

Illinois P-20 Council
Teacher & Leader Effectiveness Committee
Meeting Minutes
July 25, 2011
10:00 AM – 12:00 PM
Normal, Illinois

Present: Erika Hunt, ISU, Lisa Hood, ISU, Josh Anderson, Teach for America, Bette Bergeron, SIUE, Vicki Phillips, ISBE, Brad White, IERC, Linda Tomlinson, ISBE, Deborah Curtis, ISU, Jess House, WIU, Joe Pacha, ISU, Jan Fitzsimmons, ACI, Jim O'Connor, Advance Illinois, Debbie Meisner-Bertauski, IBHE, Melissa DeBartolo, Consultant, Michele Seelbach, P-20 Council, Pam Rosa, Consortium for Education Change, Ben Boer, Advance Illinois, Ann Courter, P-20 Council, Jessica Gunther, ISU, Imron Bhatti, Advance Illinois Intern, Ann McKenna, Advance Illinois Advisory Committee

Present on phone: John Evans, ISBE, Vicki Chou, UIC, Joyce Weiner, Ounce of Prevention, Lizanne DeStefano, UIUC, Robin Steans, Advance Illinois
Jason Helfer, Knox College, Karen Austin, Chicago Public Schools

Welcome and Introductions

Co-chairs Erika Hunt and Josh Anderson welcomed the teacher and leader subcommittees to a combined meeting. Introductions of participants in person and by phone were made.

Goals for the Meeting

The goals for the meeting were to review and discuss:

- the draft Communication Plan for the Dashboard Design
- potential data for the draft Data Collection for Teacher & Leader Program Preparation
 - Student Aspirations during High School
 - Basic Skills Data by Preparation Program
 - Professional Development—Related to Specific Skill Sets
 - Student Achievement for Teachers and Principals
 - Multiple Measures
 - Other data points
- Survey:
 - Exit Survey
 - Illinois Teacher Graduate Assessment: First & Fifth Years
 - Illinois Educational Administration Graduate Assessment
 - Mentors
- Defining of a “High-Needs School”
- Next Steps

Draft Communication Plan for the Dashboard Design

Erika Hunt shared that the purpose of the Communication Plan for the Teacher and Leader Dashboard was threefold:

1. To give teacher and school leader preparation programs the information they need to improve.
2. To give school districts the information they need to determine the effectiveness of our state's teacher and school leader preparation programs.
3. To give policymakers the information they need to determine the effectiveness of the state's teacher and leader preparation programs with impacting student learning and meeting the needs of school districts.

Discussion among participants ensued regarding the 3 purposes of the Communication Plan, the volume of data, the usefulness or value of the data, and the expense of the data collection. Discussion also centered around whether the data was going to be used to answer research/improvement/policy questions or for program accountability. Participants agreed that use of data to answer research questions and use of data for accountability are very different.

Deborah Curtis noted that each institution has a responsibility to use accountability data as part of an inward, reflective process to improve instruction and institutions have the responsibility to defining impact: the KEY to research. She said that the focus should be on asking what data is needed to help teachers to learn what they need to know and do, and how to better their instruction. She also talked about transformative initiatives that have preparation programs improving clinical experiences and have better connection to P-12 schools.

Bette Bergeron stated that this is an inward process, reflective so that individual institutions can benefit from the data. She, as well as other participants, felt strongly that data collected should not be used to rank order the programs. Data collected for use by institutions for self-improvement should not be public.

Josh Anderson suggested that programs identify 3- 4 accountability measures. It was agreed that a Delphi survey be developed through SurveyMonkey which would assess all members on the Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Subcommittee to determine their priorities for accountability measures. It was also requested that the Delphi survey have open-ended questions and comment sections.

A concern was expressed that responses to the Delphi survey could change depending on the purpose of the dashboard as it relates to which measures are most helpful and recommended. It was suggested that the format of the survey include the measures in one column and the three purposes in three separate columns, so that each measure can be evaluated according the each purpose. Erika Hunt suggested that the survey framework include data, data source, research questions/value, audience, and accountability criteria.

It was shared that P-20 Council will be utilizing Matt Clifford from Learning Point to assist in research data collection. His skills could be used for the developing and analyzing the Delphi survey as well as conducting focus groups to ask universities what data they need to collect to improve their programs. The participants were in agreement to utilize Matt Clifford's support in this process.

Erika Hunt summarized that the education reform initiatives in the state affect the purpose of the dashboard. She stated that the subcommittee cannot rush through the data dashboard and suggested revisiting the issue at the October meeting.

Data Collection for Teacher & Leader Program Preparation (Data Dashboard)

Erika Hunt asked John Evans, from the assessment division of the Illinois State Board of Education, to begin the data dashboard discussion by bringing the subcommittee up to date with the Longitudinal Data System (LDS). He shared that the current metrics being used include the Student Information System, Analogous system, demographic measures, course-taking patterns and IEP information. He stated that it was important to create an automated reporting system so that agencies and institutions do not have to duplicate reporting. He outlined the questions that will be able to be answered with the system. ISBE is on track with both federal LDS grants. For PreK-12, progress on the LDS has been good. The Student Information System is operational, and the LDS is engineered, but not yet populated with PK-12 data. The teacher service record files will be updated by July 2012. Four million high school course files have been entered, connecting teachers to courses. The next challenge is linking teachers to students—it could be another year to accomplish that linkage. It will take four years after that to develop a complete record for high school students, beginning at freshman year. It may be possible to enhance features in the existing Teacher Data Warehouse to assist the effort. Middle school course data is yet to be added. Elementary teachers are meeting to determine a framework for assigning students to teachers. This is complicated by various roles, i.e., team teaching, special education, etc. Demographic data has been added for students pertaining to gender, ethnicity, free and reduced lunch, English Language Learner, IEP, etc., and some summative data on student performance in courses is available. There is no performance data for teachers yet, since a model for a value-added measure has not yet been selected, and the evaluation system is not yet in operation.

It was asked how the LDS would be able to link elementary students to their teachers. John Evans replied that the LDS would be able to link to the data (program of study, ID #). He said they are creating a system in which all the data systems can “shake hands” and share data.

The Higher Education Consortium is meeting July 28, 2011 to organize a governance structure. Data submission from higher education institutions will begin in the fall of 2011. ISAC has completed a Memorandum of Understanding with IBHE to share data. The student ID number issue has been resolved. There are 65 data elements from the

Higher Education Consortium, including program of study. They are working on the interactivity of data sets. There has been a request made to repurpose some of the federal LDS grant to support development and external validation of a research agenda, to be certain that needed data is being collected.

Following the LDS report, the participants were encouraged to discuss other ways the data dashboard could prove helpful. Suggestions from participants included:

- adding licensure information with the date of endorsements, including when and where. With teacher and principal preparation programs changing, it will be important to distinguish between teachers and principals trained prior and post program reforms.
- the number of candidates who completed the certification exams and the number passing certification exams
- keeping track of the number of re-takes that candidates complete.
- common courses in higher education that could be used to compare programs
- formative measures
- quality measures on field experience, clinical practice, accreditation process, and diversity

Student Achievement for Teachers and Principals

ISBE is working on defining teacher effectiveness. PEAC is getting close to defining teacher growth that will be used by 2016 for teacher evaluations. The state wants to make sure that rating is done on the same calibration scales.

The Illinois public deans have coming together to discuss teacher effectiveness, mentioning a study conducted in California. They gathered data over a 7-year period, followed up with students after graduating (in 3 year intervals). The study included individual data and aggregate data. The deans expressed a need for a performance-based test, not paper and pencil in order to evaluate the effectiveness of the act of teaching, determining what the teacher is actually doing in the classroom. Data could include categories of specific reflection of candidate's teaching and how they assess their teaching.

The state teacher certification board has observed that basic skills test data won't be useful to evaluate teacher preparations programs, since all students in the programs will have passed the test. It could be of interest to institutions tracking that took the test and did not pass. There was a discussion about the purpose of the data and the value weight of data, as well as the cost of collection.

The state cannot use ISAT/PSAE scores to measure student growth. Other assessments will be developed to be able to better measure student growth over 3 years of data. The focus will be looking at the purpose and value of the data.

Discussion was held regarding NCATE reporting and outcomes that teacher education and principal preparation programs have to report for NCATE accreditation. NCATE is transitioning to CATE measuring the impact of candidates and student learning.

Residencies

Jan Fitzsimmons prompted discussion on defining residency. She asked about the one-year residency and what percentages of students are in clinical positions, how many are paid versus unpaid? What are other names for residencies, i.e. internships, methods classes, student teaching?

Vicky Chou suggested that we start capturing the variations in residency and internship programs because this is receiving more attention nationally.

Erika Hunt suggested looking at other models, possibly internationally.

Next Steps

Work with Matt Clifford to develop, administer and evaluate the Delphi survey

Develop focus groups to ask universities what data they need to collect to improve their programs

Revisit the discussion the Communication Plan and Data Dashboard

Next Joint Meeting

October 13, 2011
Normal, Illinois

July 25, 2011 meeting
Teacher Effectiveness Sub-Committee of the Illinois P-20 Council
Illinois State University Alumni Center, room 118-119
1101 N. Main, Normal, Illinois
Noon to 2 p.m.

Present: Josh Anderson, Bette Bergeron, Linda Tomlinson, Jim O'Connor, Anne McKenna, Ann Courter

On phone: Robin Steans, Jason Hefler

Linda Tomlinson from ISBE discussed the status of SB1799, the bill that creates the new professional educator licensure system. The bill has passed both chambers and was sent to the Governor on June 29. License/certificate renewal will be handled through a trailer bill, which will be drafted after stakeholders have had an opportunity for discussions. They will be looking at a 5-year renewal for most licenses, with a tiered system. Teacher effectiveness data will not be available by the first renewal date, but will likely be part of renewal once it is available. There is a possibility of requiring induction and mentoring experiences (although it was acknowledged that the state budget lines for those programs were cut). There will be a transition to the new system, with some teachers getting up to 7 years before renewal is needed. The new licenses will not be printed, but will be delivered through an on-line system, both for efficiency and in response to forgery concerns.

The Elementary and Middle Grades Group is working on rules to implement the new endorsement categories.

Student teaching assessments are moving to TPAC (Teacher Performance Assessment Consortium) video, performance-based evaluations that will be graded off-site, rather than by the candidate's own prep program. Student teaching length is recommended to be 15 weeks, or one semester, although the few colleges with a quarter system of 10-12 weeks may struggle with that.

Alternative certification is moving to a 2-year program, with more mentoring. For now, there are no more National Board Certification stipends.

In response to questions about identifying teachers with high content test scores as passing "with distinction", Linda noted that ISBE would be opposed to such a designation.

For teacher dispositions, although NCATE requires a measure, it was agreed there is no good research available.

There was much discussion of how to improve field experiences. Anne McKenna talked about a school that hires new grads as assistant teachers, and moves them into teacher positions when they are available, although the group felt that could be too expensive for most districts to propose as a model. It was noted that if the student teaching requirements are too costly, students may go to prep programs in other states. Bette Bergeron, Dean of the SIU College of Education, explained that even though secondary ed teacher programs are in the SIU College of Arts and Sciences, and only elementary education is in the School of Education, her program must find placements for and supervise 800 student teachers each year, as well as 25 administrator placements.

There was discussion of how the subcommittee can best weigh in on the future license renewal trailer bill, and involve stakeholders. Also discussed was Ann Courter's suggestion that this subcommittee might want to expand its focus to the entire P-20 spectrum, by looking at pedagogy training for community college teachers; preparation programs for preschool teachers and early childhood providers; and preparation programs for career and technical education teachers, especially in the area of math education.

Teacher prep programs will need to change quickly to respond to the new rules.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

P-20 Council
Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Committee
Bloomington, Illinois
July 25, 2011
12:00 PM – 2:00 PM Leadership Sub-Committee
Meeting Minutes

Present: Erika Hunt, ISU, Lisa Hood, ISU, Deborah Curtis, ISU, Jess House, WIU, Joe Pacha, ISU, Jan Fitzsimmons, ACI, Debbie Meisner-Bertauski, IBHE, Melissa DeBartolo, Consultant, Michele Seelbach, P-20 Council Staff, Pam Rosa, Consortium for Education Change, Ben Boer, Advance Illinois

Present on Phone: Lizanne DeStefano, UIUC

Welcome and Introductions

Erika Hunt welcomed the Leader Effectiveness Subcommittee members. Introductions of participants were made in person and by phone.

Review of Work to Date - Leadership Core Competencies

Erika shared that the purpose of the meeting was to review the leadership documents developed by Melissa DeBartolo, Alicia Haller and Luann Shields and solicit feedback from the membership. Erika also discussed the McCormick Foundation which is sponsoring the work at 4 universities to develop rubrics of competencies for principal preparation programs.

Erika began the review by presenting the crosswalk of school leadership standards in use and in stature focusing on the principalship. Erika then introduced Melissa DeBartolo who helped develop the *Illinois Aspiring Principal Framework Core Competency Dictionary*.

Melissa DeBartolo began by reviewing the core competencies handout, explaining the various standards. She continued by defining core competency as the knowledge, skills, and abilities to achieve performance standards. She further discusses this by asking how we know a core competency has been achieved. Behavioral indicators need to be developed to determine this.

Erika shifted the discussion to the Principal Preparation Rubric as an example of evaluating the core competencies.

Melissa continued the discussion by going over the methodology of the Illinois Aspiring Principal Framework Handout, stating the methodology, the patterns found in the data, and putting them back into standards to align. Joe Pacha asks, "Where are the 36 activities?"

Erika explained that the behavioral indicators will evaluate the 36 activities, this will create some alignment and will build off of this in a P-20 format.

Jess House asked about framework document, and questions the competencies within the document.

Erika mentioned the importance of using tools, and complete outcomes assessment. She states the value in a behavioral guide through clinical supervision.

Ben Boer mentioned the 8 standards of practice.

Erika asked the committee members to look over the competencies and give feedback (by August 19, 2011). She asked for suggestions on what the scale should be in the rubric (CPS Principal Competencies Portfolio Rating Rubrics)

Melissa DeBartolo suggested looking at the same four levels.

Jess House mentioned using three levels, to differentiate between the people and skill level, suggesting a continuum.

Erika mentioned using the four levels of proficiency.

Pam Rosa suggested including the question of “What are some things we need to know to be a principal?” Working this into principal preparation programs.

Erika suggested setting up a follow-up webinar to get feedback on these questions.

Jess House mentioned how to make use of this, organizing around the ELLC, and program design.

Steve McGee talked about broadening characterization, analyzing leadership data, (numbers 2, 4, 7, and 10), specifically theme 8 in Illinois Aspiring Principal Framework.

He then discusses the Certificate in Teacher Leadership program at Northwestern University.

- Student learning (math and science)
- Sustain programs (with teacher leadership)
- Implementing school wide success with science and math initiatives.
- Less about the people and more about the relationships and social networks (distributed leadership)
- Dynamics of a situation to create change in the school.

Erika discussed the Teacher Leadership Endorsement Issue, mentioning to revisit the design with feedback and thoughts, and to look at international models (Singapore and Shanghai).

Ben Boer mentioned not using a single leadership but instead to use role definition, understanding the continuum.

Erika asked the committee about developing a white paper on teacher leadership.

Vicki Phillips mentioned using bullet points and keeping document simple.

Ben Boer mentioned using the Principal Preparation rules.

Vicki also mentioned using a framework of rules and then filling in the gaps.

Erika suggested asking legislators for models.

Steve McGee mentioned hearing from other universities.

Jess House suggested that the white paper should reflect the principal rules and themes and to build on those.

Ben Boer suggested acknowledging strengths and weaknesses and that teacher leadership rules should match appropriately.

Pam Rosa mentioned the commonalities and differences in core competencies.

Erika concluded the meeting by stating that in the future they plan to revisit the rubric, gain feedback, structure the teacher leadership and to set up a webinar.

Meeting ended at 2:00 pm