Virginia M. Barry, Ph.D.
Commissioner of Education
Tel. 603-271-3144

Paul K. Leather
Deputy Commissioner
Tel. 603-271-3801

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
101 Pleasant Street
Concord, N.H. 03301
FAX 603-271-1953
Citizens Services Line 1-800-339-9900

New Hampshire Task Force on EFFECTIVE TEACHING PHASE II

◆ MINUTES ◆

Kick-off Meeting for Phase II

September 20, 2011
Londergan Hall ◆ Room 15

We had a big turnout for our kick-off event – there were only a couple of people who were unable to attend because of conflicts with their schedule. They expressed their interest in continuing, so will be kept in the loop, and will receive their handouts and any other information digitally in order that they keep up to date.

At about 4:10, Karen Soule (Task Force Co-Chair) thanked everyone for coming, ribbed the food service people about being late, asked everyone present to introduce themselves and give a brief summary of what their background is and why they are here. We quickly went around the room and learned a little bit about everyone. Karen then introduced Commissioner Virginia Barry.

To start out, Commissioner Barry talked about her introduction to the DOE and her experiences with Race to the Top (RTTT). While being a pretty awful introduction to her new job, that process was a really good way to start thinking and working on the issues that became the focus of this task force. Dr. Barry then introduced Scott Marion, the Associate Director of the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment (NCIEA). He will be working with the Task Force throughout Phase II, providing technical work in the area of data analysis and presentation. With his extensive work on the *national* scene, she commented on how lucky we are to have him living in New Hampshire and working with us. Commissioner Barry gave a brief summary of Scott's qualifications and background.

Dr. Barry commented that so much of the work we do is predicated on being open-minded to new ways of thinking. With that in mind she went on to tonight's work. She presented a brief overview of Phase I of the task force and set the stage for Phase II. Her PowerPoint answered hypothetical questions new members might have regarding the work that has already been accomplished. She quickly went through what was done, who was involved, why and how the work was done, along with the process, strategy and current status. She spoke of developing first, the definition of an effective teacher, and then the *Blueprint for Teacher* Effectiveness as a method to share these ideas with the public, and finally of the need for legislation to support the ideas presented. Then she got to the focus of this meeting: *Phase II – That's You*. As in Phase I, Phase II members are taken from many stakeholder groups: Higher education, superintendents, principals, teachers, parents, legislators, and DOE staff. The hope is that the many points of view will provide a balanced assessment and lead to a system that will be workable and acceptable to all involved. SIG Schools will be working as researchers, along with the Task Force, to develop a model that they will use to satisfy the regulations that come with their SIG grant. Commissioner Barry provided some food for thought and some examples of work done by other groups.

After a short break to get some sustenance, Commissioner Barry handed the meeting over to Scott.

Scott Marion presented a PowerPoint entitled "Designing a Statewide System for Measuring Teacher and Leader Effectiveness." He also provided two papers he has co-written on incorporating results from "non-tested" grades and subjects. (Everyone should have gotten printouts of these – if you don't have the three documents from Scott, please contact Cindy.) He started talking by noting that his company, a non-profit, has been working in the area of teacher effectiveness already and is currently working with some other states to develop systems. The system (science and math) in use for measuring effectiveness is a work in progress… we will try to find a method to measure intangibles and integrate the many criteria established by Phase I.

Scott went over what else we will be doing in Phase II and why. He talked about rationale (why a change in teacher evaluation) and a theory of action (methodology that will serve as a framework). Currently all proposals for reform by states and districts include *Student Growth/Achievement* and *Indicators of Educator Knowledge and Skills*. Phase I followed that pattern. As an aside, Scott mentioned that he felt that not getting a grant in RTTT was actually a good thing – we are not trapped into their methodology and have more flexibility in what we develop. He also noted that the waiver announcement on Friday, 9/23 would be informative.

The mission of Phase II sounds simple in theory, but when broken down graphically, you can see that it's really *not* so simple. A huge challenge is to take things like "knowledge and skills" and "student performance" and make them *measurable*. How will non-tested grades and subjects be included? How will standards be determined (what is good enough)? There are major decisions to be made regarding how to combine measures and how to attribute each part. Thought must be given to consequences (especially unintended and/or negative), and how to monitor and evaluate the system. Scott especially mentioned that the leader (principal) evaluation system needs to be designed thoughtfully. He spoke about *dosage* vs. *shared attribution* and his feeling that dosage isn't best. It's important to encourage collaboration rather than competition.

The state's task force work on Accountability must be integrated into the Effective Teaching work. In fact, it would make sense to use the same system for educator evaluation. What does that system look like?

At this point TAP (Teacher Advancement Program) was mentioned. Commissioner Barry requested that I find more information on TAP and the elements involved in their standards of teacher excellence. Please go to: http://www.tapsystem.org/ for insight into their system.

Scott went into the math and showed visual representations of the types of charts he develops, including distributions, comparisons, linear growth and bubble charts.

Work with student growth percentiles is really limited to standardized test data. Difficulty is encountered when trying to apply it to non-tested grades and subjects. Additional difficulty is encountered when trying to measure less quantitative items, i.e., "rich measures" of performance.

Scott also warned against "Campbell's Law" which talks about corruption pressures and distortion inherent in quantifying social processes.

The big questions to be worked on will include:

How will we operationalize and measure the four domains;
Who will do the work;
How will responsibility be attributed;
How will we measure educators' contribution to student learning;
How will we weight and combine the various indicators;
What is the role of the state vs. the districts and schools;
Will the state monitor local evaluation practices;
What policies need to change to support a new system; and
What training will be needed.

We need to organize and plan our time to answer these questions and develop the report that outlines the system. Who will do what? How should we work?

Dr. Barry thanked Scott for his thoughtful, thorough work and went on to say that, according to the *Blueprint for Effective Teaching*, developed by Phase I, three of the pillars are meant to be worked on by others. Teacher Preparation is under the auspices of Higher Education, Induction and Mentoring is handled by the individual schools or districts, and Professional Development is managed at the State level. Phase II is meant to work on the fourth pillar, Teacher Evaluation, and keep "all the balls in the air."

Time was given for questions and concerns. A concern was brought up about the new evaluation system being used as a yardstick when layoffs are necessary. Commissioner Barry said that this would give schools and districts a much more fair and equitable method of making decisions in this situation. She went on to say that this will be good for the teaching profession in so many ways, including fairness, and even portability to other states. Another concern was that we would spend too much time on measurement of testing and not enough time on less tangible areas, such as mastery of competencies, and social-emotional signs, etc. Scott replied that although they talked a lot about numbers tonight, he is allowing for many other inputs – read the papers he has supplied tonight. Also, take a look at a Brookings Report that he mentions in his paper. Go to http://www.brookings.edu/reports/2011/0426_evaluating_teachers.aspx

For next time — be prepared to discuss the following:

What do you need to know more about?

What are the multiple models possible?

Can Danielson be mapped out to work for everyone?
(See her work at http://www.danielsongroup.org/index.htm)

Should we break into smaller groups, and if so, how should they be constructed?

How InTASC teaching standards apply?
(for information and resources go to:
http://www.ccsso.org/Resources/Programs/Interstate_Teacher_Assessment_Consortium_(InTASC).html

Next meetings will be on October 25th, November 8th, and December 6th, same time. Reminders will be sent along with venue. More dates will be decided on later for January and February.