



INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

September 26, 2014

Indiana Government Center South
Conference Room B
402 W. Washington Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
9:00 p.m. (EDT)

Committee Members Present: Gordon Hendry (Chair), Dr. David Freitas, Dr. Brad Oliver, and B.J. Watts.

Board Members Absent: None

I. Call to Order/ Meeting Minutes Approval

The Chair Mr. Hendry called the meeting to order. The minutes for the March 10, 2014 and May 19, 2014 meetings were approved by a vote of 4-0.

II. Overview of Purpose of Committee

Dr. Oliver welcomed Mr. Hendry officially as the new chairman to the committee. He commented that the strategic plan must be implemented with fidelity and that Mr. Hendry's leadership will be important. Dr. Oliver thanked Mr. Elsener and Ms. O'Brien for their prior work with the committee. He also commented that he was disappointed with Superintendent Ritz's decision not to remain a member of the committee. Dr. Freitas echoed Dr. Oliver's comments with regard to Superintendent Ritz. He stated that implementation of the plan is important, and that implementation will be more difficult without the Superintendent on the committee. Dr. Freitas stated that it's important that the funding be aligned with the strategic plan and expressed concern about the lack of collaboration and that the budget released by the Department may not be aligned.

Mr. Hendry added that the Board is responsible for approving certain parts of the Department's budget and asked staff for clarification on that in the future. Mr. Hendry then commented that he was disappointed with the Superintendent's decision to step down from

the strategic planning committee. Mr. Watts added that everyone has to be on board for the plan to work. Dr. Oliver stated that there may be some legislative fixes or new legislation needed to support and carry out the strategic plan, and that without the Superintendent on the committee it may be more difficult to collaborate to accomplish positive legislative changes.

III. Next Steps with the Balanced Scorecard

Claire Fiddian-Green, Special Assistant to the Governor for Education Innovation, presented to the committee. Ms. Fiddian-Green commented on the importance of implementing the strategic plan and populating the balanced scorecard. She recommended using the balanced scorecard and having regular meetings to track metrics, and also stated this could become more frequent as more strategies are identified. Ms. Fiddian-Green pointed out that most of the data in the scorecard is yearly data. Dr. Freitas requested more frequent updates on the implementation of the plan; he suggested monthly meetings with short presentations by the Department. Ms. Fiddian-Green added that this could be combined with presentations regarding the waiver.

Ms. Fiddian-Green stated that some metrics must be identified and refined. She said there is research data that would be helpful with this. She recommended that Board staff and Department staff collaborate to create a list of stakeholders that could assist with this and the committee agreed. Ms. Fiddian-Green then moved on to the issue of overarching targets; she pointed out those had not been established yet. The committee agreed that is an important task the committee must undertake. Dr. Freitas recommended looking at graduation rates with waivers together to get a better picture of progress. Upon inquiry by Mr. Hendry, Ms. Fiddian-Green recommended that the committee bring targets to the full Board for approval.

IV. Priority Initiative: Teacher and Principal Evaluation Systems

a. Review of Educator Evaluation Requirements

Ashley Cowger, Program Director for the Center for Education and Career Innovation, addressed the Board next. Ms. Cowger discussed two big goals: student and teacher evaluation, and maximizing human talent. She also discussed the utilization of stakeholders throughout the process and waiver requirements. With regard to the waiver, Ms. Cowger outlined the options for evaluation. Dr. Oliver asked for clarification on how the legislature views the TAP model as compared to the others and Ms. Cowger responded that staff would complete a crosswalk so TAP can be compared to the others. Ms. Cowger moved on to discuss the teacher rating categories, which are highly effective, effective, needs improvement, and ineffective, and the

importance of feedback. Dr. Oliver stated that it's going to be very important to look closely at where adjustments need to be made; Ms. Cowger responded that stakeholder input will be one important component of this.

Upon inquiry by Mr. Hendry, Ms. Cowger stated that common practice is to have two long evaluations and three short evaluations throughout the year. Dr. Freitas asked about recognition for highly effective teachers. Ms. Cowger stated there are ways to increase compensation for these teachers. Dr. Freitas asked if there is a way to look at the data from local districts regarding compensation for highly effective teachers. Deputy Superintendent Danielle Shockey responded there isn't a way to track that at this point. Dr. Freitas recommended doing more at the Board level to recognize great teachers. Dr. Oliver echoed Dr. Freitas's comments and stressed the need to look at the performance bonuses across the state. He stated one concern of his are disparities between districts. Dr. Oliver also commented that it's important to look at whether performances bonuses are enough. Ms. Shockey responded that she will consult with Department staff to get more information on how this will be tracked.

Ms. Cowger then moved into discuss six federal waiver requirements: 1) using teacher evaluation for continual improvement of instruction, 2) meaningfully differentiating performance using at least three performance levels, 3) using multiple valid measures in determining performance levels, including student growth and achievement data as a significant factor, 4) evaluating teachers and principals on a regular basis, 5) obtaining clear and timely feedback that is useful, and 6) using evaluation information to make personnel decisions. Ms. Cowger stated that the State Educational Agency is responsible for ensuring these requirements are being done. Ms. Cowger said there has been some concern expressed by stakeholders regarding implementation and having enough personnel for evaluation.

Dr. Freitas expressed concern about the very high number of effective and highly effective teachers this past year in Indiana, even among teachers with student populations that haven't done well. He asked if that fact is indicative of an implementation issue. Mr. Watts inquired about putting "stair steps" back into place. He said this would attract talent and increase the incentive of teachers to perform well. Dr. Freitas added that he would like to see highly effective and effective teachers get rewarded more for their hard work. Ms. Fiddian-Green stated the change in guidance from the Department regarding the RISE model likely contributed to the high number of high performing teachers in the past year and that that may change this coming year.

Ms. Cowger then moved on to discuss the statutory and federal requirements that student achievement and growth must significantly inform the evaluations, as well as Department monitoring and feedback. Dr. Oliver expressed concern that the reaction to the data in front of the committee at this meeting will be a legislative change to quantify the percentage. He stated he didn't think this would be a solution to the problem. He said moving

forward the committee must be mindful of the effects this could have regarding the relationship to compensation. Dr. Oliver stated his other concern is that the assumption is everyone is in the queue. He said it's important to be mindful of how to close the gap between preparing the next generation of teachers regarding what is expected with the need to rely on external peer review.

b. Presentation by INTASS: Dr. Hardy Murphy and Dr. Sandi Cole (IU Center for Education and Lifelong Learning)

Dr. Murphy and Dr. Cole presented to the Board concerning teacher evaluation and information regarding data INTASS (the Indiana Teacher Appraisal and Support System) has gathered.¹ Dr. Cole gave some background information and explained that INTASS works with districts on their evaluation plans and implementation of those plans. She discussed two tools: the INTASS Teacher Appraisal System Rubric and the INTASS Evidence of Implementation Fidelity. She explained that these are tools that have been field tested and vetted. She said they represent quality standards. Dr. Cole also explained the INTASS consortium, which is useful for sharing and gathering information.

Dr. Cole then explained the INTASS rubric in more detail. Namely, she highlighted the importance of intent and philosophy, an emphasis on growth, data collection, the oversight process, and legislative components. Dr. Cole then walked through some data collected from districts. She explained that the rubric was created first and then they looked to implementation. She stated they developed a way to better measure implementation.

Dr. Murphy addressed the Board after Dr. Cole. He began by stating that INTASS has worked with numerous districts over the past years. He stated that he has seen very committed and hard working professionals. Dr. Murphy explained the INTASS survey and survey research. He said the survey has been a great way to gather insight into how educators feel about the current system. Dr. Murphy said he believed the system needs to change and walked through some information received from the survey.

Dr. Murphy pointed out that superintendents, principals and teachers all agree that there is a relationship between teacher effectiveness and student achievement. He also commented on some other specific results of the survey, including that approximately two-thirds of teachers do not believe that teacher evaluation should be tied to student growth, while a large majority of superintendents and principals do. Mr. Hendry responded that he was perplexed by the idea that student growth should not be tied to teacher evaluation. Dr. Murphy

¹ The INTASS presentation can be viewed at http://www.in.gov/sboe/files/2014-09-26_INTASS_PPT.pdf.

stated that percentage of teachers that believe this will increase if the accountability system is looked at more in terms of improvement and less as punishment.

Dr. Murphy then discussed how confident educators were in the evaluators. He said the result from the survey was that principals and superintendents were very confident in the validity of the measure of growth and achievement but that teachers were significantly less confident. He also pointed out teachers did not tend to think a new evaluation system was necessary while principals and superintendents did.

Dr. Murphy commented that there are some higher level takeaways from the survey regarding what has caused the variation between teachers and administrators. One is the validity and reliability of the measure of student growth and achievement, he said. Another is accurately assessing teacher learning in the evaluation. The last fact Dr. Murphy discussed was relationship of the evaluation system to compensation, professional development, and its impact on teaching and learning. Dr. Murphy pointed out that INTASS believes that the relationship between teacher evaluation and professional development is the most important part of the evaluation process. Dr. Murphy also explained that there are variations between principals and superintendents as well, but that these differences are not as significant as that with teachers.

Dr. Murphy then shared the following additional information from the survey: 1) grades K to 3 held significantly more positive views of the validity of measures of student achievement and growth, 2) teachers with less than four years of teaching experience held significantly more positive views of the new evaluation plans than did every other teaching-experience group, and 3) residence (urban, suburban or rural) did not make a difference in respondent's ratings on any of the three scales. He said the survey also revealed that some teachers did not have confidence in the evaluator's procedural and process knowledge. Principals were significantly more confident in evaluator's procedural and process knowledge, Dr. Murphy pointed out. He stated it's important to inform teachers about the process and procedure of the evaluation. Dr. Oliver added that it is important that teachers understand that evaluations aren't something that's being done to them, rather it's a process with them to help them improve.

Dr. Cole then made recommendations to the committee. She stated that INTASS recommends the following:

- Develop a differentiated rating system for district teacher evaluation plans to recognize plan quality in addition to compliance.
- Provide clear standards for plan development and implementation that go beyond compliance.
- Develop incentives for the development and implementation of plans that go beyond compliance.

- Provide resources and support for plan development and implementation with fidelity.
- Research plan development, implementation, and effectiveness across the state.
- Provide on-going evaluator and evaluation training for teachers and principals.
- Support the development and testing of common assessments for “non-tested” personnel, especially at the secondary level.

Dr. Cole and Dr. Murphy both reiterated that it’s extremely important to make sure everyone is at the table and all voices are heard. The committee took a five minute recess.

-- RECESS --

Robert Guffin, Executive Director of the Board, said the recommendations for next steps are to assess the implementation successes of the evaluations system and challenges experienced to date. Mr. Guffin informed the committee of the following specific recommendations: 1) look to national best practices and to seek guidance from national and local experts, 2) revise the RISE model to reflect lessons learned and best practices, 3) established clearer guidance to ensure compliance of locally developed models with federal and state requirements, 4) ensure appropriate technical assistance is provided by the state, 5) establish clearer definitions of what “significantly inform” means to align with guidance from the U.S. Department of Education, and 6) ensure stakeholder engagement throughout. Mr. Hendry added that he would like to continue working with Dr. Murphy and Dr. Cole going forward.

Mr. Guffin added that another recommendation is to establish clear guidance for the establishment of student learning outcomes. Dr. Oliver expressed the importance of working with the Department to ensure the student learning outcomes data is accurate before it goes out. Dr. Freitas recommended communicating with legislative leaders regarding the legislative agenda. He stated that legislators would have benefited greatly by the presentation the committee heard at this meeting.

V. Priority Initiative: Stakeholder Engagement

Mr. Hendry stated that advisory groups will be formed that will include development of teacher and school leader advisory groups using individuals from stakeholder groups who have helped develop the strategic plan. They will provide recommendations to the entire Board regarding all elements of the strategic plan. Dr. Freitas stated that broad representation is vital. Dr. Freitas also recommended a vetting process for members of the advisory groups. The

committee clarified that they would like a vetting process conducted by Board staff and then the committee would approve members of the advisory groups.

VI. Prioritization of Other Strategic Plan Initiatives

Mr. Hendry spoke about what goals need to be prioritized, what will be needed to implement them, and the timeline. He mentioned that the legislative goals item is a time sensitive issue. Mr. Hendry commented that the following items in the strategic plan are priorities at this point in his opinion: 1) 1.1.1 – support for new standards, 2) 1.1.3 – monitoring schools through outreach to ensure improvement, 3) 3.1.1. – designing a survey to measure family and community attitudes towards schools, 4) 2.1.2 – retaining talented superintendents, principals, and teachers.

Dr. Oliver commented that the four he believed are important projects for the Board are: 1) 1.1.2 – the state-wide assessment system, 2) 1.1.4 – a taskforce for a state-wide data and learning management system, 3) 2.1.1 – review of the teacher and principal evaluation rules and guidelines, and 4) 3.1.3 – coordinating the strategic plan efforts with stakeholders.

Dr. Freitas selected 1.1.8 – the character education component. He said he would like to see formalized rubrics for character education. Dr. Freitas also mentioned 1.1.6 – technology infusion in schools, and 2.1.1 – teacher and principal performance and retention.

Mr. Watts said 1.1.1 – support for new standards and support, is vital. He also stated that 3.1.2 – robust stakeholder involvement, is important. Mr. Watts spoke about spending more time celebrating things that are going right in school. He also agreed that character development is very important.

Mr. Hendry then narrowed down the high priority strategies to: 1) teacher and principal evaluation, 2) stakeholder engagement, 3) character education, and 4) retention of talented educators.

Mr. Hendry appointed Dr. Freitas to be the sponsor to the character education initiative. Mr. Hendry said the committee would deliberate further regarding the retention priority.

VIII. Next Steps

The committee discussed future hearing dates. The committee approved November 13, 2014 and December 18, 2014 as future meeting dates.

The committee adjourned.