

**Maryland Council for Educator Effectiveness (MCEE)**  
**Minutes from Meeting of February 27, 2012**

**Absent:**

*Dr. Mary Kay Finan*

*Dr. Bonita Coleman-Potter*

*Donna Hanlin*

Co-Chair Betty Weller opened the meeting at 9 a.m. and welcomed everyone.

Dr. Sadusky explained that this meeting is to ensure that the other seventeen school districts that did not participate in the first year pilot project would have adequate direction from the Council in late spring. He said Department staff have worked with the piloting staff to formulate what is workable for the rest of the school systems. He went over the issues in which consensus was reached at the Council's December meeting.

Ms. Weller said that the pilots came up with a suggestion that the "super 50%" be eliminated. She asked for comments.

Dr. Sadusky reported that the Race To The Top Application (RTTT) requires annual evaluations for teachers and principals although the piloting systems have said a one-year evaluation would not be in the best interest of the school system or the teacher. They stressed the need for several years of data to create a viable evaluation. Dr. Sadusky reported that the Council agreed to a three-year cycle.

In response to a concern expressed by Ms. Streckfus, Dr. Sadusky said he discussed this with representatives of the US Department of Education (USDE) and they will hold Maryland to a 50 percent growth model and a cycle of evaluation to constitute a full evaluation of teachers. Mr. Burton said "This is more realistic in the capacity of our evaluators."

In response to a suggestion by Senator Kelley that lessons be videotaped at the beginning of the school year and compared to videotapes at the end of the year to reflect student growth, Dr. Sadusky said the possibility does exist and will be explored.

Senator Kelley expressed the need to build capacity of on-site evaluators and suggested peer evaluations. Dr. Sandusky said that the Montgomery County School System is conducting peer evaluations and that the Prince George's County School system is

currently training trainers for peer evaluations. He cautioned that decisions made by the Council must require consistency among evaluators.

In response to a concern expressed by Mr. Burton about the lag time in getting results of the High School Assessments (HSAs), Dr. Sadusky said that the PARCC assessments should provide more immediate results.

Ms. Bost said that the Baltimore County School System is piloting a program using a videotape in the classroom. Dr. Sadusky asked her to arrange for a site visit for MSDE staff to view the program. She agreed to do so.

In response to a question by Ms. Streckfus, Dr. Sadusky said that the RTTT does allow for experimentation in the evaluation process but the real key for any evaluator, be it administrator, principal or peer, is “do you have the background and are you trained?” He said, “locals need to be more creative, especially those with large high schools.”

In response to a concern expressed by Ms. Streckfus about so many changes taking place at the same time, Dr. Sadusky assured her that local superintendents are in support of all of the changes to equip students for the changing future.

Ms. Weller explained that teachers would have an annual evaluation of their growth data but their professional practice would carry over for two to three years.

Mr. Burton expressed concern about the high cost of professional development to make all of this work. Dr. Sadusky expressed concern as well about the sustainability after the RTTT funding “dries up.” Senator Kelley said, “We should involve teacher preparation programs now. We should get the deans of education in here. We need to do some training of human resource people who are hiring.”

Dr. Foran who led the RTTT Application process said that the USDE is aware of the issues and challenges and that the Application does refer to “the ongoing work of the Council.” He explained that an onsite visit by USDE will be held in two weeks and he will share with them what the Council is doing.

Ms. Weller reported that the Council agreed, at its last meeting, to include an option for a fourth category of effectiveness that corresponds to the number of categories used in local school system (LSS) rubrics such as “developing” or “approaching” effectiveness.

Ms. Weller reported that the Governor has extended the Executive Order to convene the Council through December 2013 and Dr. Sadusky said that he and Ms. Weller support that suggestion.

### **Student Learning Objectives**

*Ms. Jean Satterfield, Assistant State Superintendent  
Division of Certification and Accreditation*

Ms. Satterfield explained that several states and some school districts are building systems of educator effectiveness that include student learning objectives (SLOs) as one of multiple measures in teacher evaluations. She said that SLOs meet the needs in non-tested areas and help to bridge the gap from the Maryland State Assessments (MSAs) to the common core assessments.

Ms. Satterfield reported on the essential components of SLOs stating that they can be aligned to national, state and local standards. She discussed the strengths and challenges of SLOs noting the process will change over time and that USDE has recognized SLOs as a valuable tool.

Ms. Bost cautioned that SLOs are a great tool “as long as everything is aligned.” She cautioned that students must not be tested on material that is not being taught.

### **ESEA Flexibility Application**

*Mary Gable, Assistant State Superintendent  
Division of Academic Policy*

Ms. Gable reported that an ESEA Flexibility Application is being submitted tomorrow to the USDE and that eleven state applications have been approved thus far. She reported that the Application is very much aligned to the RTTT Application and includes a section on the common core standards and the PARCC assessments.

Ms. Gable reported that the Application identifies three types of schools as targets for improvement and the means to meet those targets. She provided a chart outlining a Maryland School Performance Index broken down by grades preK-8 and 9-12. She explained that this Index provides a look at growth in closing the achievement gap and noted that the Index will change when the state moves from MSA and HSA to PARCC assessments.

Senator Kelley expressed the need for critical thinking measures and Ms. Gable said that issue correlates with the college and career readiness of a student. She said, “implementing the common core will require literacy. This document is going to change.”

In response to a question by Mr. Barclay, Ms. Gable explained more fully what constitutes a reward, focus and priority school. Ann Chafin, Assistant State Superintendent in the Division of Student, Family and School Support, explained that these refer only to Title I schools.

In response to a question by Ms. Pipkin, Ms. Chafin explained that the identification of the schools is based on what formerly was Annual Yearly Progress (AYP).

In response to a question by Delegate Kaiser, Ms. Chafin said that there is adequate funding for these targeted schools.

Dr. Alonso commented on the small percentage attributed to the cohort graduation rate, suggesting this now provides a different set of incentives for schools.

Ms. Gable provided a State Teacher Evaluation Model which will be used as a default model noting that LSSs can add their own measures.

Mr. Rutledge expressed concern about graduation rates being used in the school Index noting that teachers have no control over this outcome. He suggested that this part of the school Index should be more fluid.

Ms. Gable said that when all twenty-four LSSs are involved, data will be provided and that this model could change. Dr. Alonso agreed saying, “we are in a learning mode. This is going to be so imperfect. If the SLOs are aligned with the common core, I am fine with endorsing this.”

Ms. Weller said that the Council should continue to monitor progress through the next piloting year. She stressed the fact that the Council is providing a “default model” that LSSs can adapt. She reported that representatives from St. Mary’s County Public Schools will be providing their input at another Council meeting.

Dr. Sadusky said he assured local school superintendents that this is a pilot and is not the final model. He reported that a couple of school systems will be using the state model.

## **Principal Evaluation**

*Dr. Jim Foran, Assistant State Superintendent  
Division of Academic Reform and Innovation*

Dr. Foran explained that the leadership team in his Division worked on a State Principal Evaluation Model which mirrors the teacher model. He noted that schools are broken down into three categories: elementary/middle, high school, and other such as special centers, pre-K, etc. He discussed eight outcomes which are included in the Maryland Instructional Leadership Framework and four outcomes which represent other requirements of principals. He explained that a value range would be assigned to each outcome ranging from two percent to ten percent which would guide school change and drive professional development. Dr. Foran said that supervisors who evaluate principals were very positive about this proposal.

There was brief discussion and Mr. Rutledge said he was in favor of the value range noting that this would be useful in evaluating teachers as well.

## **Minutes of December 15, 2011 Meeting**

Ms. Weller asked the group to review the minutes of the Council meeting held on December 15, 2011. With no amendments, the minutes were approved. Ms. Bost noted that the minutes reflect that the presenters from the pilot counties were asked to provide written reports to the Council and that only one report has been provided. Dr. Sadusky said that the other reports will be sent to the Council members.

## **Summary/Next Steps/Future Meeting Dates**

Ms. Weller announced the following future meeting dates:

March 19

April 23

May 14

She noted that St. Mary's County Public School representatives will make a presentation at the next meeting and that the Council needs to discuss what constitutes an effective and ineffective teacher.

Dr. Leak requested an update on the USDE site visit for the next meeting. Ms. Bost asked how student growth will be measured during the interim prior to the elimination of the MSA. Dr. Sadusky said “we will share some models with you.”

In response to a question by Mr. Melendez, Ms. Chafin said the Council will be provided with a final report outlining the questions, concerns and answers provided to pilot systems. Ms. Weller said that pilot county representatives will be asked to make another presentation to the Council.

Dr. Leak requested more details on the three categories of Title I schools. Ms. Gable said that once the ESEA Flexibility Application is sent, she will provide a link which explains how to find information that Dr. Leak requests.

Ms. Pipkin suggested the group revisit the definitions of teacher and principal at a future meeting.

Mr. Burton suggested the Council look at complexity factors again at a future meeting.

With no further discussion, the meeting adjourned at 11:32 a.m.