

Maryland Council for Educator Effectiveness (MCEE)
Minutes from Meeting of May 14, 2012

Absent:

Dr. Andres Alonso

Bridgette Blue

Dr. Bonita Coleman-Potter

Delegate Anne Kaiser

Pamela Pedersen

Co-Chair Bernie Sadusky opened the meeting at 9:10 a.m. and welcomed everyone. He said, "We have a model and we need to understand the logistics."

Minutes

With no objections, the Minutes of the Meeting of April 23, 2012 were approved.

Maryland Teacher and Principal Evaluation Guidebook Questions and Answers

Mary Gable

Dr. Carolyn Wood

Dr. Jim Foran

Janice Johnson

Jean Satterfield

Co-Chair Betty Weller brought the group's attention to a *Maryland Teacher and Principal Evaluation Guidebook* which she said includes, "our best thinking at this time."

There was brief discussion about problems surrounding the professional practice components outlined on pages 157-161. Ms. Weller said, "It is a state model so you don't have to use it; we are going to revisit it later to make changes."

In response to a question by Ms. Bost, Dr. Foran discussed an LEA Evaluation Plan Checklist found on pages 136-139. He reported that staff looked at what other states are doing and modeled this one after Florida's checklist. He said, "This is a work in progress." There was discussion about the use of the word "must" in the first bullet on page 138 referring to the use of State assessments in tested area subjects counting toward the overall evaluation for teachers and principals at a minimum of ten percent.

Ms. Gable said, "We are looking at what is fair among districts. This is a baseline. This language helps us defend the model." Ms. Weller said, "Nothing is carved in stone. Some of these things will work themselves out."

Ms. Pipkin asked what the professional development (PD) will look like since the Maryland School Assessment (MSA) and the High School Assessment (HSA) do not inform instruction. Dr. Wood reported that a stakeholder group will be working on PD and said, “We need people like you to help with this.” Dr. Foran reported that a comprehensive PD program is being created with stakeholder input.

After brief discussion about the issue of state tests not informing instruction, Dr. Sadusky said that the State Board of Education will need to make decisions based on the cost of revised or additional testing. He reported that three LEAs will be using the state model and that the State is committed to providing PD to them. He noted that Ms. Gable has a matrix outlining the PD that these three LEAs have requested.

Ms. Gable brought the group’s attention to a *Maryland School Performance Index* found on page 75 noting that Maryland has always included all schools in performance targets, not just Title I schools, as other states have done. She discussed the disparities among schools that have made progress but have not met performance targets.

In response to a question by Ms. Bost, Ms. Johnson said that the *Index* is weighted to accommodate all subgroups.

There was concern expressed about the use of closing the gap between cohort graduation rates among the lowest subgroups and the highest subgroups within a school. Ms. Gable explained that there are calculations that adjust for these issues. Mr. Barclay discussed students who are challenged having difficulty meeting all of the Career-Readiness requirements. Dr. Foran said, “We are talking about concentrator status, not completer status.”

In response to a question by Ms. Bost, Ms. Johnson said the *Maryland School Performance Index* will be used in early August.

Student Learning Objectives

Jean Satterfield

Ms. Satterfield said that teacher preparation programs use Student Learning Objectives and that they will be very helpful during the transition to the PARCC assessments. She said that teachers can collaborate in creating SLOs and that SLOs support continuous improvement. She noted that all teachers can use SLOs in tested and non-tested areas and provided examples of SLOs in English Language Arts, Grade Five, cosmetology and

Middle School Physical Education. She reported that the staff is going to build SLOs for all teaching areas.

Ms. Satterfield introduced Linda Burgee, former Superintendent of Frederick County Public Schools, who interviewed teachers and principals in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg School District that is currently using SLOs. She said, "This has been powerful." She explained that SLOs outline what schools want students to learn and how they make that learning happen.

In response to a question by Mr. Rutledge, Ms. Satterfield said that, on average, a teacher would have two SLOs for students.

Ms. Burgee said that assessment tools will be district-driven and there will be an approval process for assessments of SLOs. Ms. Satterfield said that school systems are looking at their own benchmarks.

Mr. Burton said, "I hope this won't dilute the use of AP and SAT scores. Ms. Satterfield said that SLOs could be used to increase the percentage of students passing AP tests and SATs.

Dr. Pataniczek said that the use of SLOs is helpful for teacher interns.

Draft *Second Interim Report*

Ms. Weller brought the group's attention to a draft of the *Second Interim Report*. She asked the Council to read the report and provide feedback to Ms. Lichter or Ms. Spence. She said, "We will make adjustments as necessary" and noted that the *Report* will be sent to the Governor next week.

Dr. Sadusky stated that this is his last meeting with the group and said, "It's been a pleasure." He also reported that Dr. Pataniczek and Ms. Hanlin will be unable to continue their participation on the Council. He said, "Thank you for your support. This is the most difficult task education has taken in the last twenty-five years."

Mr. Rutledge reported that he will be moving and unable to continue his role on the Council as well.

With no further discussion, the meeting adjourned at 11:25 a.m.