

Maryland Council for Educator Effectiveness (MCEE)
Minutes from Meeting of March 21, 2011

Absent:

Dr. Andres Alonso

Senator Delores Kelley

Delegate Anne Kaiser

June Streckfus

Judith Walker

Minutes

Nancy Grasmick, MCEE Co-Chair, opened the meeting at 9:10 a.m. and asked members to review the Minutes of February 28, 2011. There were some editorial changes requested and the minutes were approved.

Overview of RTTT Project to Develop and Implement an Educator Effectiveness Technology Platform

Dr. Leslie Wilson

Dr. Wilson reported on the technology implications of developing and implementing an Educator Effectiveness Evaluation System.

Dr. Grasmick asked member to let her know if there are any exemplary programs being implemented in local school districts since she is required to report teacher evaluation data to the USDE as mandated in the RTTT Application and State Statute.

Consensus on Definition of “Teacher” and “Principal”

Dr. Meg Dolan

Dr. Dolan provided a working draft of definitions for “teacher” and “principal” and asked for any comments or suggestions.

Ms. Bost questioned why some teachers are listed as “specialists.” There was discussion about the differences in itinerant teachers and those who have specific groups of students.

Dr. Grasmick suggested that a teacher could be defined as being responsible for a group of students and their progress. The Council agreed to add a caveat “with local interpretation” to broaden the scope of teachers. They agreed to use COMAR examples listed as .03 -- .23.

The Council agreed that the definition of a “principal” could be defined as listed in COMAR as .02, .04, .05 and .16.

Dr. Dolan said that she will submit what was agreed upon in her report to the USDE.

Subcommittee Work on the Topic of Student Growth and Growth Measures

Dr. Grasmick reported that she is getting pressure from the USDE due to the delay in creating a pilot educator evaluation framework to be used in the next school year. She suggested that subcommittees work on a menu of multiple measures to be suggested to local school systems to represent the thirty-percent of an educator’s evaluation.

Dr. Pataniczek cautioned that there needs to be a mechanism to allow for changes and revisions of the menus. Dr. Grasmick said that the pilot framework could be revised or changed as needed.

Ms. Bost reiterated that she disagrees with the interpretation of the fifty percent of an educator’s evaluation based on student achievement. Dr. Grasmick asked that this discussion be tabled so that the group can complete its work on student growth and growth measures.

In response to a question by Mr. Burton, Dr. Grasmick said that in most instances there will be multiple evaluators.

In response to a concern expressed by Ms. Pipkin, Dr. Grasmick said that there needs to be professional development provided to local superintendents to work on the large number of tests required in the classrooms.

In response to a suggestion by Mr. Rutledge, Dr. Grasmick noted that it is important to think not about firing educators but rather providing professional development where needed. She said, “This is a work in progress” and noted that all other states are grappling with the same issues. She distributed a document prepared by Dr. Laura Goe entitled, *Measuring Teacher Effectiveness in Untested Subjects and Grades*.

The Council broke into Sub-Committee’s at 9:50 a.m. and reconvened at 11:35 a.m. Subgroup facilitators provided the following menu items to be considered as teacher evaluation criteria:

High School

- Portfolio – student work
Portfolio – teacher evidence
- Projects (locally graded; state checked)
Performance task
- Products
College/Career Readiness Tests (concerns over norm referenced—may be mock tests) (SAT, AP, Accuplacer, IB, PSAT-Is there any way to authentically make these show growth?)
- SLO
Pre/Post test standardized mid-term/?, LSS or school de?
- Reading Level Tests
Certification tests (etc.)
- Newly-designed benchmarks
- Intervention Assessment Results/Growth
Wilson Ready Intervention

Lexile level

(question about added flexibility: could different students have different combinations?)
- LasLinks
Recommendation for making this a professional development system: pick one with a checkmark – designed specifically to help teacher improve instruction for specific students (feedback must be mid-course)
- Fitness Gram, Fitness for Life, Physical Education Metrics

4-8 Tested

- Portfolios
- Performance Based
Cross curricular projects
- Writing
Artificial Intelligence or teacher scored (collaboratively, PD)
Cross Curricular
- County created Benchmarks

- Unit Assessments
 - Using state item bank
 - Teaching team created
- Research-Based Interventions
- Early Reading, Math Inventories
- State Assessments
 - Based on growth with the goal of grade level competency or beyond
- Language Proficiencies Assessments
 - LasLinks
- Modified Assessments
 - Available
 - Appropriate

4-8 Non-tested

General Statements

1. Used for professional growth
2. Multiple years within an evaluation cycle, when appropriate
3. Feasibility of collection of data, timeliness of return, and its usefulness for the improvement of instruction
4. Reliability and validity of all measurements used is important
5. Professional development for knowledge of menu items and how to interpret is critical
6. Baseline of resources, facilities, etc.

Potential Menu (could be by level, subject, specific make-up of school)

- Portfolios (student portfolios, examine the number—sampling)
- Small group videos (performance, example—drama, music groups, individual students, special education)
- Adjudication – ensembles, choir
- Pre/Post Assessment – in a given subject/year/semester, process instead of product
- Local Assessments – quarterly or other times
- State tests—(if it measures growth—LAS, HSA, MSA, Bridge, AH-MSA, AP, IB)
- In class work/projects – science fair project in class labs, problem-based
- Oral Assessment

PreK-3

- Dibels
- Benchmark Assessments (reading and math)

- Portfolios
- Sight work assessments
- Basic facts quarterly assessments
- Culminating project
- Summative checklists (K)
- Quarterly reading assessments

There was discussion about using combinations from the menus for different students and tying the measures to teacher professional growth.

Ms. Weller said that the lists will be honed down to allow appropriate time for teachers and evaluators. She asked the group to write down any concerns on 3 x 5 cards provided to be discussed at the next meeting.

In response to a question by Mr. Burton about the controversy over what percentage of student achievement should be used for evaluation purposes of educators, Ms. Weller said that she discussed the issue with Dr. Grasmick who is planning to meet with the USDE Secretary of Education at the end of the month.

Dr. Grasmick said she would discuss this with him and bring back a clarification to the Council at the first meeting in April.

Ms. Bost and Mr. Barclay expressed their belief that the USDE and the RTTT application should not drive the educator evaluation system.

There was discussion about financial implications of the decisions made by the Council for local school systems regarding the RTTT grants.

Adjournment

With no further discussion, Ms. Weller reported that the next meeting will be held on March 28, 2011, from 9 a.m. to Noon at the Board of Education Building in Anne Arundel County. She said the next meeting should focus on a principal evaluation menu. The meeting ended at 12:30 p.m.