

Maryland Council for Educator Effectiveness (MCEE)
Minutes from Meeting of April 23, 2012

Absent:

Christopher Barclay

Pamela Pedersen

Co-Chair Betty Weller opened the meeting at 9 a.m. and welcomed everyone. She brought the group's attention to an Executive Order signed by the Governor to extend the term of the Council to December 31, 2013. She explained that this will afford the Council more time to make improvements and deal with the challenges surrounding teacher and principal evaluations.

Co-Chair Bernie Sadusky said that four assurances in the Race To The Top (RTTT) grant are the framework for the third wave of education reform:

1. Moving to national Common Core Standards
2. Creating and maintaining a Longitudinal Data System to provide a basis for a professional development model for teachers
3. Creating and Maintaining a Break-through Center

Dr. Sadusky noted that the Break-through Center has been very successful in Prince George's County and Baltimore City.

St. Mary's County Public Schools (SMCPS) Pilot

Dr. Michael Martirano, Superintendent

Dr. Jeffrey Maher

Wanda Twigg, St. Mary's County Education Association

Dr. Martirano explained that a successful teacher evaluation system has been created over many years through collaboration and maintaining good relationships with all of its stakeholders. He explained that the system is built around the Charlotte Danielson Framework and that the following steps have framed the work:

1. Align to the Maryland Framework
2. Define levels of performance
3. Create a process for setting targets and measuring student learning
4. Utilize an online observation and evaluation management system
5. Utilize the Model as a professional development tool

He discussed the successes and challenges that have faced SMCPS. He explained that the model includes five components of student learning: summative assessments, formative assessments, performance assessments, student growth and daily classroom performance. He stressed the importance of collaboration with the local education association.

Dr. Maher discussed the 5th Domain, that of measuring student performance. He explained that focus groups were held at each pilot school to present the current thinking and gather input from teachers. He said the following became clear:

1. Teachers can reach and teach student in front of them – habitually truant students should not be included in teacher effectiveness calculations
2. Teachers want recognition for student growth and acknowledgement for interventions and support given – even if the student misses the goal set
3. Teaching assignments are different and data used must be appropriate to the course and students taught
4. Multiple and varied measures are essential for authentic assessments – one test should never determine achievement or effectiveness.

He provided a chart outlining the five components of student learning and the criteria used to measure student performance. He also provided a Student Learning Objective (SLO) worksheet used for self-analysis and feedback. He noted that there are more than one thousand benchmark assessments. Dr. Maher explained the key aspects for using evidence of student learning such as determining attributed students (those assigned to the teacher of record who are consistently enrolled and maintain attendance standards for the course, and performance targets, student learning outcomes and proficiency levels set for the content and grade-level band.

Dr. Martirano reported that the school system is maintaining three levels of teacher performance: ineffective, effectiveness and highly effective. He explained that if a teacher is considered “developing,” they will be designated as “effective.”

Ms. Twigg reported that the teachers association has collaborated through the entire process and has expressed concern about the workload for administrators. She thanked the teacher representatives on the Council for their excellent representation.

Dr. Martirano said, “We have a model that works. It is fair to teachers and honors student growth.” He said the next step is to pilot the model in all St. Mary’s schools next year.

Ms. Pipkin reported that the school system is providing help for teachers to use the data system to support student achievement.

In response to a question by Ms. Bost, Dr. Maher said that the school improvement plan sets targets for creating SLOs.

In response to several questions posed by Dr. Leak, Mr. Martirano explained that managing principal workload to provide multiple teacher observations requires building capacity in the schools. He said that assistant principals must be trained to be evaluators and observers. He said it is also important to provide the necessary technical tools.

In response to a question by Ms. Hanlin, Dr. Martirano said that instructional supervisors are involved in the observation process.

In response to a question by Ms. Streckfus, Ms. Twigg said that teachers have expressed the need for training in online grade books. Ms. Streckfus expressed concern by the business community about poor student performance in Algebra. Dr. Maher reported that Algebra II is currently aligned to the Maryland State Curriculum and will transition to the Common Core standards.

Senator Kelley asked a question about non-attributable students, and Dr. Martirano said that no student is left out. He explained that this designation is only used for teacher evaluation. Ms. Twigg reported that teachers and administrators are getting credit for helping students who are consistently truant.

In response to a question by Ms. Blue, Dr. Maher said that non-tenured teachers have a minimum of four observations and tenured teachers have a minimum of two observations.

In response to a question by Ms. Kitchens, Dr. Maher said that each teacher could have different performance targets. He said, "It is a one-on-one conversation."

In response to a question by Ms. Walker, Dr. Martirano reported that SMCPs built the Leadership Professional Assessment System (LPAS) and is looking at the state model as well. He explained that the principal evaluation system is on hold until the teacher system is up and running.

In response to a question by Mr. Melendez about what SMCPs would do differently, Dr. Martirano said, "If you are not engaged now, get engaged. Collaborate with your teacher association and shift your professional development."

Dr. Sadusky congratulated and thanked the presenters.

Queen Anne's County Public Schools (QACPS) Pilot

Dr. Carol Williamson, Superintendent

Tomi Fabri

Kathy Draper

Dr. Williamson reported that QACPS has not fully implemented the evaluation system. She said they are working through developing a system where the measures are acceptable and useful. She noted that collaboration, communication and professional development are critical in creating an effective evaluation system for teachers.

Ms. Draper reported that a 25-member committee was created to work on the quantitative portion of the evaluation system. She said they are developing rubrics for pilot schools and that not all teachers in the schools are included in the pilot project. She reported that they are engaging in portfolio building and that teachers have been very supportive of this process. Ms. Draper reported on the work done thus far in creating a principal evaluation system and noted the challenges faced in creating both systems.

Dr. Williamson said that because they have such a small central office, the critical issue has been finding time to provide professional development. She said that they will not have fully tested the model by the end of this year.

In response to a question by Senator Kelley, Dr. Williamson said that video documentation is being used for portfolio assessments and they are providing scoring sessions to train teachers in how to score portfolios. She note that people from across school systems will be scoring portfolios and that they are being used in all categories.

Prince George's County Public Schools (PGCPS) Pilot

Deborah Sullivan

D. Ray

Paul Mazza

Ms. Sullivan went over the background leading up to the current evaluation system explaining that professional development and leadership capacity are critical. She provided the following three primary objectives of the teacher pilot program:

1. To provide specific, actionable feedback and opportunities to improve teaching practice.
2. To identify multiple measures of teacher effectiveness
3. To identify possible issues with implementing the new teacher evaluation system

She provided the following three primary objectives of the principal pilot program:

4. To provide specific, actionable feedback and opportunities to improve leadership skills.
5. To identify multiple measures of principal effectiveness
6. To identify possible issues with implementing the new teacher evaluation system

Mr. Mazza urged the importance of training observers and using multiple measures to determine student growth and achievement. He discussed the efforts to date in implementing the pilot program and the challenges faced thus far. He noted that student attendance is a challenge and said “every teacher contributes to a student graduating from high school.”

Ms. Ray stressed the need for teachers to have a voice in the process.

Senator Kelley suggested that when teachers are collaborating to promote student learning, that the group could decide who provided the most collaboration to receive credit for a student’s growth.

In response to a question by Ms. Pipkin, Mr. Mazza said that the Tripod Survey is being used to capture student perceptions and that the results are not in at this time.

In response to a question by Dr. Sadusky, Ms. Sullivan said that an assessment is used to certify evaluations and principals.

Kent County Public Schools (KCPS) Pilot

Melissa Walters

Edward Silver

Mr. Silver said the value of this pilot has been the discussion of teaching and learning and the development of a growth culture in Kent County schools. He said that focus groups have made presentations in every school. He reported on the use of Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) and the need for a rigorous data system to determine student growth. He said that embedded in the principal evaluation system is the Instructional Leadership Framework which uses a student growth portion similar to the teachers’ system. He discussed challenges such as the need for training and linking the observation/evaluation tools to strong professional learning resources.

Ms. Walters stressed the need for open lines of communication noting that the evaluation system is “a living document.”

Charles County Public Schools (CCPS) Pilot

Steve Perakis

Cliff Eichel

Liz Brown

Mr. Perakis said “This has been a very positive process.” He said they are expanding to non-tested areas and that they are using the Charlotte Danielson Framework on the qualitative side and the state assessments on the quantitative side. He reported that each school is provided an improvement plan and they are in the process of finalizing scoring rubrics in all areas. He reported that the school system sought out help from experts in tracking teacher performance.

Mr. Eichel said that teachers are able to glean results online from any test they conduct. The teacher can view a student’s test score, click to determine a student’s weaknesses and then is provided with lesson plans to help the student in the particular area. Likewise, he said that students can log on to find out their weakness and appropriate resources to help them in specific areas. He said that parents will also be able to log on to get resources to help move the student forward. He noted that this will be available for Algebra I, II and geometry for the fall semester.

Mr. Perakis said that the school system needs more clarification on the school index prior to establishing a new principal evaluation system. He noted the challenges of more time for essential professional development.

Senator Kelley congratulated the presenters on linking student and teacher identifiers and suggested that MSDE could assist with coordinating and linking professional development and data.

Ms. Streckfus reported that the Maryland Business Roundtable is developing a clearinghouse and will be meeting with local school system personnel to provide assistance.

Baltimore County Public Schools (BCPS)

Billy Burke

Abby Beytin

Ms. Beytin discussed the qualitative measures, the quantitative measures and the evaluation ratings being used in Baltimore County pilot schools. She discussed details of the 2012-2013 pilot project.

Mr. Burke discussed the progress made thus far and the challenges to be met. He noted the recommendation for an additional year to pilot in order to consider and incorporate the PARCC assessment data and common core implementation data into the newly developed system.

Baltimore City Public Schools (BCPS) Pilot

Jennifer Bell-Ellwanger

Chad Rubalcaba

Lee Rutledge

Keith Steinhart

Ms. Bell-Ellwanger reported that all teachers at pilot schools have been engaged in the work and that more than half are in non-tested areas. She discussed a Roster Validation Process that was conducted to verify which students were taught by which teacher(s) for a particular subject. She reported that they are looking at developing Student Learning Objectives (SLOs).

Maryland Teacher and Principal Evaluation Guidebook

Mary Gable

Dr. Carolyn Wood

Jean Satterfield

Ms. Gable provided Council members with a copy of a *Maryland Teacher and Principal Evaluation Guidebook* which will guide the field test next year and reported that 22 of the 24 school districts will field test next year. She walked the group through the various sections of the *Guidebook* and reported that Anne Arundel, Somerset and Calvert County Public Schools will field test the State Model next year.

Ms. Gable noted a RTTT Project discussed on page 65 in which MSDE is designing a calculation engine that will support use of the State model for the Education Effectiveness Rating System as well as LEA models that follow similar principles.

She is seeking feedback from not only the local school systems but from the Council as well.

In response to a concern expressed by Senator Kelley about the teacher preparation programs, Ms. Satterfield, Assistant State Superintendent in the Division of Certification and Accreditation at MSDE, said that they are working with institutes of higher education (IHE) on this issue.

Dr. Pataniczek said that IHEs have been working with SLOs for many years and that their use is on the increase. He said he will discuss these issues with his colleagues and noted the need for common language.

Dr. Wood discussed the challenges of incorporating student growth into teacher evaluations and the “givens” in this process. She also discussed using MSA performance levels to create a standardized score for each year the student is tested. Dr. Wood provided examples of how to value achievement within basic, proficient and advanced performance levels.

Ms. Pipkin and Senator Kelley expressed the importance of item analysis and showing teachers where students are basic, proficient or advanced.

Ms. Satterfield said that research was gleaned from other states on the use of SLOs and the responses have been very positive. She said that they are encouraging cross-county teams to implement SLOs. Ms. Satterfield reviewed the portion of the *Guidebook* dealing with the implementation of SLOs.

Summary/Next Steps

Ms. Weller asked the Group to review the *Guidebook* more closely and provide feedback to either Co-Chair. She reported that the next meeting will be held on May 14, 2012 at the Lowe House Office Building at 9 a.m. to answer any outstanding issues, and revisit the initial recommendations in order to prepare another Report to the Governor due in June.

Minutes

With no objections, the Minutes of the Meeting of February 27, 2012 were approved.

With no further discussion, the meeting adjourned at 1:10 p.m.