

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

**October 10, 2011**

The Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Commission began its regular meeting at 1:00 p.m., October 10, 2011, at the Hodge Education Building, 2500 North Lincoln Boulevard, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. The Agenda was posted at 1:00 p.m., October 7, 2011, in accordance with 70 O.S. § 6-101-.17.

The following were present:

Ms. Kerri White, Assistant State Superintendent of Student Support, Oklahoma State Department of Education

Members of the Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Commission present:

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. Heather Johnson, designee for Susan Harris, Tulsa Chamber of Commerce  
Senator Richard Lerblance, Oklahoma State Senate  
Dr. Jeff Mills, Oklahoma State School Boards Association  
Ms. Linda Reid, Oklahoma Commission for Teacher Preparation  
Mr. Joel Robison, Oklahoma Education Association  
Mr. Renzi Stone, Saxum  
Ms. Ginger Tinney, Professional Oklahoma Educators  
Representative Earl Sears, Oklahoma House of Representative

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

See Attachment A.

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

Secretary Hudecki 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**

Secretary Hudecki welcomed the members of the Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Commission. Secretary Hudecki informed the Commission that Superintendent Barresi was in Woodward, Oklahoma, and was not able to attend the meeting.

## **MINUTES FROM THE SEPTEMBER 12, 2011**

At the September 12, 2011, and September 28, 2011, meetings the Commission did not have a quorum to approve minutes. Ms. White explained the legal opinion regarding approval of minutes that stated that the Commission can have a motion to approve the minutes with the amendment that the Commission is certifying that the minutes are an accurate reflection of the meeting that took place. The Commission agreed to vote on the minutes separately.

Secretary Hudecki requested approval on the September 12, 2011, minutes. Ms. Reid moved to approve the minutes. Mr. Robison seconded. This motion was voted on with the following votes: Mr. Allen, yes; Dr. Ballard, yes; Representative Cannaday, yes; Senator Ford, abstain; Secretary Hudecki, yes; Senator Lerblance, yes; Dr. Mills, yes; Ms. Reid, yes; Mr. Robison, yes; Ms. Tinney, abstain, said that she needed to read them. A quorum was not met and Secretary Hudecki requested to table approving the September 12 meeting minutes until the next meeting on November 7, 2011.

## **MINUTES FROM THE SEPTEMBER 28, 2011, REGULAR MEETING APPROVED**

Secretary Hudecki requested approval on the September 28, 2011, minutes. Ms. Reid moved to approve the minutes. Representative Cannaday seconded. Mr. Allen requested to amend his comments on page 6 in the last sentence to replace “they” with “we”. Ms. Tinney requested correction to place Jack Herron as her representative under “Members of the Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Commission present.”

This motion was voted on with the following votes: Mr. Allen, yes; Dr. Ballard, yes; Representative Cannaday, yes; Senator Ford, yes; Secretary Hudecki, yes; Senator Lerblance, yes; Dr. Mills, yes; Ms. Reid, yes; Mr. Robison, yes; Ms. Tinney, yes.

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

Ms. White informed the Commission that the focus would be on the two qualitative recommendations made at the September 12<sup>th</sup> meeting. Ms. White stated that the two preliminary recommendations have been out for public comment. Ms. White provided the Commission with a CD with all of the public comments. Ms. White’s presentation was a

summary of the contents of the CD. Public comments were conducted through survey, email or written mail. Ms. White noted that nearly all public comments were submitted via electronic survey. 76.6% of the comments were submitted by teachers. A smaller percentage was submitted by district administrators and building administrators, and an even smaller percentage were submitted by others. 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?* On a scale of 0-3, the average response was 2.49. This shows that the 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?* had a much lower response. The majority of responders have not been following the work of the Commission.

Question:

1) Q: Secretary Hudecki - Kerri, how were these comments solicited?

A: Ms. White - We sent out emails and letters to all of the agency listservs. So, those include teachers and administrators. Many of you sent them, many of the Commission members sent them to the constituents that you represent, and it was posted on our website on our public comment area. We did tell people, as we notified them of the public comment period, that there was no official closing date to the public comment and that we would continue to update you with those public comments that were received. So as we meet again we will add to this list just in case there are others that have not yet had a chance to comment.

Ms. White added that there are webinars available to explain the work that the Commission has done so that responders could review the information prior to completing the comments. Ms. White then discussed Preliminary Recommendation #1. Ms. White reminded the Commission that this recommendation involved naming a default framework as well as identifying the approvable frameworks. This recommendation had five questions.

QUESTION 1 - *To what degree do you agree with naming a default framework for both Teacher and Leader Systems?* A majority of responders either agreed or strongly agreed to name a default.

QUESTION 2 - *To what degree do you agree with selecting the default Teacher framework from either, Danielson's Marzano's or Tulsa's model.* In general, each recommendation was approved as a possible default. The majority of responders either agreed or strongly agreed that the default should be named from one of the three recommendations.

QUESTION 3 - *To what degree do you agree with approving a limited number of frameworks that meet the criteria?* The overwhelming majority of responders either agreed or strongly agreed to provide more than one option in conjunction with the default. A few responders stated that they would not want these recommendations included as options. Marzano's framework was selected by a majority of responders as the default recommendation, however, Tulsa's framework was also strongly recommended. Danielson's was selected as the default by a much smaller number of responders. Many comments stated that they did not know enough about any of the three frameworks to make a choice; therefore, they marked in the negative. Ms. White

informed the Commission that some of the responder's suggested to use Rick Wormeli's Differentiated Assessment or to continue to use TAS (Teacher Appraisal System). One responder asked why the State Department Education didn't just develop its on TLE framework, another responder suggested using the National Board Frameworks, and several suggested allowing district's to develop their own framework.

QUESTION 4 - *To what degree do you agree with selecting the default Leader framework from either, Marzano's, McREL's or Reeves' model?* A majority of responders either agreed or strongly agreed with selecting a default. Responders overwhelmingly supported having a limited selection of frameworks for districts to choose from.

Questions:

1) Q: Ms. Reid - Kerri, I have a question on that. How is that phrased in the call for public comment because I can see responders focusing on the limit, that there is going to be a limited number as opposed to responding positively that, yes, let's have a limited number. I could almost see myself as reading that and saying "Yes" we don't want to have an unlimited number. Does that make sense?

A: Ms. White - It does make sense. It was worded how it was approved by the Commission's recommendations. I will tell you that during the webinars and conferences, several people asked me "what does a limited number mean?" Does limited mean three, or does limited mean twenty, or does limited mean two hundred? So, since the Commission did not put a limit on limited number, this question could be ambiguously answered.

2) Q: Ms. Tinney - Do we have a copy of how this list, is it on the CD?

A: Ms. White - Yes the CD is word for word how the questions were asked with the caveat that the first page was word for word the recommendations that you approved that we gave a copy of that out at the last meeting. But, if you need another copy of that or, we also emailed that to you. I will be happy to email that. That was emailed, when we sent it out for public comment we emailed it to you as well as the public comment so that you could forward it to your constituents. So, that document is word for word, what was the first page of the survey. I'd be happy to send that again if you need it.

QUESTION 5 - *Are you familiar with the Leader Frameworks that have been reviewed by the Commission?* Ms. White noted that there were a smaller number of responders who were familiar with the leader frameworks, but more responders wanted to include them as an option as opposed to not include them as an option. Of the three frameworks, more respondents would like to include Marzano as the default.

Questions and Comments:

1) Q: Sen. Ford - Tulsa does not have a Leaders Program here? Because you're not one of the three.

A: Dr. Ballard - I don't think we have one here, we have one, but it is not included here.

2) Q: Sen. Ford - Will it be considered?

A: Ms. White: It was my understanding that Tulsa could not offer their leadership model in the same way that they could offer their teacher model because their leadership model relies on McREL's work, and they contracted with McREL. So Tulsa does not have the copyright permission to put it out. So, the majority of Tulsa's Leadership Model is reflected in McREL's. Is that accurate?

A: Dr. Ballard - Yes, that is correct.

Ms. White stated that other responder suggestions included adding VAL-ED as a framework option, continue to use TAS, use National Board Frameworks, and district's should be able to develop their own framework.

Ms. White then discussed the public comment associated with Preliminary Recommendation # 2.

QUESTION 6 - *To what degree do you agree that modifications must be approved by the Oklahoma State Board of Education based on impact on student learning?* On a scale of 0 to 3 this received overwhelming support with over 2.5 as the average. So, in general respondents believed that having the modifications improved by the State Board was a good plan.

QUESTION 7 - *What do you believe will be the most positive outcomes of implementation of the TLE qualitative assessment?* Some of the themes throughout the responses related to consistency across the state as a positive outcome, a fair representation of the teacher's skill, it will cause us to move more effectively to the common core standards, all systems are research based, ensure each student's teacher is high quality, and several said that the most positive outcome is that there are no positive outcomes.

QUESTION 8 - *What would you like to see changed or added, if anything, to the preliminary recommendations of the TLE Commission in regard to the qualitative assessments?* Responses included wanting less of an emphasis on student performance, training in usage and implementation should be a funded requirement, and make considerations for teachers of special needs students. One responder asked what will be done for library media specialists and counselors who do not teach in a regular classroom, but are considered teachers. Ms. White suggested that this is an issue that the Commission might consider when choosing a default framework as well as the other approved frameworks.

QUESTION 9 - *What other comments do you have, if any, for the Commission?* Responder's suggestions included: to not simply look at test scores, address how music, art, P.E. Ag, etc., will be evaluated in order to be consistent with core area teachers, teachers who teach AP and their advantage over those who do not, will be harder to get good teachers in low performing schools. Ms. White reminded the Commission that their goal was to make preliminary recommendations, put them out for public comment, and some time before December 15<sup>th</sup>, the Commission would make a recommendation to the School Board.

## Questions and Comments:

- 1) Q: Mr. Robinson (proxy for Dr. Berkenbile) - Has someone sat down and figured out how much these three models will cost? Obviously, Keith has volunteered all his for free, but I'm not seeing any figures on the other two.  
A: Ms. White - So when we are talking about the teacher frameworks, Marzano, Danielson, and Tulsa's; Tulsa's rubric is available to us for free, Marzano's is available at the cost of the book in which it is published.
- 2) Q: Mr. Robinson - And do you know what that is?  
A: Ms. White - It is part of the *Art and Science of Teaching* and, \$26.00, approximately. Depending on where you purchase it. And then Danielson is also available in I believe in more than one of the books that she has published. So, it would be the cost of purchasing the book, or we may be able to negotiate a cheaper price if they were a negotiated at a State level. Now that is just the cost of the rubric itself. As far as the cost of implementing the system using technology and things to make it easier to implement, there are costs that could be incurred. It is my understanding from various business that have already tried to sell things to some of us who are not ready to buy, that any of those models could be put in a software format at essentially the same price and be made available on a handheld device that administrators could use while conducting the evaluations. So, from that perspective, and from what we have heard from other states, there does not appear to be a significant difference in the price of implementing any of those three systems since none of those systems require us to contract with the creator of the system in order to make that happen.
- 3) Q: Mr. Robison (OEA) - So if we go with Marzano's or Danielson's marketed products, and we were going to make the system work with the handhelds and all that stuff, we could develop that internally, and not have to pay those companies any sort of licensing fee or anything for using their market products?  
A: Ms. White - It is my understanding that we would be getting the rubrics at the price that I talked about before, and if we were to create our own software, if we could do that cheaper than purchasing something that already exists, we could do so.
- 4) Q: Sen. Ford - And any training?  
A: Ms. White - Training on those systems again would be an additional cost depending on who the trainers are. So if there are systems that we have people in the State that are already trainers that could provide that training, if they are able to be released from their regular duties in order to do that, then perhaps we could get them cheaper than we could others. But again, the estimates that I've been given, and Dr. Ballard you are probable the one that could speak to whether you could give your staff away to do training. But, for the other two, there does not appear to be a difference in the cost between the two for training.

Dr. Ballard – Tulsa’s software is free and I think it would cut it down to a matter of training. And while we would, to some extent, train the trainers, we don’t have the capacity to go out and do large scale training, nor do we have the intent to do that. We already had several schools come through and say they were very interested in what you are doing and your evaluation program and in a sense that is a form of training that transpires right there. And we could do that. We could work with trainers that would then go out but the rubrics, software, and everything else would be free. There could be some costs if the State would decide that they want to have trainers trained in the Tulsa model to go across the State.

5) Q: Rep. Cannaday - I guess I just need clarification where we are only talking about systems, we are only talking about the qualitative aspect, is that correct?

A: Ms. White - That’s correct. For those two preliminary recommendations, we are talking about the qualitative component.

6) Q: Sen. Lerblance - Does this have to be put out for bid?

A: Ms. White - As far as the three systems, or the three frameworks, three models, this Commission can make a recommendation to the State Board what is approvable. If the State were going to do a contract for services, whether that would be services of technology, services of software, or services of training, that would have to go out for a competitive bid. But, the State Board does have the authority to determine which frameworks are approvable.

7) Q: Sen. Lerblance - This \$26 you are talking about, is that per student?

A: Ms. White - No, and actually, Marty just found on Amazon.com you can get that book for \$16.80. Apparently, the Kindle edition is even cheaper, but that would be per administrator, in order to have access to those rubrics. In fact, we might be able to negotiate a statewide price and we would not have to acquire them through a traditional means of getting those books, if that were chosen as the default model. And, I would say that not only for *The Art and Science of Teaching*, but also for Danielson’s and Tulsa’s.

8) Q: Mr. Allen - two questions, you said the books were for administrators, would we be getting them for each teacher, too?

A: Ms. White - Yes, good point.

9) Q: Mr. Allen - OK, and the other question that I have is that I still need to hear a dollar amount for the training for Marzano’s.

A: Ms. White - Again the training would be dependent upon who might be available to do that training. We would put that out for competitive bid. So I can’t give you a dollar amount.

10) Q: Mr. Allen - Is there a ballpark? I have to decide on something when you don’t know.

A: Ms. White - I understand. I can tell you that in Tennessee, in their first year of training, on their qualitative component, for all of their administrators statewide, spent just under a million dollars. That was all training, all technology, and all acquisition of their rubrics.

11) Q: Ms. Tinney - Was that Marzano's?

A: Ms. White - Their default model.

12) Q: Ms. Tinney - Why is Oklahoma City paying such big money then you are saying now the cost would be far less? I'm not following you.

A: Ms. White - I don't know what Oklahoma City was paying so I don't know how to answer that.

Q: Mr. Robison - According to their thing on September 19<sup>th</sup> it looks like they adopted Marzano's and they agreed to pay \$360,590 with an ongoing annual amount of \$179,000.

13) Q: Ms. White - Does that also include the professional development for teachers?

A: Dr. Staples - It's really not to hire Marzano's, that's the complete technology. So its professional development to the district provided by Learning Sciences. It's not to MRL. That's a choice the district will make.

Dr. Ballard - I'm not sure I understand that.

Dr. Staples - Our district put out an RFP for an evaluation system. The system chosen was Learning Sciences. They do all of the paperwork online. That's what that RFP is for that amount. About half is for professional development and it's not for the Art and Science of Teaching.

14) Q: Dr. Ballard - Is the iObservation then a required component of that system?

A: Dr. Staples - No, it's just the technology side. So the real issue is how you are going to manage all of this. There's a statutory requirement on how to manage all the data. To make it where administrators can truly do observations is where technology comes in. That's the side that does that.

15) Q: Ms. Tinney - Is it possible then that maybe some of these states could do what iObservation is doing for Oklahoma City, I mean....

A: Dr. Staples - Sure, I mean, if somebody's got the time and all that kind of stuff to develop the software. Like Kerri's comment that if it's cheaper for someone to develop that, maybe that is what you want to do. Just as a comparison, we did it just for a site this year and it cost 20 some thousand, the technological side.

A: Dr. Ballard - As an answer to your question, yes, we do have that as a package to our software.

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

Secretary Hudecki noted that the conversation was leaning towards agenda item number 6, therefore, the Commission moved to the topic of Qualitative Assessments.

16) Q: Mr. Robison - The technology part - none of this professional development part is for teachers or leaders in the system itself, in the Marzano System?

A: Dr. Staples - No it is, about half of it is. It is a combination of the PD and *the Art and Science of Teaching*. But really though, it is an observational protocol in using the technology.

17) Q: Mr. Robison - So that is another cost in addition to whatever technology....

A: Dr. Staples - I would suggest to get a true estimate of cost, for a district the size of Oklahoma City for the implementation side, any system that comes in, you are really going to have to have a system that can manage the data.

18) Q: Mr. Allen - The \$178,000 then, for the follow-up, could you tell us exactly what that is?

A: Dr. Staples - That's the yearly cost to use the technology.

19) Q: Mr. Allen - Just the technology part, not the professional development?

A: Dr. Staples - Yes, to use iObservation on a yearly basis for a district the size of Oklahoma City

20) Q: Sen. Lerblance - Does the State Department of Education have money set aside to do fund this once it is implemented or is this something for the legislature for appropriations and if it had to be appropriated, would this have to be a line item..

A: Ms. White - I would need to defer that question to Superintendent Barresi who is not here today. But I am under the impression that there may be a small percentage of initial training that we do have funding for in our current State Department budget so that we could begin training for a pilot for a training in the Spring this year, but that statewide training, probably not have enough in our current budget. We would need additional funding for future years. Superintendent Barresi would need to be the one to give you the exact amount that would cost. What might or might not be in our State Department budget.

21) Q: Dr. Mills - Is it fair to say it's about \$4.50 per pupil?

A: Ms. White - So again I think part of the concern is that it is very difficult for us to get some of those estimates before putting out those RFP's without getting into concerns about, there are more than just Marzano's and his staff that are certified to be trainers, on Marzano's Model. As Dr. Staples has mentioned they have

worked with a completely separate company to provide their training on Marzano's Model, that same company can provide training on Danielson's model. There are other companies that can provide training on all of those, so I can work on getting you an estimate, but keep in mind because there are multiple companies that can do that and it could differ once a Statewide RFP is released.

22) Q: Dr. Mills - So timeline wise, you're saying that we need to adopt and then send out an RFP or send out an RFP and then adopt?

A: Ms. White - I don't know that I can legally advise you. But, your role is to make a decision on approvable rubrics based on the criteria in law, and cost is not one of the criteria in law.

23) Q: Rep. Cannaday - Would it not be premature to approve a qualitative without incorporating the quantitative according to SB2033.

A: Ms. White - You will have to explain to me why you see that as a conflict.

24) Q: Rep. Cannaday - In the way that I read 2033, its together, its, you know what I'm saying, its blended together, you have the 50% qualitative, and the 50 % quantitative but on the last page you talk about combining qualitative and quantitative.

A: Ms. White - So to get an overall teacher's evaluation score, yes, you would be combining their qualitative and quantitative. But one of the roles of this Commission as we move forward is to continually study and assess whether the qualitative and quantitative are accurately reflecting one another and if they are working in conjunction with one another. So to me that would imply they would be two separate components and that you are using them, checks and balances together.

25) Q: Rep. Cannaday - Thank you for that explanation because when I read section 7 "emphasis shall be placed on the observed qualitative assessment as well as contribution to the overall" to me that is in the context of quantitative.

A: Ms. White - And were going to talk about number 7 quite a bit in a little bit. Component number 7 in the law specifically relates to those teachers in non-testing grades and subjects. And so we will be talking about that shortly.

Ms. White explained that no recommendation from the Commission was necessary at this time. Ms. White wanted to simply provide information to the Commission and the Commission need only make a recommendation if they deemed it appropriate. The Commission will have more meetings before recommendation deadline of December 15, 2011.

26) Q: Senator Ford - Kerri, what we are looking at doing is essentially adopting a default framework. There are three models on the table. We are looking at adopting training implementation requirements that will be paid by the State. The other two; districts could use if they wanted to. My question is, Is the training a fixed cost? Is that a cost really a cost per pupil? If we had a two

programs that we are going to pay the cost for, is it going to cost twice as much if half the districts adopt one and half the other? Won't we pay the same amount of money as if we paid the training and implementation on one but only half the districts adopt it, and the other half paid for it?

A: Ms. White - If we as a State paid for the default model and it is only used by half of the State, and the other half of the State is going to pay for it themselves out of their own local costs. If we were to aggregate those costs the cost of development of software, if we were to develop our own software, you would then be developing two different sets, so it would be twice the cost. If we were purchasing software that was already available or acquiring software that was already developed, then essentially no. Training tends to be billed at a cost per participant, but the more participants you have the cheaper it gets. So, the majority of the State will all be trained on one system, so it would be less cost per participant than if you were doing a smaller number of people on the training. But, can I tell you today, that it is exactly twice the cost? I can't. I do think the more people you have using one system, the less expensive it gets. Per teacher, per principal, per student, however you want to divide that out.

27) Q: Dr. Mills - Would it not be acceptable to say we have X amount of dollars and then let a school choose based on the dollars we had? We have the criteria; we know what we have to have. And I realize the issue with training is to cover staffing. That gives a little bit more room and control.

A: Ms. White - I think that would be a decision that the Commission would have to make.

28) Q: Mr. Allen - Ok I guess now I am a little confused because didn't we, when we voted for a selected default, and then two others, weren't we considering the cost at that point? That's why we were only going to select only one and now we are having discussion about cost and the law. Now are we supposed to be considering cost or not?

A: Ms. White - I will tell you that, from the standpoint.... My understanding about choosing a default was as much about capacity as it was about cost. The capacity of the department to be able to support multiple systems, or multiple frameworks and in that cost is a piece of capacity, then yes. But, as far as choosing one framework over the other, whether you take cost in consideration, I'm just saying that that is not one of the criteria that's in the law. So, it's hard for me to... it was in the context of the question "should you put out an RFP now to find out what it would cost?" Without having the selection of one of the three, I don't know how we would put out an RFP to ask for what it would cost.

29) Q: Secretary Hudecki - Is this a level of detail that the State Board of Education actually deals with or is this something the Commission deals with?

A: Mr. Robison - I think we are making a recommendation now and they'll have to deal with it.

There was discussion regarding the public comments and the fact that the public wants a system that is fairly applied. A member of the Commission pointed out that the more system options that are made available, the more likely teachers are going to be treated differently. Another member discussed whether small districts would just be able to use any of the approved systems.

Ms. White reminded the Commission that at the September 12<sup>th</sup> meeting the Commission voted to approve one framework as the default. They are also to select limited number of others that meet the criteria that are in State statute as well as align with best practice, that districts could choose to use, if they want and are willing to pay for the cost of training and implementation. This was done to achieve a balance with consistency while still providing local districts control, for those district's that are already heavily invested in a system.

A Commission member noted that all of the criteria would be the same so there will be consistency, just with a different model. The Commission discussed whether data will "make sense" if there are multiple models that are used. The Commission also discussed whether it was "fair" to force a district to pay for a model if they did not choose the State default. The Commission also discussed whether district that chose not to use the State default, could use its allocated staff development money to pay for a model.

30) Q: Sen. Ford - By paying for only one model, is the Commission trying to force districts to pick one?

A: Ms. White - I don't want to try to speak on behalf of the Commission members, but my feeling was not that the Commission was trying to force one or the other, but to simply state that we would provide training, and perhaps software, or the technology to support one. But, that we would not be able to develop all of those components for a larger number of approvable options. So, yes, as far as managing those and reports from multiple options, we were talking about doing some bridging between options. One of the roles of this Commission would be to monitor over time if one model is giving us a better picture of teacher performance than other models. But, really we were just talking about from the perspective of training and those initial implementation costs is where the state department would focus its efforts.

Dr. Ballard stated that he wanted to make it clear that his district is not in this to make money. Tulsa's main thrust is to be able to use their system, and have an impact in the State if at all possible. He stated that the district will give away as much of the software, training, materials as it could. There will be a certain amount of cost to the Tulsa program. There will be a critical mass issue. Dr. Ballard mentioned that the district does have some interest and its training and costs would be significantly less cost than either of the others would.

#### **PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF OKLAHOMA'S HISTORICAL CURRENT, AND FUTURE CAPABILITIES RELATED TO STUDENT GROWTH MEASURES**

31) Q: Ms. Reid - Given that it appears that we are leaning towards predominately two models, defaulting to, and given that we all wish we had a little more time, is there a deadline? Are we on a short timeline? Do we have more time to discuss

Marzano's and Tulsa's? Or, have those times past? I'm wanting to shift to quantitative, but I want to first know are we going to revisit this concretely?

A: Ms. White - Yes, and we can do that at the November meeting.

Mr. Kraman began his presentation by reviewing information using 10 indicators Florida uses. Mr. Kraman stated that the State Department of Education collects all of this data. He stated that there is an interim step in the process to certify the data. Some data, such as assessments, is already certified. Mr. Kraman informed the Commission that a pilot will be ready this year and then more data will be certifiable for the 2012-2013 school year. This data includes ELL status and class size. It may be possible to certify the data in academic quarters or semesters as opposed to academic years. Mr. Kraman stated that it would be difficult to estimate costs because the Commission has not determined which indicators to use.

32) Q: Rep Cannaday - As I am listening to these ten items that you have identified here that would be certified by the October 1 enrolment count, are you telling us that this has been tested to show a high positive correlation between student outcome on state mandated testing? Because this is in the quantitative area.

A: Ms. White - These are the ten indicators that Florida used in their value added model that Mr. Forrester shared with us last time. I simply asked John and his team to look at these ten indicators to see if we had those available. So these are just samples of data that we might choose to use. There might be other data that you will want to choose, but, you'll remember that he said some of these will be highly correlated, some to be moderately correlated, and some to have little to no impact at all.

33) Q: Secretary Hudecki - So this is just an example of a model that we could use?

A: Ms. White - Correct.

The Commission discussed statistical methodology. One Commission member stated that value added takes into consideration test score but its not everything.

34) Q: Mr. Robison - So value-added, that's what we look at. I had some concerns about the Florida thing last year because basically they were following students through the years, through several years over subject matter and that kind of stuff and it may not necessarily match up very well. If you were just going to look at one particular teacher, teaching during one particular year, with pre and post tests and those types of things could you calculate an expected value added amount using that approach?

A: Dr. McBee - All of these variables are possible things that we can include in a formula for value added and what they mean is that we're taking away the impact that that variable would have on a student achievement test score and looking at what's left. So we wanted to look at what Florida was doing. They took away several variables, par achievement is a big deal, so were all the others that Kerri

listed for John. We wanted you to have options as far as Oklahoma. The State could use these to predict our achievement. Take away the influences that the teacher has no control over and then seeing what's left. And then evaluate them that way. John was showing you some options; we really want you to have some simulations. We want you to be able to see if we choose these particular variables, here is what the impact would be.

Dr. McBee began her presentation by reviewing the tests Oklahoma currently administers. In grades 3-8 the tests are math and reading. Therefore, it will be simple to receive prior test score data for 4<sup>th</sup> graders in reading and math. The bigger challenge is for science, social studies, geography and writing. Dr. McBee explained that in high school, Algebra I and English II and I are the measures used that are required by the Federal Government for the reading and math component. Each time a student takes a test, they get a score and it is converted to a scaled score, and it is separate from all other scaled scores. Therefore, the third grade math test is different than the 4<sup>th</sup> grade test, etc. However, beginning this Spring, the State will begin a vertical score. So the third, fourth and fifth grade test scores (for example) will be based on the same scale. This will help to see actual growth from year to year in Reading and Math content areas. This data will be helpful in determining what we can attribute to the actual student.

35) Q: Ms. Tinney - What if you have a student who changes teachers mid-year? How do we adjust that so that so that one teacher won't be responsible for another teacher's teaching?

A: Dr. McBee - There are several models that we are looking at. A teacher who had the student for a fourth of the year can get a fourth credit for the growth or loss, and the other teacher will get whatever percentage they had. I don't know that I would recommend that, but that is what some other people have done because many students are not with the same teacher the whole year long.

There was discussion regarding how the value-added model will take into account multiple factors. Specifically on how low achieving and high achieving classrooms will affect a teacher's evaluation.

36) Q: Ms. Tinney - In the next meeting you will be offering some simulations and models?

A: Dr. McBee - I would love to say yes to that, but as John said before, we don't have all the data to do the simulations, which is scary seeing that you all have a decision to make in the very near future. We can benefit from Tulsa. Tulsa has a proxy simulation; we might look at that again. In my opinion, we need to put some words in the recommendations so that we will be able to look at the results.

Ms. White suggests to the Commission that there may be some options on how to handle that process when the Commission discusses Item number 9. Mr. Kraman informed the Commission that he will be able to get the data on a daily basis, but will certify it on a quarterly, semester, or yearly basis. The confidence that the Department has in the accuracy of the data diminishes with any time smaller than the quarter level. The Commission wanted to know how Oklahoma City

handles the quantitative information. At this time, Oklahoma City has not worked with the quantitative information.

George Kimball (CIO of Oklahoma City Public Schools) discussed a Washington D.C. model. Washington D.C. has added and dropped many variables. Mr. Kimball stated that they have dropped race as a variable because they found no correlations. In his opinion the most important factor is verifying schedules, meaning, are these really the students that were in a particular teacher's class. It is a very complex calculation. How to add value added will be the next step in Oklahoma City's process.

### **PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF TULSA PUBLIC SCHOOLS' EXPERIENCE WITH STUDENT GROWTH MEASURES**

Dr. Ballard informed the Commission that Tulsa is in its third year of working with value added. Value added is a statistical methodology that whittles away all the other factors and just looks at "how well does that teacher teach?" Value added is not an achievement test score. It is a measure of growth. An added bonus is that it does inform and drive instruction. The beauty of value added is that it does not take into consideration factors that are beyond the teacher's control.

Ms. Jana Burke presented information regarding how Tulsa is using value added in its evaluation model. She stated that The Value Added Research Center has created the "Oak Tree Analogy". This analogy shows that there are more factors to consider when determining whether you are a good gardener such as soil, temperature, rainfall, etc. Evidence of a highly effective gardener is shown when all of those factors are accounted for. This is similar to determining a highly effective teacher. Ms. Burke stated that we must look at all of the factors to predict growth. We will use pre-tests and post-tests, Then calculate the gain of the pre-and post-test. Then eliminate external factors that are beyond the teacher's control such as mobility, suspension rates, ELL, disability, etc. Tulsa has gathered information for 2 years, but has not used it for evaluation purposes yet. It is for information, analysis and improvement. This was done because the district wants buy-in from teachers that the data is accurate and makes sense. Battelle for Kids is a nonprofit group from Ohio that worked with Tulsa on the concept of value added.

Ms. Burke began a discussion with the Commission regarding the data used in value added. She explained that while students are tested in grades 3-6, there is no prior testing for a third grade student, therefore, value added data begins in fourth grade. There was a discussion on how tests are selected to be the pre and post test. The covariant that is the most predictive of the post test is the students prior test score. The Commission reviewed copies of sample school level reports. Ms. Burke noted the use of a confidence interval, which shows the possible error. The confidence level should be close to 95%. The confidence level will change when you have more data. If a teacher has a small class size, the confidence level may be lower, therefore it is important to review that confidence level percentage to determine if the data should be used for professional development or for something more high stakes.

37) Q: Ms. Tinney - There is one thing that has not been discussed as a factor, or covariant, and that is a catastrophic event, a death of a parent, parent being deployed. We have all had it, when we have a student who has experienced a death, they don't progress as much that year.

- A: Ms. Burke - yes, I can remember one student in particular whose parents were going through a nasty, nasty divorce, and what happened? He stopped showing up for class. Attendance history captures that.
- 38) Q: Ms. Tinney - But even if they are attending,...
- A: Ms. Burke - No, that is a good point. Let me tell you, in the end, a lot of districts that have done this year after year, will peel away the other covariant, because in the end it is just the prior test scores that really have the large coefficients. They capture so many others that go beyond the control of the teacher that there is really no need to statically to account for that. So I would say to you that we are capturing what you are talking about. It is important and we are doing it with attendance history, doing it with mobility, often times there are different, sadly, low income is often associated with a catastrophic event. We want to be careful and we want teachers to buy in and think that this is fair.
- 39) Q: Ms. Tinney - Teacher are going to be like me, they are going to think of all the things that...
- A: Ms. Burke - Right, which is why we are listing them all. We include them all in the model. It's not just to list them, it is to take into account for them. Because, otherwise you will always wonder what actually happened.
- 40) Q: Rep. Sears - The training, when you started this, how long was the training and how many times did you talk to them throughout the year?
- A: Ms. Burke - We probably had a total of 9-10 hours training per principal.
- 41) Q: Rep. Sears - Per principal?
- A: Ms. Burke - Yes
- 42) Q: Rep. Sears - So you do this all at once?
- A: Ms. Burke - No, we provide, we had principal leadership conferences for three months now, and I would say that we have had one meeting a month.
- 43) Q: Rep. Sears - How do the teachers, when they have the training do they buy in to the program?
- A: Ms. Burke - Oh, gosh yes.
- 44) Q: Rep. Sears - So you said this starts on October 20<sup>th</sup>? How big will that group be?
- A: Ms. Burke - It's going to be huge. I'm not going to be providing it, neither is anyone from Battelle For Kids. Instead, the principal, as the instructional leader, is going to provide the value added training to the teachers.
- 45) Q: Rep. Sears - So he could do that in two or three afterschool faculty meetings, correct?

A: Ms. Burke - Yes. We have a three-hour training for teachers. It's going to be held on Professional Development Day, October 20<sup>th</sup>. For those schools that have other obligations, we are going to break it into two different staff meetings of an hour and half durations. Last week we trained principals on how to train teachers.

Dr. Ballard discussed how the teachers have been involved in this process from the beginning. The value added system is not a surprise to the teachers. Since it is not part of the evaluation, they will have time to be trained and to be acclimated to the system. Dr. Ballard suggested that buy-in is the key element in this process.

46) Q: Rep. Cannaday - Will the value added score for the school site correlate to the, or connect to the letter grade that we in the legislature have required that each school have?

A: Ms. Burke - I'm not sure that the proposed regulation for the report card.. But to me it would be the only fair way.

47) Q: Rep. Cannaday - Do you assign a specific quantifiable value to like prior OCT reading scores as compared to attendance history?

A: Ms. Burke - Right, each covariant is associated with its own coefficient, which manipulates the model so that it controls appropriately for that particular factor's effect on student test scores.

48) Q: Rep. Cannaday - OK, and that is done statistically by some people there?

A: Ms. Burke - Yes, using complex statistical models... They use actual numbers for that review. They are not static, they do evaluations every year.

49) Q: Sen. Lerblance - We have talked about math and science and reading, and we are not testing in those areas that are not covered. How are we going to bring those in?

A: Ms. Burke - That is an excellent question, and that is the next thing on our list of things to do. There is a lot of discussion across the country on the best way to do this. I have a couple of answers. We can look at unit assessments, we can look at teacher created assessments. But then we will have issues of reliability of the test instrument itself. So we will be working with the Value Added Research Center at the University of Wisconsin to identify the best ways to generate a value added estimate for those particular classes.

Ms. Burke then showed the Commission a list of all of the high school classes that have value added reporting. Ms. Burke then discussed what Tulsa is doing with the teacher observation component of the evaluation system. Ms. Burke stated that Tulsa found that if the qualitative evaluation is highly correlated to value added scores, then the district may not need to go through the expense and trouble of value added reporting for those grades and subjects for which there is not currently a method for doing that.

Dr. Rob Meyer, the Director of the Value-Added Research Center at the University of Wisconsin, discussed how New York City and other cities have worked on the non-tested areas. Hillsboro has 680 assessments and they are building value added models in all assessments, in every subject from biology to welding. Dr. Meyer stated that when you look at the teachers who are teaching in the non-tested areas you move from “are we measuring growth” to “are we exceeding predictions.” For example, you can predict how children will do in ninth grade biology by looking at eighth grade science, and add in reading and math. Oklahoma is moving towards the PARCC assessments, which is trying to be more curriculum-sensitive.

50) Q: Rep. Cannaday - Would you say the description on how you would assess teachers outside those state mandated areas would be objective, as opposed to subjective? Because the statute says it must be objective.

A: Dr. Meyer - I think so. Certainly in the sense that these tests can be graded and scored, using a rubric, that would not preclude a different type of assessment. Under PARCC, there may be items that may be graded by tasks and performance tasks. All of these methods can be applied because what value added and growth are designed to do is extract the meaning from the test. The more the test has meaning, the more useful is the abstraction. So, for instance in Hillsboro we used AP scores which only has a score 1-5. So, it turns out that prior AP courses are gangbuster predictors because there is something about the aptitude and the hard working ability that is embedded in those.

Ms. White led a discussion on what would be some items that the Commission may need to make a decision on in the future. The focus was on the Student Academic Growth (35% overall) Ms. White posed the following questions to the Commission:

- Question 1 - Which grades and subjects do you believe we currently have data that can be attributed to particular teachers and leaders?
  - We have state level assessments in grades 4-8 and Tulsa has made calculations for other grades and subjects. The Value Added Research Center at the University of Wisconsin may be consulted to help the Commission make the decision.
- Question 2 - For the grades and subject that we have data, does the Commission want to have a simple growth model analysis or does the Commission want to have a value added model?
  - The growth model compares the student performance from before instruction to after instruction and value added looks at how much of the growth we can attribute to the teacher.
  -
- Question 3 - If the Commission chooses a value added model, then the Commission will need to decide whether to use a covariant model, as presented by Ms. Burke, or use a learning path model, which is more along the lines of what Tennessee has done.

Ms. White also stated that the Commission can also decide to have someone do more research on the subject before a decision is made. Ms. White also stated that the Commission will also need to decide which of the covariates or attributes of teachers, students, or schools, need to be taken into consideration in developing the model. The Commission may also decide to contract with a

company to determine this. A research entity can do simulations to see what it would look like in Oklahoma.

- Question 4 - How do you take a teacher who is teaching multiple subjects and combine their value added score (aggregation) and what should be done with the score? How will the teacher be classified? (highly effective, effective, etc.)

Ms. White stated that the Commission could determine all of the rules, or allow districts to submit plans on how they would write the rules to make sense in their district, or the Commission may need more research. There was discussion regarding how to address the teachers who do not teach tested grades and subject areas. Options include:

Option A - Develop additional state assessments.

Option B - Develop a list of content specific appropriate measures. Ex. - AP exams or ACT scores. Districts could submit what content specific measures they are using. Tulsa is considering this.

Option C - Use what is called “Owned Students”. Ex. - 6<sup>th</sup> grade art teacher. The 6<sup>th</sup> graders take math and reading tests. One of the art teacher’s responsibilities is for her to contribute to her students’ success in their core subjects. Therefore, the art teacher could take responsibility for a portion of the student’s achievement in the core subjects.

Option D - Combination of all the measures. The 35% value added score could come from different pieces of different statistical data. The law says that in absence of a student growth measure, emphasis would be placed on the qualitative measures. The legislative intent may be that the qualitative component may extend to the quantitative portion to “fill the gap”. Therefore, the qualitative portion could be as much as 85%.

Option F - Allow districts to submit pilot plans.

Option G - Conduct more research.

Ms. White then discussed the 15% “other academic measures” portion of the TLE. Tennessee allowed each grouping of teachers and administrators to select from a list of choices to determine what the 15% would be. If there was disagreement, the evaluator made the final decision. This allowed for a teacher or principal that was high performing to choose to use their value added score for the 15%, which would make the value added score worth 50%. Ms. White then presented Tennessee’s matrix to the Commission.

Ms. White stated that some of these decisions may not be possible to be made by December 15. Therefore, the next Commission meeting should be focused on establishing a framework to determine implementation timelines, growth model vs. value added model. Then the details of the value added or growth model may need to wait until you have more research. There is some funding available to conduct this research as the pilot program begins in the spring semester.

Ms. White reminded the Commission that the next meeting dates are November 7, 2011, and 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, Secretary Hudecki adjourned the meeting.

The next regular meeting of the Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Commission will be held on Monday November 7, 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  
Mr. Marty Fulk, Oklahoma State Department of Education  
Dr. Maridyth McBee, Oklahoma State Department of Education  
Mr. Scott Goldman, Oklahoma State Department of Education

### Other guests:

Mr. Steve Daniel, ConnectED  
Ms. Jana Burk, Tulsa Public Schools  
Mr. Michael Barlow, Barlow and Associates  
Mr. Lou Barlow, Barlow and Associates  
Mr. Robert Meyer, SW REL / University of Wisconsin  
Mr. Ted Gillespie, OACTE  
Mr. George Kimball, Oklahoma City Public Schools  
M. Jimmie Smith, Darlington Public School  
Ms. Dottie Hager, OEA  
Ms. Katie Hawk, OEA  
Ms. Erin Boeckman, eCapitol  
Ms. Karen Patton, OKC AFT  
Mr. Karl Springer, Oklahoma City Public Schools  
Mr. Brian Staples, Oklahoma City Public Schools  
Ms. Randa Pirrong, Oklahoma City Public Schools  
Ms. Linda Toure, Oklahoma City Public Schools  
Ms. Alicia Priest, OEA  
Ms. Jennifer Pettit, MC3  
Ms. Lisa Holder, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education  
Ms. Lorri Thomas, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, GEAR UP  
Ms. Amy Polonchek, Tulsa Public Schools  
Mr. Jack Herron, Professional Oklahoma Educators  
Dr. Vickie Williams, CCOSA  
Mr. Steven Crawford, CCOSA