

**Maryland Council for Educator Effectiveness (MCEE)**  
**Minutes from Meeting of May 16, 2011**

**Absent:**

*Delegate Anne Kaiser*  
*Dr. Andres Alonso*  
*Bridgette Blue*

*Enrique Melendez*  
*Lee Rutledge*

Nancy Grasmick, MCEE Co-Chair, opened the meeting at 9:05 a.m. She gave a brief update on the recent monitoring visit conducted by the US Department of Education. (USDE) explaining that the process is being closely watched by states that did not receive the RTTT grant as well as Congress. She explained that although the amendment request made by MSDE had excellent rationale, the request is being sent to the Secretary's Office for a decision.

Senator Kelley asked if the response will be affected by the change in leadership at MSDE. Dr. Grasmick said that the staff gave a very good response as to how the Department is prepared for a seamless transition.

Dr. Jim Foran, RTTT Project Director, said that several state superintendents will be leaving their positions this year.

Dr. Finan asked if they (USDE) is aware that we are having an evaluation done independently. Dr. Grasmick said yes.

Dr. Grasmick report that 24 state superintendents are leaving their positions and that the USDE is having experts in evaluations to look at non-tested areas this year.

**Minutes**

Ms. Weller, MCEE Co-Chair, asked for approval of the Minutes of the meeting held on May 2, 2011. The group asked to table the adoption of the Minutes until the next meeting since they had no time to review them.

## **Definitions of Terms Used in the Framework for Systems to Evaluate Teachers and Principals**

Ms. Bost expressed concern about the workload of administrators regarding the requirement of *Annual Evaluation*.

Dr. Grasmick said that the State Regulation requires an annual evaluation and would need to be amended. She noting a discrepancy between the RTTT application and the regulation in the requirement of an annual evaluation. Dr. Grasmick said that there needs to be a yearly evaluation process since there are often changes in principals and teachers in the schools.

Dr. Finan said that student growth measures should be done every year noting that evaluations are currently being conducted yearly.

Dr. Foran said that the RTTT application called for annual evaluations and anything else would be considered a “substantial” change.

Ms. Pipkin described how St. Mary’s Public School’s evaluation process includes a formal evaluation every other year with teachers creating formative goals to be met on the off years. She said she is in favor of clearing up the matter in the Council’s recommendations.

Senator agreed with Ms. Pipkin’s suggestion saying, “It’s a reasonable way to go. It makes teachers become self-evaluating and goal setting.”

Dr. Foran said that seven of the twelve states are considering some type of inclusion of growth measures in their evaluations.

Dr. Grasmick said, “We should capture that in the definition. We don’t want to lock the LEAs in. This is no fault. We want creativity by LEAs.”

Dr. Coleman-Potter expressed concern about Prince George’s County Public Schools losing a funding stream through Title II. Ms. Lichter, MSDE’s Federal Liaison, said that PGCPs will still receive the majority of its Title II funding.

There was some discussion about mentoring of teachers and Dr. Grasmick said that there is a Regulation requiring teacher induction programs in all school districts.

Ms. Bost asked if the references to FARM and ELL students under *Complexity Factors* is to be eliminated. Dr. Grasmick said that she feels it is important to provide examples of *complexity factors*.

Mr. Barclay expressed concern about these examples providing “excuses” for poor student growth.

Ms. Coleman-Porter discussed the problems with students who are not in the classroom for large periods of time. Senator Kelley reiterated that many complaints come from schools where students are very transient.

Mr. Burton expressed concern about language that says certain students aren’t going to learn.

Dr. Grasmick said that *complexity factors* didn’t alter expectations and agreed that “transient movement” should be included.

Dr. Wilson, MSDE Assistant Superintendent for Assessments, said that schools are not held accountable for students that do not attend school after September 30<sup>th</sup>.

Dr. Leak suggested that if the “mobility” issue could be addressed elsewhere, it wouldn’t need to be included in this definition.

Dr. Grasmick asked Council members to review the definitions and provide language suggestions in writing at the next meeting.

### **Revised “Teacher/Principal Evaluation System General Standards”**

*Dr. Jim Foran, RTTT Project Manager*

Dr. Foran provided a proposed set of general standards broken down by *Professional Practice* and *Student Growth*. He noted that several states are moving toward this concept.

Ms. Bost suggested that the *Professional Practice* section not refer directly to the “Danielson” domains and the “Maryland Instructional Leadership Framework.” Dr. Foran said that the actual domains could be listed in place of the term “Danielson.” He also agreed on eliminating the reference to the “Maryland Instructional Leadership Framework.”

Mr. Burton expressed concern that these standards do not reflect fifty percent professional practice and fifty percent student growth. Senator Kelley said that the reason for conducting pilot programs is to learn what works and what doesn't and make adjustments. Dr. Leak agreed that the pilots will provide an analysis to make adjustments.

Ms. Bost expressed her concern with the fifty-fifty percentages which she feels is "really sixty-forty" and recommended that the Council revise this. Dr. Grasmick cautioned that this change would put the RTTT grant in jeopardy.

Dr. Finan suggested two editorial changes: change "assigns" to "rates" and "circle" to "indicate."

After much debate about the percentages, Senator Kelley made a motion to do nothing that undermines the grant or reduces the student growth at fifty percent. Dr. Pataniczek seconded the Motion.

Ms. Pipkin provided a friendly amendment as follows, "These will be re-evaluated in light of the output from the pilots." Senator Kelley said, "Your suggestions are operational."

Upon a vote, the motion carried. Ms. Bost, Ms. Kitchens, Mr. Barclay and Ms. Pipkin voted in opposition. Ms. Pipkin said, "Our vote is reflective that we are putting a lot out there and there are too many questions."

Dr. Foran asked the group to provide its input on the ratings assigned to each of the nine cells under "Overall Evaluation."

### **InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards**

*Mary Gable, MSDE Assistant State Superintendent*

*Jean Satterfield, MSDE Assistant State Superintendent*

Ms. Gable explained that the Council of Chief State School Officers' (CCSSO) Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) developed a Model Core Teaching Standards Resource looking at three things: knowledge, disposition and performance. She said the standards address the learner and learning, content and instructional practice. She provided a synopsis of the ten standards and brought the group's attention to a glossary of terms and a reference chart of key cross-cutting themes in the updated standards.

Ms. Satterfield explained that these standards are used in Maryland’s teacher preparation programs and they include a much stronger emphasis on content application, critical thinking, community context and leadership.

Ms. Gable said, “This will move us in a new direction.”

Mr. Burton said, “As a principal, this will lead our professional development.”

Dr. Pataniczek said they have been using InTASC since 1992 and said, “This is great.”

Dr. Leak and Dr. Finan expressed their full support.

Ms. Pipkin talked about a pyramid with the common core standards as the base and aligned with all of these standards.

Upon motion by Dr. Leak, seconded by Senator Kelley, and with unanimous agreement, the Council endorsed the InTASC standards.

### **Using Portfolios to Measure Student Growth**

*Dr. Gail Goldberg, Consultant, Better Teaching, Better Testing*

Dr. Goldberg said, “There is no right way to assess student learning.” She explained that portfolio assessment is not new and outlined three types of portfolios:

1. presentation and showcase
2. growth portfolio (show student growth)
3. evaluation portfolio (demonstrates how well the person has met goals over time)

She explained that the Council is looking at a hybrid that uses evidence of student growth for the purpose of teacher evaluation. She said, “no one has done that.” She explained the need to provide opportunities to revisit and revise the portfolio and allow for diverse means of measuring. Dr. Goldberg said that the portfolio should encourage reflection and decision-making on future actions and include evidence of student learning and teacher input. It should also include evidence of gradual evolution of the work and feedback from the teacher on the identification of advancement and goals.

Dr. Goldberg said there should be considerable constraints on the inclusion of portfolio materials and said she can provide guidelines on a portfolio menu which should have what the entries must include. She noted that any support should be documented. She said a

certain number of projects done by students over time should be selected and that a rubric can be developed for these snapshots. Dr. Goldberg said it should include 1) Adequacy of the sample 2) comparability of entries; and 3) what are they representative of.

She noted that the scoring system needs to be created with great care and stated the following two items that have caused problems: evaluators are asked to make too broad of judgments; and descriptors are too atomized. She said, “The more constrained, the more thorough and specified the training has to be. The more complex the portfolio needs to be, the more complex the raters should be.” She recommended e-portfolios which provide many options and are easily learned. She said they also solve some scoring issues and that the monitoring capacity is phenomenal.

Dr. Goldberg explained that one or more raters would score the portfolios and that portfolio assessments are costly and include many hidden costs. She recommended a document that analyzes the costs of portfolio assessment. She reported that the hourly rate for raters is \$12 - \$15 per hour and that the Educational Testing Service (ETS) pays \$18 - \$19 per hour.

She said one of the benefits of portfolios, is to give an opportunity for consideration of other interests and artifacts. She noted the importance of portfolios including a guiding question that allows the person being assessed to decide how they would change their work and what they would do differently.

Senator Kelley stated that if training and monitoring are done, valid and reliable scoring can be provided. She suggested that e-portfolios should be double scored from within the community and with an outside evaluator. She requested a copy of Dr. Goldberg’s presentation and suggested that retired teachers could be recruited to assess portfolios.

Ms. Bost asked why assessment of a portfolio could take up to fifty minutes to score. Dr. Goldberg said that complex projects could require that amount of time to evaluate.

Mr. Burton asked how would a random selection of student portfolios be selected and Dr. Goldberg said it is important to make sure that the sample represents the student population. She noted there is no single formula.

Dr. Leak asked, “What would a school leader need to do if they are going to be a pilot?” Dr. Goldberg said they would need to “fast track” with provisional models and training. She suggested that some mock portfolios be created for training purposes.

Senator Kelley asked if the colleges are training teaching students about portfolio assessments and Dr. Goldberg explained that new teachers are better prepared in creating portfolios. Dr. Pataniczek said that college students do e-portfolios but that they would ramp up the student learning piece. Dr. Finan said that her students are required to demonstrate student growth.

Ms. Pipkin commented on the importance and power of professional conversations among teachers.

Dr. Grasmick requested Dr. Goldberg's notes and thanked her for an excellent presentation.

### **Adjournment**

Ms. Weller reported that the next meeting will be held on June 7, 2011, from 9 a.m. to Noon at the Board of Education Building in Anne Arundel County. She reminded Council members to come back with written revisions to the list of definitions. The group agreed to provide their comments online no later than Friday, May 20<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Weller reported that the June 20<sup>th</sup> meeting will be held at the House Appropriations Building in Annapolis from 9 a.m. to noon. With no further discussion, the meeting ended at 11:50 a.m.