

ACEES Meeting #3
August 16, 2010; 1-4 PM
Meeting Notes

Updates and Old Business

- MAS introduces agenda and reiterates ACEES role to provide feedback on the synthesis of all the pieces of the evaluation system (look at evaluation system as a whole) vs. working groups who are diving deeply into their specific topic area
- Implementation
 - o Starting in January, professional development on evaluation system will begin – evaluator training so that system is implemented with fidelity
 - o Commitment to making sure the system is designed and implemented “right”; do not want to be capricious or reckless
 - o Full system implementation in SY 2011-12 but without state-level consequences for the first year of implementation
 - o District policies are still intact – district discretion to use SY 2011-12 evaluation results. For state policy – SY 2012-13 will be year one of using evaluation results.
- MAS requests suggestions for getting word out about RI Model work/updates. Group suggests:
 - o RIDE website on district websites through superintendents’ retreat
 - o Principals’ listserv
- AFT Innovation Grant – RI Model collaboration discussion
 - o \$5M over 4 years, frontloading in years 1-3, plus \$1M match raised
 - o Will AFT and RIDE do work as separate entities, or combine work?
 - o MAS and Colleen met last week to discuss this, will take further deliberate actions to take to determine how close the groups are
 - o MAS invites ACEES members to join in the conversation on Aug 26
- AFT work update:
 - o Originally wanted to do a district approved plan and get RIDE’s approval and have a separate evaluation system
 - o Working off of Charlotte Danielson framework
 - o Met with superintendents- heard feedback that they did not want throw out work that has already been done
 - o Need to think carefully about whether or not there are different ways that districts can operate in terms of process (e.g., evidence collection)

Review of Current Progress by Working Groups

- MAS reviews primary components of teacher evaluation system – student learning outcomes, professional practice, and professional responsibilities
- Quick working group updates- all six groups
 - o General progress and content status for each group, plus next steps/ plan for upcoming meeting
 - o (Notes follow the bullets in the deck)

- Update on the district developed group
 - o 4 districts will participate in this process by submitting self-audit materials (Barrington, Westerly, Coventry, Chariho)
 - o Have until December to submit final materials
 - o Feedback from RIDE on Friday so that districts can create action plans based on assessing where they are, compared to where RIDE thinks they are, to prepare their applications
- Local level data systems needed to be able to track of each component of the evaluation system
- Student learning questions:
 - o Growth model for NECAP (Category 1) only – other two categories (other standardized and local assessments) are for goal attainment process
 - o Growth model will cover up to 7th grade; 8th grade will not have a growth number under NECAP; PARCC will allow growth model calculations between grades 3-11.

Feedback Focus: Current Draft of the Evaluation Process

LF walks group through the key elements of the proposed evaluation process (three formal conferences, conference inputs, required observations, frequency, use of student data, primary and complementary evaluators)

ISP line item in R2T – use as support for implementation and also to help build capacity for sustainability

Questions:

- Where does the support discussion come into play? LF: Formal check in conference, also things should be flagged along the way, consistent feedback in between formal conferences
- Is primary evaluator solely responsible for gathering evidence? LF: In theory, group comfortable with using other individuals in the evidence gathering process, but at the end of the day, principal needs to be ultimately accountable.
- Complementary evaluators could be content specialists or highly trained individuals; provides additional pieces of information
- Are complementary evaluators out of district? LF: Group landed on at least out of school. They may be comfortable with out of district. – Group discussion about making sure complementary evaluators understand the school dynamic and context.
- Concern: Use of observations as a way to list off incompetent in certain areas?

Group feedback for the process proposal:

- In small districts, central office personnel who are already in the buildings might be considered as primary evaluators
- Idea of complementary evaluation team: Principal with individuals with content expertise, and team is consistent throughout the year for the teacher. Individual teachers know who their evaluator team is.
- Need to be mindful about potential consequences of evaluation results

- For a complementary evaluation team – not just one individual, play with the configuration, types of individuals, etc. Same criterion based training for all individuals. So that administrator has experts at the table. Primary still owns the formal aspects, but the team helps with all the evidence gathering.
- Think more broadly about who else to consider who can be evaluators
- Put to rest the idea that there is a SWAT team of evaluators coming in to conduct evaluations
- Idea of having a parent on the evaluation team? Think about what's the right role for parents in the evaluation system.
- Complementary should be trained by highly skilled administrators, not an outside group to do the training
- Suggestion for having all complementary evaluator observations be announced
- Need context before going into observations
- Counterpoint: Knowing all the context makes it harder to be unbiased or objective – admin preference to have someone come in who doesn't know the people and give an objective assessment
- Most important: complementary evaluators have to be an objective, highly trained individual whose specific role it is to conduct observations and provide feedback
- Use language that talks about minimums – informal visits have to be minimum of 10 minutes, for example.
- Formal observation more toward later in the year, use mid-year check to plan out what the principal will look for in the formal observation and what the teacher should think about focusing on. – Further protocols around the observations
- Consider the March 1 date for untenured teachers

Feedback Focus: Administrator Professional Practice

AA walks group through APP framework and design approach (built directly off of RIELS)

Group feedback:

- Elevate importance of the kind of support admin gives to faculty and staff
- Language in the current draft should be more explicit around giving support
- Relationship and support aspect isn't captured well enough – admin as leader, not as authoritarian
- Evidence statements are too vague – doesn't provide clarity on how it reflects performance
- Types of evidence should reflect performance – eg. How principal engages with data team – Not what were the goals, what were survey results, these are static metrics.
- Broader domains – building mgmt, instructional leadership, etc- too wordy to describe broad buckets