professional development at my building, and the professional development within my building for high school teachers, versus junior high teachers may look different based on the needs of those teachers. So you’re really helping to build that collaboration and self-identify within your building based on that rubric. So it’s not the same professional development, and the professional development and the understanding of the rubric process is different at the administrator level than it needs to be at the teacher level.

39) Q: Representative Cannaday – Wouldn’t it be less expensive to do it this way than it would be to hire outside consultants to come in on those five days of staff development if we did it in-house?

A: Ms. White – I think it depends on the school, it depends on the capacity of the administrative team in that school. Some schools now, many schools for years have not brought in outside consultants. Some schools do, many of them call on us. So it depends on each school individually whether it would be more or less expensive professional development. Regardless of the Framework, regardless of whether we have a default, I do believe the three Frameworks being focused around teaching and learning is going to give the state the opportunity to focus on those things, those strategies that are most important to what makes a difference in student achievement.

Dr. Ballard informed the Commission that this is ultimately a decision for Superintendent Barresi, but he expressed that the professional development can be implemented with Title dollars that districts already have.

40) Q: Mr. Allen – But that would mean that you would have to channel the money, you would have to take the money from somewhere else.

A: Dr. Ballard – That is correct, but that was our priority for what we were doing with our dollars.

Superintendent Barresi – I can just tell you in a general statement, as we are looking at professional development dollars coming out of this Department, we are finding that repurposing those dollars has produced some efficiencies and those dollars will be directed in professional development, not just in this but in transition to Common Core and in Reading.

41) Q: Senator Ford – As far as implementing the program, the person to be trained is an administrator at each site. Correct?

A: Superintendent Barresi – Yes.

42) Q: Senator Ford – The person doing the training is the trainer that will train those individuals.

A: Superintendent Barresi – Yes.

43) Q: Senator Ford – So what we are looking at is someone to train the trainer.

A: Superintendent Barresi – Correct.

44) Q: Senator Ford – Now you're saying the trainer will probably be a state department employee?

A: Superintendent Barresi – Not necessarily, or a contract person.

45) Q: Senator Ford – So in the Train the Trainer, is that person in the case of Marzano, a Marzano employee, or a Marzano certified individual?

A: Ms. White – I think perhaps we have added an extra layer that we may not need. We need somebody that's going to train administrators. That person, if we are contracting with someone that already knows Tulsa's system, they can be the direct trainer. If we are contracting with someone that already knows Marzano's then they can be the direct trainer, Danielson system the same. In the case of Tulsa, there are many people in Tulsa that know the system, but Dr. Ballard doesn't want them to be our full-time trainers, so there would be in Tulsa's case, that extra piece, where they would have to train trainers to do that direct work. So, in some of those cases we may have a Train the Trainer, in other cases we may be able to contract directly with a trainer who already knows the system.

46) Q: Senator Ford – But if you are contracting with a trainer and it's not a state department person, it's a third party person that knows the system, then at their expense they would be the one that learns the system. If Tulsa was one of the options, those trainers, at their expense, would learn the Tulsa model, and then we would contract with them to go out and do the training. So there shouldn't be any additional expense.

A: Ms. White – Correct

**DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON ADDITIONAL PRELIMINARY
RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE OKLAHOMA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
RELATED TO THE QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENTS FOR THE TEACHER AND
LEADER EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION SYSTEM (TLE)**

Superintendent Barresi stated that she was advised that there was discussion regarding potential alterations to Preliminary Recommendations # 1 and #2. Superintendent Barresi went on to say that this was the reason she requested Ms. Currin-Moore to present the additional public comments to Preliminary Recommendations #1 and #2 and why there was additional discussions regarding Frameworks so that the Commission can have as much information as possible.

Ms. White reminded the Commission that at the last meeting, Dr. Mills suggested looking at the Department's budget for the default model and reserve a portion of that Department budget that would be available to districts if they chose a model other than the default model.

Dr. Mills added that there are two good models that districts have put intense resources into and perhaps funds could be set aside for a two default system.

47) Q: Mr. Allen – Please refresh our memories on why we were going with one default, what was the purpose of that?

A: Ms. White – Based on the experience of other states, some states have said, districts go forth, and do as you please. This created a lot of discrepancy from district to district. Other states approved a short list, other states approved one, and then a few other states approved a short list with a default. Those states' implementation has been most successful. Based on those experiences, some of the rationale for why they believe that was the most successful is the capacity of small schools that do not have the ability to create their own, or even to research between the models to determine which would be the most effective in their school. It's a way of saying from the states perspective, "We believe this would be effective in all schools." It doesn't mean that we don't believe the others wouldn't be effective in all schools, but it is a way for schools that don't have the capacity to make a selection to have something in place. I also think it goes back to Senator Ford's question earlier about the cost. How much training are we going to do? The more we can put in one system, the more likely we are to get more value out of it.

A: Superintendent Barresi – We were looking at experience across the country because I am not about top-down types of decisions. We looked across the country and said what states have implemented this with the highest level of fidelity, and how did they do it. This is how they did it, with a default, but with a choice of others.

Mr. Robison made a motion to name the Tulsa model as the default model for the state and that Marzano and Danielson be named as well.

Superintendent Barresi noted that this motion was not an action item on the agenda and that naming the default will be on the December's agenda item.

Ms. White explained that the agenda item for this meeting centers on whether the Commission would like to maintain the preliminary recommendation to name a default, or change the wording of the preliminary recommendation to name two defaults.

48) Q: Mr. Robison – So is the Commission now to learn that we are not going to be able at some point in the future to name our suggested default?

A: Superintendent Barresi – No. The reason this was brought up, and excuse me because I was not here last time, it was my understanding that there was some discussion about whether indeed do we what to stick to our original recommendations of a default and then choices. Not about any particular brand name. So staff said there was enough discussion about it that we feel like it needs to be fleshed out a bit more. So our desire is to re-visit it and make sure that the Commission is comfortable with those recommendations.

49) Q: Mr. Robison – My only concern is that, we only have one more meeting to go and this is really kind of the easy deal, the qualitative, we really haven't spent a lot of time on the non-tested subjects, all those things that are really the more difficult issues here, I think. I was just hoping today that we could at least put one thing off the table so we could focus on some other things.

A: Superintendent Barresi – I understand. We are going to. The next item we have is some suggestions for you on quantitative but for right now we just felt like there was enough discussion at the last meeting; staff brought it to me and I thought it needed to be another agenda item.

50) Q: Representative Cannaday – I want a little clarification here, we want to say a default with choices. What would be the role of the State Board with the choices?

A: Superintendent Barresi – Well, the Commission is making its recommendation around this. So, those recommendations are made to the legislature and the State Board of Education. It is stating specifically what you see in those recommendations there. I believe those recommendations outline criteria under which a district can actually select another system. So, we just looked across the country at who implemented it the best and this is what was brought up.

51) Q: Ms. Groves – Under Teacher Framework under Danielson and Tulsa's, it says "pending correlation with statutory criteria". Have we received the information we need on that?

A: Ms. White – From Danielson, the only change that needs to be made is moving from a 4-tier to a 5-tier system. The data comes in such a way that it can easily be done. It has not yet been created. For Tulsa, it is the results of the MET study that would make Tulsa in line with the statutory requirements. Dr. Ballard, do we have an estimated time on when the MET study will be...

A: Ms. Vernon – Before the first of the year.

A: Ms. White – So those would be the two pieces that we are waiting on and the timing of those.

52) Q: Ms. Groves – So we have to name a default prior to knowing whether either of those are going to meet the criteria?

A: Ms. White – Yes.

53) Q: Senator Ford – Is all we're doing is making a recommendation to the State Board who will make the final decision, is that correct?

A: Superintendent Barresi – You will be making these recommendations, naming a default and the Board will act off of the recommendations of this Commission. May I point out that in December, the Commission's work is not done. The work of the Commission is ongoing and we will speak to that in just a moment.

Senator Ford made a motion to change Preliminary Recommendation #1 from naming “a default” to “no more than two default Frameworks” .

Senator Ford noted that this would give the Commission the option to name more than one Framework.

Ms. White explained that Preliminary Recommendation # 1 could be re-worded to say:

For both the Teacher Evaluation System and the Leader Evaluation System, the TLE Commission recommends that the Oklahoma State Board of Education name *not more than two* default Frameworks that are paid for by the state in terms of training and implementation requirements to serve as the qualitative assessment component that must comprise 50% of the total evaluation criteria required by 70 O.S. § 6-101.16.

Representative Sears seconded the motion.

54) Q: Ms. Groves – Senator Ford, would you mind speaking to this a little bit more? Why do you feel that we need two?

A: Senator Ford – I'm just saying it gives us the option of naming two. It doesn't say that we have to have two. Because, right now with the way the preliminary recommendation is written, we can only name one. We have had a lot of

discussion. I would just like to give this Commission the option of naming two, if we choose.

55) Q: Ms. Reid – The Commission continues its work for several years. If we were to name two defaults and as time went on we found that one was more successful than the other, is this something that over the next couple of years can be paired back down to one default?

A: Senator Ford – I would certainly hope so. Through legislation or new rules.

A: Superintendent Barresi – I would think that data would drive decision-making. This would be another one of those issues.

Ms. Reid noted that the Commission may be hesitant because of the incredibly important decisions that must be made in a short window of time.

Superintendent Barresi – Would the Commission also consider Dr. Mills’ suggestion regarding this?

56) Q: Mr. Allen – What does this mean with this scenario – if half of our districts are in Tulsa and half in Marzano, or 45% are in one and 45% in another and 10% are in various. What does that mean as far as collecting data? What does that mean to you all?

A: Superintendent Barresi – It means a lot more work.

A: Ms. White – I would argue that if we have a list of three, or more, the same amount of work is going to be required of this Department as if we named two or more defaults. As long as they are all options, we are going to have to collect the data on all of them. So, as far as data collection, the work is probably the same. As one of my colleagues reminded me, we are going to get the calls, “so which one of these is better?” Other than that, with the things we have already discussed, I don’t know if data collection is a difference maker.

57) Q: Mr. Ross – How do you compare teachers and leaders across state, if there are three different forms of measuring their progress? It seems like we should come up with one.

58) Q: Representative Cannaday – Can you be in compliance with Senate Bill 2033 if you do more than one?

A: Superintendent Barresi – Well the bill simply says that the Commission will develop a system. We are back to our original quandary when we had these discussions. What does the word “a system” mean? Is it one system or is it a system of evaluations?

59) Q: Secretary Hudecki – I am a little concerned about teachers who move among districts. Even if you have strong inter-rater reliability built in the best that you can, if we are using multiple systems and I am a highly effective teacher in district and I move and I flip, what does that say? Or, is that just too bad you shouldn't have moved?

A: Ms. White – I think that is the data that we would come back to the Commission with and say “Is this system really working? We have teachers under one system which would be rated high and on another system would be rated low.” Regardless of whether we have one default or more than one default, if we have more than one on the list, then I think we would want to have some studies done where we would evaluate or observe teachers under all three systems to ensure that we would get similar results.

Ms. Reid stated that she was interested in Senator Ford's recommendation because having an option of two defaults would give us purer data than what the Commission reviewed earlier. With two default systems, it would be easier to explain the data to teacher preparation programs; as opposed to explaining multiple systems.

Superintendent Barresi – We have to consider that in future years, there may be systems that will come down the road that will trump any of the three of these. One of the things we don't want to do is put ourselves into a corner, where we have no options at all. I understand exactly what you're saying, but... that doesn't satisfy... No, I am not open to multiple, I am open to a default with just a couple of other choices.

Mr. Allen stated that the Commission's first recommendation is the best way to proceed. Districts will still have a choice. But a dual system has potential problems.

60) Q: Representative Cannaday – The State Superintendent and the State Board would make that decision if School B decides to do option 5 or 6. This is my concern about the word choices. I could see districts wanting to do their own system, but the State Board must approve that system, is that correct?

A: Ms. White – Correct. That's your preliminary recommendation number 2, that any Framework that has not been approved by the State Board, or any changes to one that has been approved by the State Board, would have to be approved by the State Board. As long as that happens while you all are in existence, I'm sure that we would want your input on that before taking it to the State Board.

Mr. Stone stated that because the state will never have the funds to be able to become experts, perhaps the Commission should choose one Framework and allow the Department to “dig in” and become experts in one Framework to avoid some of the cost issues involved in trying to become experts in multiple Frameworks.

Mr. Robinson pointed out that the State's two largest districts already are using two different models and if one is selected as a default, the other district will most likely continue using their current model. So there will still be a data issue.

61) Q: Mr. Ross – Oklahoma City’s in only in one school though, right? So theoretically, they could switch to Tulsa.

A: Dr. Staples – It’s currently in two schools, but, it has also been adopted district-wide for initial implementation.

62) Q: Mr. Allen – If we approve two, or one, or three, or whatever, if we approve Marzano and Tulsa obviously wants to do Tulsa, Tulsa doesn’t have to get approval from the Board if it is one of the ones that is already in the three.

A: Ms. White – Correct

Ms. White reminded the Commission that there was a motion and a second on the floor.

Senator Ford stated that in reality the state will be implementing Tulsa and Marzano. He would like to help the districts by providing training for both. This would allow for better, more consistent training. The state has two major districts that will go two different ways and Senator Ford would like to use state resources to help districts move down the path that they choose.

Superintendent Barresi called for a vote.

Mr. Allen, no; Superintendent Barresi, no; Dr. Ballard, yes; Representative Cannaday, no; Senator Ford, yes; Mrs. Groves, no; Ms. Harris, no; Secretary Hudecki, no; Dr. Mills, yes; Ms. Reid, yes; Mr. Robison, no; Mr. Ross, no; Representative Sears, yes; Mr. Stone, no. The motion failed.

**DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS
TO THE OKLAHOMA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION RELATED TO THE
QUANTITATIVE MEASURES FOR THE TEACHER AND LEADER EFFECTIVENESS
EVALUATION SYSTEM (TLE)**

Ms. White informed the Commission that there are many details regarding the quantitative system. Ms. White also informed the Commission that recently Tennessee has had some issues with its quantitative system and this is why Superintendent Barresi initially stated that the state should pilot the qualitative portion of the TLE first, and then allow more time to add the quantitative components. Ms. White then discussed a simple growth model and a value-added model. Both models will take into account the student’s growth in achievement. The value-added model will also look at factors that teachers may see as barriers to student achievement.

A motion was made by Mr. Allen and seconded by Ms. Reid to make a preliminary recommendation to use a value-added model in calculating the thirty-five percentage points attributed to student academic growth using multiple years of standardized test data for those teachers in grades and subjects for which multiple years of standardized test data exist.

63) Q: Mr. Robison – On the simple growth model we are comparing a student’s performance at the end of instruction prior to instruction? What is being contemplated for this? Having a test at the first of the year and then at the end of

the year? Or, are you using the student's score at the end of the previous year to the end of the current year?

A: Ms. White – The same process would be used for both Option A or Option B (Simple Growth Model and Value Added Model, respectively). At this time we do not give a statewide assessment at the beginning of the school year, so to do so would increase cost significantly. However, through our negotiations with Pearson, we will now be reporting scores on a vertical scale, meaning it will be easier to compare end of one year test to end of another year tests. So although we won't have beginning of one year; we will have better end of year comparison data.

64) Q: Representative Sears – Do we know of any other state that has Option A, or other districts that are using Option A?

A: Ms. White – There are states that just do growth models. I do not know if they use it as part of an evaluation system, or if they just give that information to teachers for information. The states that I am familiar with that use a Teacher and Leader Effectiveness System do a value added.

Representative Cannaday requested a review of both models. Ms. White explained that a simple growth model subtracts a student's prior performance from their current performance. Value added also does this, but it also considers other factors that may or may not cause a student to learn at different rates.

65) Q: Representative Cannaday – This would be comparable to the covariates that we discussed?

A: Ms. White – Yes, the covariates that we talked about are part of the value added.

Superintendent Barresi called for a vote to approve making a preliminary recommendation to use a value-added model in calculating the thirty-five percentage points attributed to student academic growth using multiple years of standardized test data for those teachers in grades and subjects for which multiple years of standardized test data exist.

The motion carried with the following votes: Mr. Allen, yes; Superintendent Barresi, yes; Dr. Ballard, yes; Representative Cannaday, yes; Senator Ford, yes; Mrs. Groves, yes; Ms. Harris, yes; Secretary Hudecki, yes; Dr. Mills, yes; Ms. Reid, yes; Mr. Robison, yes; Mr. Ross, yes; Representative Sears, yes; Mr. Stone, yes.

Ms. White then discussed issues regarding teachers in non-tested grades and subjects or teachers who will not have prior test scores to make growth comparisons. Ms. White said that there are several possible options; develop a state assessment for these teachers; develop a list of content-specific appropriate achievements; taking ownership of a student's math and/or reading scores based on that teacher's contribution to the student's literacy and numeracy; using some combinations of these measures. If these options are not viable, the state law allows a greater

emphasis to be placed on the qualitative portion of the evaluation system. Additional options would be to allow districts to submit pilot plans; or solicit input from teachers in non-tested grades and subjects and conduct research on best practices.

66) Q: Mr. Robison – Option F (allow districts to submit a pilot plan), wouldn't that defeat the purpose of having one qualitative assessment?

A: Ms. White – Well, this is the quantitative portion.

67) Q: Mr. Robison – I know but, if everybody does the qualitative in one manner and then you add a multitude of approaches on the quantitative side, haven't you defeated the purpose?

68) Q: Mr. Allen – What about Option G (conduct more research) and the previous Option? Can you combine them?

A: Ms. White – So some combination of different things and taking an opportunity to work with the professional organizations that represent those content areas to develop some appropriate categories?

Ms. Harris noted that in light of the issues with Tennessee's model, it is important that the Commission conduct additional content-specific research to ensure fairness and consistency.

Dr. Ballard added that through his experience with value-added, it is extremely complex and additional research is needed.

Mr. Robinson added that he would like to have more input from the career tech perspective.

Ms. Groves made a motion to preliminarily recommend Option G - Conduct more research regarding teachers in grades and subjects for which there is no state-mandated testing measure to create a quantitative assessment, and to determine the appropriate measure(s) of student achievement taking into account a combination of multiple measures. Representative Sears seconded the motion.

Mr. Allen asked to combine options to allow for teacher input in the process.

Ms. Groves requested a friendly amendment to include teacher and specialist input during the research process.

Superintendent Barresi called for a vote.

Mr. Allen, yes; Superintendent Barresi, yes; Dr. Ballard, yes; Representative Cannaday, yes; Senator Ford, yes; Mrs. Groves, yes; Ms. Harris, yes; Dr. Mills, yes; Ms. Reid, yes; Mr. Robison, yes; Mr. Ross, yes; Representative Sears, yes; Mr. Stone, yes. The motion carried.

Ms. White then discussed the final fifteen percentage points attributed to the quantitative portion of the evaluation classified as "other academic measures". Ms. White then showed the Commission a model used by Tennessee that the state could use as a template. This model has different options for teachers to select from that would be used to account for the fifteen

percentage points. The options are based on each teacher's specific class assignment. Ms. White emphasized that the state does not have to use the Tennessee model in its entirety. The Tennessee model might be a way to get teacher input on what might account for the final fifteen percent.

69) Q: Mr. Robison – So basically we're going to, like the ACT is up there, these are recognized national or regional assessments that teachers could pick and choose off of a menu?

A: Ms. White – That is how Tennessee has established theirs. Again, you could choose or you could work with committees of teachers and their representatives to develop whatever options you might want to include, especially as more research becomes available from the MET study. We may find that some of those measures of effective teaching could be valuable to include on such a matrix.

Ms. Harris made a motion to conduct further study of best practices across the country to develop a list of appropriate measures for Oklahoma. Representative Sears seconded.

70) Q: Mr. Allen – Is there teacher involvement in this one?

71) Q: Superintendent Barresi – Would you accept an amendment to accept teacher input?

A: Ms. Harris – Absolutely.

Superintendent Barresi called for a vote.

The motion carried with the following votes: Mr. Allen, yes; Superintendent Barresi, yes; Dr. Ballard, yes; Representative Cannaday, yes; Senator Ford, yes; Mrs. Groves, yes; Ms. Harris, yes; Dr. Mills, yes; Ms. Reid, yes; Mr. Robison, yes; Mr. Ross, yes; Representative Sears, yes; Mr. Stone, yes.

Ms. White reminded the Commission that there are two preliminary recommendations related to the qualitative portion of the evaluation and three preliminary recommendations related to the quantitative portion. Ms. White will share the final three preliminary recommendations to the public as well as the Commission to be shared with respective constituents.

Ms. White reminded the Commission that the next meeting date is December 5, 2011, from 1:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

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 December 5, 2011, 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. Tammy Lawson for Ms. Malissa Cook, Oklahoma State Department of Education
Ms. Mary Colvin, Oklahoma State Department of Education
Ms. Gloria Bayouth, Oklahoma State Department of Education
Ms. Ramona Coats, Oklahoma State Department of Education
Mr. Marty Fulk, Oklahoma State Department of Education
Dr. Maridyth McBee, Oklahoma State Department of Education

Other guests:

Ms. Jana Burk, Tulsa Public Schools
Mr. Michael Barlow, Barlow and Associates
Mr. Ted Gillespie, OACTE
Mr. Jimmie Smith, Darlington Public School
Ms. Dottie Hager, OEA
Ms. Katie Hawk, OEA
Ms. Erin Boeckman, eCapitol
Ms. Karen Patton, OKC AFT
Mr. Brian Staples, Oklahoma City Public Schools
Ms. Pamela Greathouse, Oklahoma City Public Schools
Ms. Randa Pirrong, Oklahoma City Public Schools
Ms. Alicia Priest, OEA
Ms. Jennifer Pettit, MC3
Ms. Lisa Holder, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
Ms. Amy Polonchek, Tulsa Public Schools
Ms. Stacey Vernon, Tulsa Public Schools
Ms. Lynn Stockley, Tulsa Public Schools
Mr. Corey Holland, Oklahoma House of Representatives
Mr. Kaan Camuz, Tulsa Dove Science Academy