

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

September 28, 2011

The Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Commission began its regular meeting at 1:00 p.m., September 28, 2011, at the Hodge Education Building, 2500 North Lincoln Boulevard, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. The Agenda was posted at 1:00 p.m., Tuesday, September 27, 2011, in accordance with 70 O.S. § 6-101-.17.

The following were present:

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

Members of the Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Commission present:

Dr. Janet Barresi, State Superintendent of Public Instruction (Chair)
Mr. Ed Allen, American Federation of Teachers
Dr. Keith Ballard, Tulsa Public Schools
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
Senator Richard Lerblance, Oklahoma State Senate
Ms. Shelly Shelby, designee for Dr. Jeff Mills, OSSBA
Ms. Linda Reid, Oklahoma Commission for Teacher Preparation
Mr. Joel Robison, Oklahoma Education Association
Mr. Robert Ross, Inasmuch Foundation

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 and thanked them for their work developing the recommendations around the qualitative components. She informed them that the components had been put out for public comment and has gotten a robust response from teachers.

Supt. Barresi welcomed and introduced the newly appointed members of the Commission, Dr. Keith Ballard and Mr. Renzi Stone. She also welcomed and introduced the 2012 Teacher of the Year, Ms. Kristin Shelby from Hollis Public Schools.

MINUTES FROM THE SEPTEMBER 12, 2011, REGULAR MEETING APPROVED

Superintendent Barresi requested approval on the September 12, 2011, minutes. Mr. Ross had one amendment to make on page 6, to delete "too or" from his statement. Supt. Barresi requested that a motion be made, Dr. Berkenbile made a motion to make that change, Mr. Ross seconded it. This motion was voted on with the following votes: Mr. Allen, yes; Supt. Barresi, yes; Dr. Keith Ballard, abstain; Dr. Berkenbile, yes; Representative Cannaday, abstain; Senator Ford, abstain; Mrs. Groves, yes; Ms. Harris, yes; Ms. Shelby, designee for Dr. Mills, abstain; Ms. Reid, yes; Mr. Robison, yes; Mr. Ross, yes. A quorum was not met and Supt. Barresi requested to table approving the September 12 meeting minutes until the next meeting on October 10, 2011.

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF QUANTITATIVE COMPONENT: STUDENT ACADEMIC GROWTH

Ms. Kerri White informed the Commission that the TLE webpage is now available on the State Department of Education website. She informed the Commission that all agendas, meeting minutes, handouts from the webinars, and the link to the webinars are available on that webpage. The checklist and public comments information is available on that page as well

Ms. White had the Commission look at the quantitative component as mentioned in the law. She stated that the state law requires that the evaluation system be 50% qualitative, 35% quantitative from student academic growth, and 15% quantitative, other academic measurements. Ms. White reminded the Commission that they are going to be looking for a 5 tier rating system that the 35% that is based on student academic growth is to use multiple years of standardized test data, as stated in the law. And in addition to the qualitative pieces, the law does address in the quantitative areas, how we handle teachers that are engrained in subjects that are not tested. So there is information in the law that helps guide us in making those decisions. Today the Commission will be focusing on value added. Ms. White gave them her layman understanding of value added to get them thinking and then told them that Mr. Foerster would do the really good work of explaining.

Ms. White asked the Commission to focus their attention on how they would answer the first two questions:

- Which of the models do you believe best represents teacher's contribution to student academic growth?
- What are the characteristics or factors that we need to consider about students, teachers, and schools in making that decision?

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF EXPERIENCES FROM FLORIDA

Mr. Sam Foerster, Associate Superintendent, Putnam County Schools, Florida and Chair of the Florida Student Growth Implementation Committee.

This Committee was a group of people whose charge it was to select a value added model, not just a type of model, but the types of parameters to be considered and to make recommendations to the commissioner. There are parallels to the value added models and their utility in education.

There are two overriding things that I hope you accomplish or we accomplish together through the course of this discussion.

- The first thing is; I hope you have a really good understanding of what value added models are. That you get the concept, so that you understand why they are necessary, how they work, what the general choices are, and most importantly, why they matter. Why it is that we need to use them.
- The second thing is; how Florida actually developed its value added model. The actual process that we went through to arrive at the decision that we made.

The definition of value added model is a series of calculations that we use to estimate that amount of student growth that is attributable to the teacher. There are two things that are implied by that definition:

- That you can measure the student growth. Not only can you measure student growth, but that you can differentiate, what is the teacher and what is not the teacher.
- It's important to remember that it is an estimate.

Why do value added models? They help us level the playing field. You're trying to level the field based on the kids that come into the classroom. You want to understand what impact the teacher has had and the teacher is responsible for. Not the extraneous or socio-economic status or any other factor that they may have. The second thing we wish to get out of this is the ability to classify. You'll want the output of your value added model to be a classification scheme.

Questions and Comments:

Q: Mr. Foerster - Why do we want to classify teachers?

A: Ms. Harris - So we can have more teachers be as highly effective as possible?

A: Mr. Foerster - Yes.

Q: Rep. Cannaday - When we are talking about student growth we are talking about cognitive development only? Not social maturation or anything like that?

A: Mr. Foerster - Even more specifically, we are assuming that cognitive development is demonstrated by performance on a standardized test. Which at least, you have to believe that it is meaningful and true.

Mr. Foerster gave information regarding attainment models, simple growth models, and value added models. Mr. Foerster and the Commission members continued discussions on the number of years of teachers' data to use, what the effects are in an urban setting, effects on students with effective or ineffective teachers and how that affects them when moving between school sites and/or districts.

Questions and discussions continued in regards to the Learning Path Models and the Covariate Models.

Mr. Foerster explained that residual is the difference between actual performance and expected performance. What we are trying to predict is an outcome for a student, then we're actually going to have the outcome, and then we're going to look at the difference. If that difference is positive, that student grew more than we expected and if that difference is negative, that student grew less than we would have expected. That concept of residual is that it works, because it is, in fact, the foundation of what a value added score is. He continued explaining the relationship between residuals and standard errors in the value added system.

Mr. Foerster explained how the Committee chose which model to use and recommended to the commissioner, who then accepted their recommendation. The State said, here is the model, then it was up to the districts to decide, when they got the numbers, in terms of aggregation which gave them flexibility.

Supt. Barresi - So the process of allowing districts to determine what their particular formula is leads to a productive conversation about outcomes about where the district wants to go and how they intend to get there.

Mr. Foerster - Yes.

Commission members discussed their concerns of all schools having flexibility.

Mr. Foerster explained that everything was on the parameter side. The thing that was most important in predicting student growth is prior year achievement. Three things that were in the middle include:

- Student attendance
- Difference from modal age - Kids who had been held back
- Whether a student was enrolled in two or more courses of the same subject

Additional things that were specifically significant, but had pretty low standards:

- Class size
- Language impaired
- Specific learning disabilities
- ELL Indicators
- Heterogeneous distribution of ability levels through the class
- Mobility - Number of times students move from one facility to another

Mr. Foerster presented information about how they implemented their model in Putnam County Schools, Florida.

Questions and Comments:

Supt. Barresi - Value added focuses more on the teacher, where growth models focus solely on the student. The student's component, obviously, is built into the value added. In terms of accountability, we're talking about growth models for flexibility. And here for teacher evaluation we're talking a lot more about value added. It's almost running two systems.

Mr. Allen - Asked about discussions involving teachers either being assigned to certain grade levels, the testing grades, or removed from those, such as non tested grade subjects. Such as taking a weaker teacher or a teacher they don't like, so that they will fail.

Supt. Barresi - But there is an accountability issue of the district, that should guide it as well.

Dr. Berkenbile - In the elementary area, do you have any schools that are doing team teaching?

Mr. Foerster - No. What we have tried this year in a couple of setting is departmentalization, because of the phenomenon that was brought up earlier that you do get a sense, quickly, that some teachers are stronger at teaching reading and math and vice versa. And why wouldn't you fill a block with people who are good at reading and fill a block with people who are good at math. And it's early, but the preliminary feedback is that the teachers love it. Initially, we thought they would love it because it's one less prep. They like it because it speaks to their strengths and they are able to go deeper, because they have twice as much time to get good at it. So we're hopeful that we going to see that that approach yields some proof in elementary school.

Supt. Barresi - How do you evaluate teachers that are in non-tested grades and subjects. How do you get to the quantitative on that?

Mr. Foerster - We are in the earliest phases of figuring out what to do there. We have district internal assessments that are standards aligned that we give between four and six times a year. In some cases that may be our best shot. But, it isn't great and we are going to have to be really careful about how we do that.

Supt. Barresi - Dr. Ballard, do you have any knowledge of the group that you are using in Wisconsin, do they address that? How do you address in Tulsa, non-tested grades and subjects? Or have you gotten to that point yet?

Dr. Ballard - We have not gotten to that point yet. We are still waiting to see what we will do with the value added and how we will do it. For now, we are relying on our qualitative evaluation, which we will address with that, but we have not gotten to that point.

Sen. Lerblance - Did you say that this is implemented in Putnam County and you're using it now?

Mr. Foerster - We have substantial agreement on the approach and I think we will likely be using this as the evaluation scheme this year.

Sen. Lerblance - So who is going accumulate all this information and get all of these charts and numbers together? Is that not going to be a monumental task for administrators to get this information together for your evaluations?

Mr. Foerster - The hardest part is going to be coming to consensus with your stakeholders as to what your approach is going to be. It will take time, but not a ton of time to build out the software to run the reports and generate the graphs and stuff. The majority of the time will be spent in training and education to get people comfortable phase. The first exposure is how to give them enough, but not too much, to help them understand what they are looking at. That is really the next big commitment.

Sen. Lerblance - Is Florida mandated to do this?

Mr. Foerster - Yes.

Supt. Barresi - For the Race To The Top. And I think to that point, Tennessee and Rhode Island is already doing some work on non-tested grades and subjects so we can check with them and see where they are in that progress. This may be so new that it may take three to four years of data to be able to come to that point. Do you not agree?

Mr. Foerster - Yes.

Rep. Cannaday - Just an observation, but as a former high school principal, 70% of my teachers were out of the testing area so...

Mr. Foerster - So there we are thinking, perhaps, interim assessments for some subjects, U.S. history, science, ACT.

The Commission continued discussing other circumstances involved.

Supt. Barresi asked if there was any other questions and thanked Mr. Foerster for his information and presentation. She said that Mr. Foerster's slides and other information from Florida will be made available to the Commission.

Ms. White said that the Commission will be discussing and debate on the recommendations made today. She asked if anyone had questions or needed more information before the October 10th meeting to let her know so that she could get that information.

Mr. Allen made the comment to the legislators in attendance that he has the overwhelming feeling that everything was moving way to fast in making recommendations. He commented he knows the law is the law, but he hoped they would take into consideration as they move along that maybe they were jumping the gun a little, since after only two meetings they are making recommendations on this part.

Supt. Barresi agreed to that point and that they were going to look at the language and see to what level this Commission can make recommendations about the quantitative component within the parameters of the law and possibly see if they could build in some comfort levels.

Dr. Ballard asked if it would helpful for Tulsa Public Schools to show what they have done in this value added piece, since they are a year into it. If that would be helpful with the

comfort levels in understanding how you move into that. He would be glad to present that information.

Supt. Barresi thanked Dr. Ballard for offering to present that information to the Commission.

NEW BUSINESS

Supt. Barresi asked if there was any 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, October 10, 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. Tricia Pemberton, Oklahoma State Department of Education
Ms. Tammy Lawson for Ms. Malissa Cook, Oklahoma State Department of Education
Mr. Marty Fulk, Oklahoma State Department of Education

Other guests:

Mr. Michael Barlow, Barlow and Associates
Mr. Lou Barlow, Barlow and Associates
Ms. Gracie Branch, Oklahoma Cooperative Council for Oklahoma School Administration (CCOSA)
Mr. Joe Robinson, Oklahoma State Department of Career and Technology Education
Ms. Gracy Taylor, Oklahoma Educational Service, LLC
Mr. Brian Staples, Oklahoma City Public Schools
Ms. Randa Pirrong, Oklahoma City Public Schools
Ms. Lynn Stockley, TCTA / TPS
Ms. Teena Nations, OCTP
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
M. Jimmie Smith, Darlington Public Schools
Ms. Jamie Mitchell, Cyril Public Schools
Mr. Steve Daniel, ConnectEd
Ms. Susan Newkham, Oklahoma University
Ms. Erin Boeckman, eCapitol
Mr. Ted Gillespie, OACTE
Ms. Karen Patton, AFT
Mr. Joe Van Tuyl, Stroud Public Schools
Ms. Kristin Shelby, 2012 Oklahoma Teacher of the Year, Hollis Public Schools
Ms. Jan Barrick, Alpha Plus
Ms. Talia Shaul, Tulsa Public Schools
Ms. Jana Burk, Tulsa Public Schools
Ms. Shannon Shay, Choctaw-Nicoma Park Public Schools
Ms. Rebecca Weber, Choctaw-Nicoma Park Public Schools
Ms. Elizabeth Karnes, Choctaw-Nicoma Park Public Schools