



INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

MINUTES

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

January 14, 2016

Indiana Government Center South
Conference Room A
302 W. Washington St., Indianapolis, IN 46204

The meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee ("SPC") convened at 8:30 AM.

Committee members Gordon Hendry, Dr. David Freitas and B.J. Watts were present. Committee member Dr. Vince Bertram was not present. Staff members PJ McGrew, Sarah Rossier, and John Snethen were present.

I. **Call to Order**

Mr. Hendry called the meeting to order at 8:30 AM.

II. **Approval of Minutes**

Mr. Watts motioned to approve the minutes, Dr. Freitas approved. The minutes were approved.

III. **Quarterly Update from INTASS**

Mr. Hendry invited Dr. Sandie Cole and Dr. Hardy Murphy of INTASS to present an update to the SPC. Dr. Cole began by discussing product development. The online evaluator training Level One was passed out last semester. Teachers participated in this training. Dr. Cole stressed the importance of teacher involvement in this process, stating that the training was also sent to ISTA and TRT. The outline for Level Two of the training was completed on January 14. Other tools have also been revised: the INTASS plan-rubric tool and the evidence of implementation.

Participant satisfaction from the level one training was high. Mr. Hendry contributed that this is an exciting sign for the online training. Dr. Cole discussed plans to better market the training. Mr. Watts inquired about the breakdown of those who completed the training. Dr. Cole stated that about a quarter of the participants were teachers and they would like more. Dr. Freitas expressed interest in the continued marketing of this online training to many groups, questioning if those in administration preparation programs can access the training. Dr. Cole said they will work on reaching out to higher education. Dr. Freitas suggested reaching out to those specifically teaching in educational leadership. Mr. Hendry asked how the SBOE could be helpful. Dr. Cole responded that the link is on the IDOE and SBOE websites and word of mouth is very helpful. Mr. Hendry contributed that the members can mention these efforts in the next report to the SBOE to get the word out.

Dr. Cole then detailed the steps involved in district recognition. This is a way to acknowledge districts that are doing exemplary things. Dr. Cole provided examples of Columbus and Fairfield, which will be recognized at the February 3rd SBOE meeting, specifically citing high teacher satisfaction. Others will be provided in May. Dr. Freitas contributed that these districts need to be celebrated, and then questioned the characteristics that these districts possess that make them exemplary. Mr. PJ McGrew, SBOE, addressed the SPC, explaining that these districts meet the requirements of the state, standards and development, and fidelity and implementation. These districts go above and beyond these requirements. Dr. Freitas questioned why these districts decided to go above and beyond, in hopes that other districts could be motivated to also do so. Dr. Cole stated that leadership is the dominant factor. INTASS supervision and the plan-rubric tool are also factors. Dr. Freitas followed up with a question concerning what the SBOE could do to encourage districts. Dr. Cole suggested championing the recognition of those districts doing well, proving that improvements translate to betterment for the children.

Mr. Watts and Dr. Cole reiterated the importance of teacher satisfaction and confronting this as a way to improve with purposeful feedback. Mr. Hendry questioned how to engage the larger school districts. Dr. Cole responded that bringing these districts into the consortium and providing technical assistance is the best way to push them toward recognition. Dr. Murphy contributed that an incentive-based system may be beneficial for the larger districts. This would enable the allotment of resources where they are most needed, meaning that perhaps some teachers may not need an evaluation. Dr. Freitas agreed, stating that a “one-size fits all” method for teacher evaluation is not ideal.

Dr. Freitas stressed the importance of professional development, questioning how this would play out in the system. Dr. Murphy stressed student learning outcomes and an effective teacher evaluation system with different levels at the district, school and classroom levels. Dr. Freitas asked if Indiana policy is moving towards individualized professional development. Dr. Murphy replied that there will be some occasions with group professional development. Dr. Cole stated that teacher evaluation data must be utilized to determine how to best help teachers. Dr. Freitas commended Indiana for teacher evaluation, stressing the need to continue the sharing of best practices. Mr. Watts clarified that the SBOE should not overreach in this area. Dr. Cole reiterated that teachers know their needs, but need ways to understand how to change practice in the context of their classroom. This should not be mandated at the state level, but solid data should be used to drive professional development in districts across the state. Dr. Murphy recognized that schools, districts and the states all have a vision and there is a need to work towards a common vision. Dr. Cole stated that there is no concrete incentive to perform teacher evaluations well. This is important to recognize moving forward.

Dr. Cole then covered the preliminary results of the research. Three hundred evaluations were reviewed. There is a small number of non-compliant districts that do not have Indiana Growth Model written into their plans. A large majority utilize A-F or school report card for some or all of their teacher evaluations. A small number use NWEA, with more continuing to do so. Many districts in their plans said they were using SLO's, but without providing the measures used in the SLO's. Plans ranged in length from 15-500+ pages,

obviously varying in the level of detail. Over fifty objective measures were utilized in plans, with about thirty being standardized assessments. There is a great deal of inconsistency in the format and amount of detail in the plans. Teacher certainty is key, so the inconsistency and lack of detail is a problem.

Dr. Freitas stated it has been identified that the pendulum may have moved farther in the direction of local control from a policy perspective. Dr. Freitas asked if there could be a common format or other recommendations for “guardrails”, while still allowing district flexibility. Mr. Hendry asked if TNTP spoke to this in the recommendation. Dr. Cole stated that TNTP spoke to consistent guidelines. Dr. Cole stated that INTASS has no single model, but districts have choices about how they perform teacher evaluations. The plan rubric and fidelity tool are in place to provide standards for districts. There is also a cover sheet each district must attach to their plan for compliance. Dr. Cole stated that INTASS can provide aspects that they feel are important. Dr. Murphy contributed that initiative could be stifled if there is pressure to comply with strict guidelines. Dr. Murphy stated that the real issue is whether the teacher evaluation process as it stands is serving its purpose. If there is room for improvement, however, perhaps there should be “guardrails” provided. Dr. Freitas questioned if there was any correlation between plans and student achievement. Dr. Murphy provided that this is what INTASS will do. Dr. Cole stated that INTASS will link the data to find a relationship through a variety of mediums. Mr. Hendy stated that the Board is looking forward to seeing more data on this. Dr. Murphy reiterated that there is a relationship between student growth and achievement, hence there is a two-pronged analysis.

Dr. Cole continued with the second part of the research, which involves the relationship between the plan characteristics, educator ratings and student outcomes. The data share agreement is now complete. Dr. Cole expressed thanks to the DOE for their help in this effort. There is now five years of student, teacher and district data. Dr. Cole presented research questions. A final report will be provided in December 2016. An educator satisfaction survey was taken two years ago and a follow up will be sent this fall. A subsequent report on that survey data will also be presented in the fall. Dr. Cole explained that the intent of the revisions in teacher evaluations is to be based on research and data.

Dr. Cole inquired if there were any further items that members would like to consider. Dr. Freitas brought up inter-rater reliability, meaning that teachers are receiving fair evaluations regardless of their location, both statewide and at the district level. Dr. Murphy responded that consistency is important and there are many factors to consider. This is beyond the scope of INTASS at the district level. Dr. Murphy explained that they are currently addressing this statewide through Level 1 and Level 2 training. Though inter-rater reliability has not been the focus of this research, it is still important. Dr. Freitas said that there may be a module for this, a type of “teacher vignette”, perhaps in digital format, to be provided to the districts for the sake of fairness. Dr. Cole cited other districts who have a team of principles that observe classrooms together on a regular basis. Dr. Murphy contributed that this is a good suggestion. Dr. Cole stated that the problem with the online Level 1 piece is that there is not the feedback they would like. Mr. Watts stated that teachers will also be more comfortable the more that they know of this process. Dr. Murphy said that sharing teacher portfolios with parents is more

effective than testing data. Mr. Hendry reiterated that this is hugely important and expressed his gratitude for the work done by INTASS. Dr. Murphy acknowledged other colleagues who have also helped in the process.

IV. Next Steps

Mr. Hendry proceeded to discuss future committee dates. Meetings will be every other month. Mr. McGrew stated that March 2nd is the next scheduled meeting, but the Board will make the decision of whether to move this to March 16th due to testing. Mr. Hendry requested waiting to decide upon this to coordinate with the SBOE. Mr. McGrew said this will be decided at the February meeting.

Mr. Hendry brought up the ESSA, stating that this is a great opportunity to shape the educational future. Anything happening on a bipartisan basis in Washington is something to celebrate. Mr. Hendry requested a federal legislative update at the next SBOE meeting. NASBE recently had a webinar on the subject which may be helpful to staff. Mr. Hendry requested that the resolutions appear on the Agenda for the next SBOE meeting. The SPC update could happen at this time on the action agenda. Dr. Freitas mentioned that shifting policy making back to the states and local districts is a good step. It is critical to understand their roles as state lawmakers and policymakers.

Mr. PJ McGrew stated that he will send the TNTF feedback on recommendations about guardrails – it is on page 4 of the final recommendations. Also, the DOE report cover page will be sent to show the layout for the plan. Mr. Hendry welcomed Mr. McGrew as the new Chief of Staff for the SBOE.

V. Adjourn

Dr. Freitas motioned to adjourn and Mr. Watts seconded. The meeting adjourned at 10:00 AM.