

Maryland Council for Educator Effectiveness (MCEE)
Minutes from Meeting of January 24, 2011

Absent:

Mr. John Ratliff

Dr. Larry Leak

Senator Delores Kelley

Minutes

Betty Weller, MCEE Co-Chair, opened the meeting at 1 p.m. and asked members to review the Minutes of January 10, 2011. With no discussion, the minutes were approved as presented.

Meeting Dates

Ms. Weller distributed dates for future meetings of the Council. Dr. Grasmick asked for comments regarding the upcoming meeting dates and distributed a list of “Think Tank” meeting dates and minutes from prior meetings of these groups. She said that questions posed by the MCEE were distributed to the Think Tank Groups and that their responses can be extrapolated from the minutes.

Ms. Weller distributed a template for MCEE Committees to use for submission of their Interim Reports due by March 15, 2011. Dr. Grasmick noted that the template will be sent electronically for completion by Committee Facilitators. Ms. Pipken stressed the need for a group dynamic tool to incorporate the Committee responses.

Presentation: *The Framework for Teaching*

Dr. Charlotte Danielson, The Danielson Group

Dr. Danielson discussed the purposes of teacher evaluation and the “what” and “how” of a teacher evaluation system.

In response to a question by Ms. Bost, Dr. Danielson said that teachers are not evaluated on things over which they have no control such as space and other resources.

Dr. Danielson discussed the importance of training and professional development for evaluators and noted that her group is working on a proficiency test for evaluators.

In response to a question by Mr. Burton, Dr. Danielson said they currently have fifteen trainers but that many more are needed.

Dr. Danielson provided a Blueprint for Teacher Evaluation as well as a Teacher Evaluation System Design. She noted two basic approaches to assessing teacher effectiveness:

- Teacher practices (what teachers do, how well they do the work of teaching)
- Teacher results (what teachers accomplish, typically how well their students learn)

She provided the following four Domains for assessing teaching noting that they are all solidly research-based:

1. Planning and Preparation
2. The Classroom Environment
3. Instruction
4. Professional Responsibilities

Dr. Danielson discussed:

- common themes among the four domains
- assumptions of assessing good teaching based on what teachers do
- unintended consequences, both positive and negative, of assessing teacher practices
- defining what teachers accomplish (how well their students learn)
- fallacies in assessing teacher effectiveness through the use of standardized tests and value-added models.

She stated that portfolios are very revealing in capturing student learning, noting that “any time teachers are required to analyze student work is the most valuable training.”

She provided valid alternatives to State tests, alternatives to individual teacher accountability for student learning and a recommended process for determining team “score” for student learning.

In response to a question by Mr. Burton, Dr. Danielson said that a day or two of training is needed for evaluators.

Delegate Kaiser suggested that Dr. Danielson’s Framework be used to determine and provide appropriate professional development to teachers rather than its use as a high stakes evaluation system.

Dr. Grasmick reported that currently much of Dr. Danielson’s instructional framework is included in the evaluation of principals and asked Dr. Danielson to make any recommendations regarding its use for evaluation of teachers. Dr. Danielson said, “There is no equivalent for watching teachers, when evaluating a principal. It is very important for

principals to hear from the teachers regarding respect and fairness.” She said she would look into this and respond to Dr. Grasmick with any suggestions.

Growth Models, Teacher Effectiveness and Students and Disabilities

Dr. Carol Ann Heath, Assistant Superintendent, Special Education and Early Intervention Services, MSDE

Leslie Margolis, Esq., Managing Attorney, Maryland Disabilities Law Center

Ms. Margolis stated, “The relationship of students with disabilities is very complex.” She reported that the linking of teacher accountability for the performance of students with disabilities to the individualized education programs (IEPs) is flawed in many ways. She said that in order to use an IEP for the purpose of teacher accountability, it would have to be appropriately developed and implemented which is not always the case. Ms. Margolis said that this growth model based on a student’s IEP could possibly lower the expectations for these students. She also noted that this model undercuts the fundamental tenet of access to the general curriculum.

Ms. Margolis provided an alternative suggestion. She suggested tying teacher evaluations to the use of a growth model based on test scores currently being used. She said a growth model based on MSA results could be blended into the current model, which would ensure that students with and without disabilities would be treated equally.

Dr. Heath said that a small group of stakeholders has been convened to provide input from those directly affected by this issue. She said that it is not appropriate to rely solely on a student’s IEP since many students spend the bulk of their education in the general school classroom. She said a growth model would work if it is combined with other assessments and accountability measures. Dr. Heath said that the reauthorization of the IDEA and ESEA should address some of these difficulties and that “The current system has raised the bar.” Dr. Heath noted that the most important issue for students with disabilities is the need for regular attendance at school.

In response to a question by Ms. Pipken, Dr. Heath said that assessments are taking place throughout the year and that progress reports are done quarterly on students with disabilities.

Dr. Heath explained that there is an IEP quality tool that many school systems are piloting this year.

Committee Meetings

Committees met in separate groups at 3:15 p.m. and reported back at 3:50 p.m.

PreK-3

Facilitator: Judy Walker

Ms. Walker said the group reflected on the presentations made today.

Tested 4-8

Facilitator: Bridgette Blue

Ms. Blue said the group touched on administrator evaluations and what they may look like. She said they discussed the growth model focus and what are we going to be looking at for student growth. She said the group agreed to meet outside of Council meetings.

Non-tested 4-8

Reporter: Dennis Pataniczek

Mr. Pataniczek said that his Committee agreed that they need a significant amount of time to meet their goals. He said that the Committee had posed various questions to Dr. Danielson during their meeting time.

High School

Facilitator: Christopher Barclay

Mr. Barclay said the group reflected on the presentations given and discussed Delegate Kaiser's comment about making evaluations not so high stakes but tying it to the need and provision of professional development. He said the Committee needs more time to deliberate.

Dr. Grasmick said that the next meeting would include only one presentation from Laura Goe and that the bulk of the meeting would be dedicated to Committee work. She noted that the meeting on February 28th would be solely dedicated to Committee work and asked members to email either her or Debra Lichter any suggestion or ideas for the Council.

Adjournment

Dr. Grasmick reported that the next meeting will held on February 14, 2011, from 9 a.m. to Noon at the Board of Education Building in Anne Arundel County.