



INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

MINUTES

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

May 11, 2016

Indiana Statehouse

Room 233

200 W Washington St, Indianapolis, IN 46204

The meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee (“SPC”) convened at 11:00 AM.

Committee members Dr. Vince Bertram, Dr. David Freitas, Mr. Gordon Hendry and Mr. B.J. Watts were present. Staff members PJ McGrew, Brian Murphy, Sarah Rossier, Ron Sandlin, Taylore Fox, and Asha Hardy were present.

I. **Call to Order**

Mr. Hendry called the meeting to order at 11:00 AM.

II. **Approval of Minutes**

Mr. Hendry motioned to approve the minutes, Dr. Freitas seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

III. **Update from INTASS/ University Educator Support (Goals 2 and 3)**

INTASS District Recognition- Dr. Sandi Cole, INTASS

Dr. Cole from INTASS began by updating the committee using the INTASS Quarterly Update presentation where she spoke about Level 1 Evaluator Online Training and Level 2 Evaluator Onsite Training. These modules allow for educators to receive certifications after completion of Levels 1 and 2. Dr. Cole then moved on to the recognition of school districts that have achieved exemplary status for the development and criteria of their teacher evaluation system by criteria from the State Board of Education (“SBOE”) and the Indiana Department of Education (“IDOE”). The districts, Speedway School Corporation and MSD Washington Township, had draft resolutions to bring before committee and Dr. Cole mentioned that the IDOE staff would continue to recommend new districts for INTASS to review.

Dr. Cole then continued with her presentation to describe the two main parts of the Teacher Evaluation plans that will be preliminarily given to the committee in July and final research will be given in December. The two main parts of the review included: A review of the objective measures used in the Teacher Evaluation plans and a review of the characteristics of the Teacher Evaluation plan. Dr. Cole discussed how her and her staff reviewed 245 Plans from the 2014-15 School Year and looked then looked at the characteristics of those 245 Plans reviewed. Dr. Cole explained to the committee what the literature has said about teacher evaluations. Of the bullet points featured on the Quarterly Update Presentation, a few of the main points mentioned included: Unclear expectations for teachers with regards to how they are being evaluated and plans that have an inclusive design, utilize multiple measures, and have the ultimate purpose of helping teachers improve. The methods that INTASS used for the review included the

objective measure review and the plan characteristic review. Their results of the objective measures component indicated the number of districts that met the four criteria INTASS developed (Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (“TER”), IGM, A-F Letter Grade, and Student Learning Objectives (“SLO’s”), as well as a percentage of the number of districts who met the four criteria divided by the 245 plans reviewed in total. Next Dr. Cole discussed the plan characteristics. They used the 2015-16 plans from the IDOE website and developed an assessment tool derived from INTASS Educator Evaluation Plan Rubric and assessed 271 plans. She also emphasized that their staff conducted inter-rater reliability checks on three occasions.

Dr. Cole then went over the results of the objective measures where she first discussed the number of evaluations reviewed and the number of districts that included a use of teacher evaluation rubrics, IGM, and A-F letter grade. The next table she described represented the highest and lowest weights used for the teacher effectiveness rubric, IGM, A-F letter grade and SLO to calculate summative ratings (The highest weight was 100% and the lowest was 2%). Dr. Cole noted that there is discussion within the state about what is the correct weight for each criteria and she noted that the next part of their research would cover this. Dr. Bertram inquired about the 40% Teacher effectiveness rubric and was curious about how they distribute the other weights in the other categories. Dr. Cole said she would pursue that question, but noted that she would be able to go back through the data and look into his question. Dr. Bertram’s other comment focused on teacher effectiveness and the discrepancies that arise with local autonomy and how one district characterizes an effective teacher versus how another district would characterize an effective teacher. Dr. Cole responded that her team is having conversations about this and also noted that there is not one standard way to submit a plan. Dr. Bertram commented that this process has the potential to be subjective and it reminded him of when the districts were asked to rate the effectiveness of their teachers before they assessed them. Dr. Cole responded that his comment highlights a concern that INTASS has with teacher evaluation and she also highlighted that IGM is in statute yet not all districts are including it. Dr. Freitas made a comment about equating teacher evaluation and teacher pay and went on to note that he did not like linking teacher evaluation to teacher pay. Dr. Freitas inquired about the other variables that would be linked to teacher compensation and other perceptions. Dr. Cole responded to this comment by stating that INTASS has largely strayed away from the compensation conversation, but agreed that teachers who are in need of improvement are not being compensated and discussed the possibility of compensation regardless of the rating, and even distancing compensation from evaluation. Dr. Cole stated that all of the INTASS schools that use the SLO data have found that perceptions of the teachers have been heightened. Dr. Freitas inquired about the correlation between perceptions of the teacher evaluation system and the score the teacher receives. For example, if a teacher receives a good evaluation from the Principal, she will likely have a positive perception of the rubric and vice versa, as stated by Dr. Freitas. Dr. Cole responded to his question by stating that the heart of this conversation is making teachers feel confident and making sure that the teachers feel part of the planning process of the plan. She wants to support teachers and help them improve as an underlying goal of this research.

Dr. Cole then went on to the assessment review part of the research. She noted that there were 49 different assessment that were noted for measuring student growth and achievement. However, their results showed that only 33 districts are using one measure of student growth and achievement, 1 in 5 are not using IGM, 21 districts are using A-f,

and only 58 are using ISTAR. Dr. Bertram inquired about the multiple measure concept. He asked if they are using only one student growth or achievement and not using other teacher evaluation measures. Dr. Cole confirmed that the one measure of student growth and achievement coupled with other teacher evaluation measures are used; meaning that there is not only one measure overall for the plan. Dr. Bertram asked what Dr. Cole recommends for districts to use multiple measures for growth and achievement and Dr. Cole responded to this question by stating that INTASS does not make recommendations, but they help the districts achieve a plan that includes multiple measures.

Dr. Cole went on to the second part of the research which includes the plan characteristics. Her team separated the districts in to low, medium, and high performing districts. Then she discussed the different components in plans that denote what makes a plan high performing. Dr. Freitas inquired about how INTASS divided the districts into low, medium, and high performing districts. Dr. Cole responded that INTASS converted their rubric and used the components to measure if a school had included this in their plan. Dr. Cole stated that this data is a way to show performance through specific criteria (components). Other components measured a high quality teacher evaluation rubric, evaluators and evaluator training, and observation timelines and procedures. Dr. Freitas noted that we should be careful about the data with regards to the pre and post conference reviewing because all the data shows is that it was not included in the physical plan. However, Dr. Freitas noted, the districts could still be doing this and it could not be noted in the plan. Mr. Watts also commented that in his district, their teachers have to answer questions before the conference and was curious if that would be considered pre-conference planning. Dr. Cole stated that yes, those would be considered pre-conference planning and mentioned that Dr. Freitas's comment is important to note because they would like to have the plans drive practice and hopefully their plans would be able to give teachers more guidance and understanding. Dr. Freitas responded that he thinks it is important to distinguish from what is included in the plan and what the districts are actually doing but have not noted it in their plan. Dr. Cole added that the things that INTASS brings to the committee mentioned in statute, should be monitored. Dr. Freitas responded that compliance is important and emphasized the need to get districts to comply statutorily. Dr. Cole added that their purpose was to show the committee those districts who have gone above and beyond compliance and those are shown through the high districts. Dr. Freitas added that as a policy recommendation, the State Board could act to adopt the criteria as necessary components to all plans.

Dr. Cole then went on to describe the remaining components related to: evidence and artifacts in their plans, conferences and meaningful feedback, weights of measures and summative scores, and measuring student learning. Mrs. Kwiatkowski made a comment concerning standardized measures and how teachers try their best to develop measures, but they run into problems when developing reliable measures. Dr. Bertram asked a question concerning the importance of each component in the plans, adding that he was unsure about how to consult school districts on the most important components. Dr. Bertram also added that from his personal experience, he had noted that even the high performing districts did not have all of these components in their plans. His second question concerned accountability and the teacher evaluation process. He was concerned about the low and middle performing districts and how they would have access to resources that they high performing ones do. Dr. Cole prioritized the components that were mentioned in statute, as well as using DOE's monitoring tool as a secondary priority. To the second question, Dr. Cole responded that the state can

help with the resources and in the six districts that have come to INTASS, they are relying on the collaborative discussion to make progress. Dr. Cole mentioned that she believes that it is about developing a leadership mentality in how these plans are implemented. Dr. Bertram added that at the state level, he does not feel that we cannot ignore the resource allocation conversation. Mr. Watts made a comment about his personal experience in an elementary school where resources are hard to come by and their principal does not serve as an educational leader, but as an evaluator, and he feels that if we want to have honest educational leaders who can provide feedback, we need to identify those who actually need improvement and can spend more time for growth. His point was that of resource allocation and time management.

Mr. Hendry interjected to remind the committee to be conscious of time and to save questions until the end. Dr. Cole then proceed components related to oversight and she described as a way for them to store their data for district evaluation plans. Then she proceeded with the components related to professional development and the components related to timelines, protocols, and forms. To end the presentation, she spoke to the committee about the areas of consistency among the plans which included, components related to high quality rubrics, providing forms, and including student data. She also looked at the areas of discrepancy between the high and low districts and noted, in the bullet points, that these key components are what they would think a high performing district would include in their plan. Finally, Dr. Cole summarized the initial observations and came to the conclusion that it will be important to provide clear guidance to address the ambiguities in the interpretation of the legislation since the passage of SB 1. Mr. Hendry asked if the information from the PowerPoint could be made public for the committee members to view and Mr. Freitas asked since this video was recorded, it is open to the public. Mr. Hendry suggested adding this presentation to the Strategic Planning Committee materials.

Mr. Hendry asked if a Dr. Cole would be able to quickly recognize the districts that are to be going before the board at the coming meeting: Speedway School Corporation, and MSD Washington Township School Corporation. The two district recognitions are going to be brought before the board to be recognized at the next board meeting.

IV. Next Steps

There were no next steps discussed during this meeting.

V. Adjourn

Mr. Hendry then asked for a motion to adjourn, Mr. Watts moved for the motion and Mr. Hendry seconded that motion. The meeting adjourned at 12:15 PM.