

NEW HAMPSHIRE TASK FOR ON EFFECTIVE TEACHING: PHASE II
DECEMBER 6, 2011
SERESC
MEETING NOTES

I. Welcome/Overview Commissioner Barry

Commissioner Barry welcomed Task Force members and guests, gave an update of happenings at the state level including asking Task Force members to consider signing a letter of support for the longitudinal grant that the Dept. of Education is applying for. This grant would provide the resources for the continued development of data systems to support state and local districts. She then introduced Scott Marion sharing that he would who would discuss the Policy Values that need to be discussed and agreed upon in the Design of a Statewide System of Measuring Teacher and Leader Effectiveness in New Hampshire.

II Policy Values Considerations Scott Marion

Scott began by stating that there is a pink elephant in the room that we as a task force must acknowledge and address before we go any further in our design of a model. In New Hampshire due to our policy and regulatory structure there are constrains as to what can be implemented here. He discussed the lack of authority that the DOE has over local districts, i.e.: unfunded mandates. He then shared that there are a number of key decisions that we have to make as we move forward. He gave the example of the SIG schools that had to agree to certain conditions in order to be eligible for funds and other resources. Unfortunately there are very few other requirements that the Dept. of Education can impose on districts without legislation and regulations. Before we can design a system or systems there are several key decisions that we need to make very soon.

He posed the following questions:

- Will all schools be required to implement a new educator evaluation system?
- Will all schools be required to incorporate student performance results in their evaluations?
- Will there be a "state model system" that all schools are expected to use?
- Will all schools be required to evaluate educators against the same set of standards?
- Will all schools be required to measure the standards using the same tools?
- Will all schools be required to combine the results using the same approach?
- Is there any intention to ensure portability of educator classifications, non-probationary status, effectiveness rating?

The views of the task force and decision about comparability will significantly influence subsequent decisions. Our existing statute requires that all districts have an educator evaluation policy, but does not require any state oversight of the policy or system.

-Does the Task force want to recommend state oversight of local evaluation systems?

The Phase I Task Force overwhelmingly endorsed the notion that student performance results must be part of all educator evaluations so would the task force want this required by all local systems?

-Should the state require local districts to either use the model system or design a system at least as rigorous?

-Should we develop a state model educator evaluation system, who would judge the rigor and quality of local systems and what are the opportunities and challenges that would be faced in a state model?

A state model would provide opportunities to have clarity around a shared purpose, create powerful communication opportunities with the legislature and others, sharing of professional development and resources and the model could still allow plenty of local flexibility. The challenges are how to avoid the unfunded mandate piece and the potential loss of local decision-making authority

One of the early decisions needs to be about the standards that will be used in the system. With common standards it would provide a common framework across the state, still allows for plenty of local flexibility, and even though it is not the only way to ensure comparability, it would be much easier to do so with common standard. The common standards might provide more of an illusion of comparability than is justified due to differences in implementation and once again may be perceived usurping local control.

-What are the standards by which we evaluate teachers recommend for any state model system or for the SIG schools?

-Will all schools be required to evaluate their educators against the same set of standards or will schools be allowed to evaluate educators against any standards they choose?

-If not required to use the same standards, will there be (Should there be a process to evaluate the acceptability of district standards?)

We all need to consider measurement approaches and if each district is required to use the same set of standards, will there be or should there be required approaches for measuring the standards? Can get more specific with this, only if the task force answers “yes” to this question.

The group also needs to come to terms around student performance measures. The Phase I Task Force recommended the use of multiple measures of student growth and teacher performance. Therefore, we need to determine:

- What indicators of student growth should be used for NECAP grades and content areas?
- Will all schools have to use NECAP (or consortium) results in tested areas?
- How do we combine student growth component and practice component?
- How do we make decisions regarding weighting?

Scott gave information from Colorado regarding their weighting system. Individual districts determined their weighting system with a minimum for each standard, important for comparability or portability.

- Will New Hampshire expect all districts to arrive at an overall judgment of educator effectiveness.
- What will be the consequences and support for districts? e.g.: two years of ineffective ratings.
- Does it go from district to district?

III. Longitudinal Data Systems

Mike Schwartz

Prior to the break for a light buffet, Karen Soule asked Mike Schwartz to give highlights of the longitudinal grant that the DOE is applying for that will assist districts in collecting data to make informed decisions. After Mike presented there was a question about value-added. If other task force members had questions they were asked to talk to Mike directly.

IV. Key Considerations in designing educator evaluation system Stan Rabinowitz (via Skype)

After being introduced by Scott Marion Stanley began his presentation by stating that he would be discussing state and local relationships from a variety of perspectives:

- State and local continuum across a variety of issues: Question: How should the relationship of state and local be described?
 - If the discussion is around legal defensibility and compliance, people are not all that cooperative. However, if I describe it in terms of comparability, equity and fairness, then people become cooperative versus adversarial. So, as you think about this issue, a teacher or principal in one district ought to have a comparable rating in

another district for doing the same work. So, stop thinking about compliance and start thinking about equity and fairness. Keep that as your lens as we talk through.

- We are going to talk through four different continua:

The model: some states have a statewide model where every district's evaluation model is held to the same standard. In some states, there is local autonomy where they so not have to implement the same model. Think about this potential model in two ways. One is a series of decisions about how the model plays out:

- Indicators – in some states, 50% of teacher effectiveness and accountability needs to be based on test scores. But how that gets operationalized can differ across the states. So, in some states it automatically means using the states CRT. For other states, it could mean a choice between states CRT and other measures such as local selected interim assessment – as long as the assessment is showing certain technical requirements such as validity, reliability, and freedom of bias. The other issue is the weighting of the indicator. The third thing you may decide to have is comparability around weighting of indicators within the system.
 - What many states are thinking about doing is a combination of a whole set of indicators that every teacher gets evaluated on and unique indicators to further enhance the evaluation process e.g. formative assessment, feedback to students and parents.
 - Formal approval of the model: Approval can have three different points. For most locally controlled the state acknowledges receipt of the local model (which may or may not be compliant). A little to the more formal side of that is a local model that must follow a state mandated process. It could be that there is agreement between the school board and the teacher's association. The difference between this and the next one is that the process has to be followed but the substance can vary. The third level is whether the state needs to approve the substance of the model on issues of validity, reliability, comparably, and equity. This is an issue for NH as it thinks about submitting its waiver. This one varies from the model of "I submitted it and you have it one file" to "I submitted and you must followed the process I submitted" .
 - Another piece is training of evaluators – face to face, online training, rubrics that have been developed. For example, the state of IL has just released an RFP asking vendors to develop a statewide model.
- These continua that you need to grapple with.
 - Policy has so outpaced practice there is not a single state that is able to do a fully effective educator evaluation that goes beyond the 31% (teachers in tested grades and subjects). What we are missing are a whole lot of other indicators for the other 69%.
 - Think of this as a process using a 1 – 3 – 5 – 10 year approach: One is what is the system you can actually develop now that you have the faith, resources to develop now. It is a very incomplete system. Think about what that better system would be. If you had 2 years of development, communication and training, how much better would this system be. How much better would the system be? And what would the supports be? Our

system is actually a year three system. The five year system – what are the studies I need to develop? What kind of data do I need to evaluate our model? What do I need to know to understand the system whether it's working? Whether the value outweighs the burden? Where does 10 come in? I am not sure that many of us will be in the same jobs we are now in 2021. Ten years give you the freedom to see how creative and innovative you can be in your system. One thing is certainly between now and 10 years from now, every classroom and every state will have two-way access to the world in real time. Teachers and students can look out into the world and experts can look into the classroom to provide feedback and guidance. NASA, legislators, others can support learning. The artifacts that will be available will be much more sophisticated. I encourage you to think 10 years out to build the best 1, 3 and 5 year systems. Balance the need for local control with issues of comparability, equity, and fairness. How can state and locals work together to build a fair, equitable and comparable system?

- Question: Any thoughts on the 10 year projection in light of the development of assessment systems?

Answer: We are really talking about 10 year assessments. Right now both SMARTER Balanced and PARCC are doing a technology audit. The model that people are thinking about is already an outdated model. Both models are thinking about using a laptop. That is not cost effective and gets in the way of a short and powerful testing model. Suppose we stop thinking laptops and start thinking I Pad, iPhones, etc. Contact lenses are a means of administration of tests. Real world simulations, artificial intelligence scoring.

- Question: We are focusing on teacher effectiveness including principals?

Answer: We are dealing with both.

- Question: What is the relationship between teacher and principal effectiveness systems?

Answer: The first question I ask: How much should principal effectiveness be identical to your school accountability system? It is more sophisticated than test scores but also includes status in growth, parent indicators. Then, add certain pieces on to that. If there are some measures, really specific to the principal e.g. improving teacher performance, instructional leadership, etc. At the core level, now we get to teacher versus principal. At the core level, there should be some things that will overlap. I would build a core of comparability and build some additional indicators specific to role of teacher and role of principal.

- Question: Are there models that include the context?

Answer: Some states (Missouri being one) are thinking about differential weighting of indicators based on whether the school is high status growth or whether the school is

teaching low or high performing students. Another model is having some school wide indicators that all educators in the school are held responsible for. So, in an elementary school for example, the reading scores (through some weighting system) are all responsible to some extent for reading scores. At the high school we may switch it around. For example, science may be (in part) the responsibility of the English teacher, etc. It is a complicated attribution model but it is a way to spread the responsibility across content areas while also asking teachers to be responsible for their own content areas.

▪ Question:

Answer: It becomes a better predictive model if you include SES and even race in the system. Politically it is a very difficult argument to make – that teachers will be held differentially accountable with lower or higher standards. A better way to do this is to use academic performance as a proxy for these issues.

V. Following the presentation Scott asked us all the following questions

- Is the task Force interested in supporting the development of a state model one that districts can use or make adjustments?

-If we are not developing a state model, what are we doing? What should be the goal of this task force?

Each table was asked to answer these questions and then to report out.

Scott then asked each table to report out.

TABLE ONE

The first table reported that they talked a lot about finding a balance,
- Why reinvent the wheel if this is coming?
- How burdensome would it be to have talked about having guidelines
- Frameworks suggested parameters, not a model top down
- Guidelines favor, teasing out a balance.

TABLE TWO

Would embrace a state model and would like to see exemplar
- Exemplars in collaboration IHE's and K-12

TABLE THREE

- Would support a state model that allowed for local changes, cultures.
- Important to consider equity what would truly be equitable, what's the role of the - task force?
- What has been important is the process to get to the product.

- Task force could help people understand some of the components of process that would be critical
- Professional Development offered to SIG schools providing a structure for the process lead us to a product, not everyone has time or resources to do this

TABLE FOUR

Supported the idea of state model, using RTI model

Additional comments shared.

- Might not be an either or model, state create one 5 to 7 years many choose to do it not have to be yes or no answer.
- Not everybody use it not used for next 10 yrs. Kids are mobile, allow data to go from district to district.
- Dean Cascadden shared master development plan guidelines to tell districts how to write plan-developing sandbox for district to play in.
- Have to identify teacher standards to measure teachers against, have to have student achievement piece in that need to provide enough latitude for local control. Also can use path of least resistance, now put all parameters in model?
- Stephanie LaFreniere shared that the SIG schools, task force juggling competing demands, SIG timelines.

Commissioner Barry then asked if we could have a consensus from the task force to develop a model. After getting a consensus the Commissioner shared that what goes on in this task force will send a strong message that New Hampshire wants the best teachers in the country to educate our students, and that it we have an ethical responsibility to our profession. We need to make these kinds of decisions before they are made for us. Accountability is not going away and is going to affect formula funding whether we have a coherent system in place. It also impacts New Hampshire's ability to access foundation grants.

She then thanked everyone sharing that we have an exciting year ahead of us thanking SERESC Thank you to SERESC and Judy Fillion for funding the buffet. Next meeting on Tuesday January 3rd.