

**Maryland Council for Educator Effectiveness (MCEE)**  
**Minutes from Meeting of February 14, 2011**

**Absent:**

*Senator Delores Kelley*

*Dr. Mary Kay Finan*

*Mr. Christopher Barclay*

*Delegate Anne Kaiser*

**Minutes**

Nancy Grasmick, MCEE Co-Chair, opened the meeting at 9 a.m. and asked members to review the Minutes of January 24, 2011. With no discussion, the minutes were approved as presented.

**Measuring Teacher Effectiveness in Untested Subjects and Grades**

*Dr. Laura Goe, Research Scientist, Educational Testing Service and*

*Principal Investigator for The National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality*

Dr. Goe explained that measuring teacher effectiveness has been designated a federal priority but noted the lack of research in the area. She said there is very limited research on using student achievement for evaluation purposes. She said that multiple measures are required to gauge teacher effectiveness stating “we need agreed upon evidence in ongoing teaching.” She explained that student tests have not been validated to measure teacher effectiveness.

Dr. Goe reported on the following multiple measures of teacher effectiveness:

- Evidence of growth in student learning and competency
- Evidence of instructional quality
- Evidence of professional responsibility

She also reported on the following multiple measure of student learning:

- Evidence of growth in student learning and competency
- Evidence collected by teachers and scored by groups of educators
- Evidence collected and scored in classrooms

Dr. Goe provided the Council with several evaluation system models being used throughout the country. She noted that the Delaware model comes closest to meeting all of the criteria of a fair, rigorous and comparable educator evaluation system. She stressed the

importance of assessments focusing on standards and that are given in a standardized way (same day, same length of time, same preparation).

Dr. Goe explained that validity is ensured when the instrument/test accurately measures what it is intended to measure. She noted that “validity is a process which takes time. It can’t be done in the first year”. Dr. Goe reported on how to discern evidence in student learning noting it must be standardized, valid and recorded. She also discussed the challenges for special education teachers and ELL Specialists. Dr. Goe reported on how to measure student learning of teachers with “caseloads” such as nurses, counselors, special ed, ELL and other itinerant teachers. She briefly discussed the measurement of student learning through student products, presentations, portfolios or projects.

In response to a question by Ms. Bost about the importance of providing resources to teachers, Dr. Goe said that many states don’t use statewide measures since there is inequity in the availability of resources in the schools. She said that Maryland may or may not be able to use statewide measures.

In response to a question by Ms. Streckfus, Dr. Goe said that school systems may have to train teachers or assistant principals to do evaluations if school principals are unable to add more responsibilities to their workload.

There was some discussion about creating assessments and Dr. Goe urged that teachers need to be an integral parts of the process. She said that in the elementary grades, where teachers are teaching all subject areas, school districts may have to determine priorities. Dr. Goe explained that professional growth opportunities could allow teachers time to observe other teachers. She said, “Seeing teachers in action is great professional development.”

Dr. Grasmick said she would prefer to see the use of the term “professional development” in place of “evaluation” since evaluation has a negative connotation.

In response to a question by Dr. Grasmick, Dr. Goe said she would provide the Council with resources to create a fair and comparable principal evaluation system as well.

In response to a question by Mr. Burton, Dr. Goe said that the principal’s role in evaluations is to ensure that the measures are done in a fair and correct way and ensure that teachers get support and appropriate resources.

In response to a question by Dr. Pataniczek about the distinction between effective and highly effective teachers, Dr. Goe said that an effective teacher should produce a one or one and one-half year’s growth for students. She said that if the measures can’t show

growth, the wrong curriculum is being used for the student. She said the local school systems will have to determine what is considered a year's growth.

In response to a question by Ms. Pedersen about how to mitigate issues outside of the teacher's control such as whether a particular project is actually the work of the student or the parents, Dr. Goe said that when there is a validity issue the school district will have to make allowances for these issues. She said where a situation occurs that a student performs well below his or her expectations, an investigation should be done.

In response to a question by Ms. Weller, Dr. Goe said that students should bear some responsibility in this realm and that schools will have to use data to put some responsibility on students.

The Council members applauded and thanked Dr. Goe for her presentation.

### **Sub-committee Work**

Dr. Grasmick asked committees to break into groups and be prepared to discuss with Meg Dolan proposed definitions for teachers and principals. The Sub-committees returned and reported out as follows:

Dr. Dolan asked Committee members to provide their thoughts on the definitions for teachers.

### **Teachers**

Ms. Bost said that her group determined that an effective teacher would be able to use all of the resources to advance student achievement.

Dr. Leak said that his group felt that any individual that is certified under COMAR is defined as a teacher.

Ms. Pipken said that an effective teacher might use other resources to achieve student learning.

Ms. Bost noted that social workers in schools may be licensed rather than certificated.

Mr. Rutledge stated that a teacher refers to a bargaining unit employee who works with students, either part of or all day.

Dr. Dolan asked for the sub-committee's ideas on a definition of principal.

### **Principal**

Ms. Bost said that the definition for principal should include content supervisors and others based on who is best qualified to perform the evaluations.

Ms. Pipken said that in some cases assistant principals are groomed to evaluate teachers and are often knowledgeable about instruction and monitor instruction in the school.

Mr. Burton said that the principal has the key responsibility to do evaluations and that if the group agrees, this should be made clear. He noted there may be a few exceptions to this rule. Ms. Dolan stated that the principal must sign off on the evaluations.

Mr. Melendez said the principal has the ultimate management responsibility regardless of who is delegated to do the evaluations.

Dr. Leak agreed that others in the school building should be delegated to take the burden off the principal for evaluation and that the role of the principal is that of the leader.

Mr. Burton noted that principals do not always make all of the personnel decisions for the schools.

Ms. Pipken urged that content supervisors must be linked to the evaluation process since they are the real experts in that teaching area.

Dr. Dolan suggested that members think about this as an “evaluation team” with the principal a part of that team.

Ms. Walker said that the collaborative piece should delineate between effective and highly effective teachers and principals.

Ms. Bost said that defining “growth” is critical and that the professional freedom to use tools is also critical for teachers.

Ms. Pipken reported the following definitions for her group (Tested 4-8):

Effective teachers have high expectations for all students and help them learn as demonstrated on multiple measures, contribute to positive academic outcomes by building relationships and using school level resources, use a variety of instructional resources to meet the needs of students, contribute to developing well-rounded students through collaboration with peers.

Effective principals lead with a sense of urgency to ensure student success, build organizational capacity by developing leadership in others, have foundational

knowledge of pedagogy and actively monitor instruction in classrooms, develop support structures for staff with the ultimate goal of maximizing student performance, actively involve the community in supporting stated school goals, establish and maintain a healthy school culture of high expectation where actions support the common values and beliefs of the school.

Dr. Dolan said that she will compare the group's responses and bring that information back to them at their next meeting. She asked the group to think about key questions and assumptions and whether the MSA should be a single growth measure.

Dr. Grasmick said that the group must be a little "futuristic" referring to the Common Core Standards and Assessments. She asked the group to grapple with relationships between local school systems and the State. She also asked the group to think about what constitutes a realistic evaluation system that local school systems can individualize to their needs.

Dr. Pataniczek said that the group needs to reach an agreement on whether a value-added or growth model should be used and that clear definitions of these terms should be determined.

Dr. Grasmick said, "It's not possible to have this written in stone. It's a work in progress." She reported that there will be Educator Academies this summer and that every principal, as well as a number of teachers to be designated, will participate.

Ms. Bost reminded the Council that Delegate Kaiser stated that this work should relate to professional development rather than evaluation.

### **Adjournment**

Dr. Grasmick reported that the next meeting will be held on February 28, 2011, from 9 a.m. to Noon at the Board of Education Building in Anne Arundel County. With no further discussion, the meeting ended at 12:10 p.m.