

ACEES Meeting #2
July 19, 2010
Notes

Old Business

MAS reviews:

- Meeting agenda
- ACEES role and operating norms as an advisory committee - ACEES will provide direction and feedback on working group products
- Confidentiality as professional respect - safe environment to speak honestly, but the work itself is anything but confidential
- Guiding principles, highlighting edits made since the last meeting based on group feedback
- Group signs off on above items

LF leads discussion about the performance level descriptors

- Group given time to read through descriptors and discuss in small groups what kinds of details should be included in future iterations
- Feedback from group
 - Quantifiable language is too general - e.g., almost all, most, significant progress - what do we mean by that? Must define this explicitly, for all student subgroups
 - Inconsistencies within definitions - meeting standards v making progress toward standards in the "effective" description. Need to add language (like "all") to clarify; reduce amount of interpretation
 - Quantification and clarification do not necessarily have to be included in this set of descriptions, as long as they're articulated in another document
 - Ensure descriptors are inclusive of all teachers, including those in non-core subject areas
 - Missing/inconsistent piece - at higher levels, teachers are independent learners, and lower levels, they need support. Lower level descriptions don't have any sense of self-initiative. Shouldn't district provide support for higher level teachers too? And, if lower level teachers aren't given support by district, does that mean they're off the hook?
 - "Significant" does not mean the same thing for every person, teacher or student. Must be clear about this. (ie., fair does not mean equal)
 - What happens if a teacher meets the description of some of the statements in one level but for one of the statements is in a different level?

Review of New Material/Working Groups

AA reviews phase-in plan

- Teachers and building admin still on original timeline for 2011-12 implementation
- Support professionals also on original timeline for 2012-13 implementation
- District admin will be pushed back one year to sync with the 2012-13 implementation timeline
- AA highlights the multi-year v single year phase in

- Group voices concern for training necessary to get the system up and running – MAS response: Commissioner committed to having all teachers evaluated in year one of implementation; also R2T allows for funding to hire individuals to help with evaluation and support the system in the first few years.

PJG updates group on the district developed systems working group

- Attendees, review of guidelines and standards, timeline for district models
- LEAs will declare intent by July 28
- LEAs conduct self-audits, will submit by Aug 11 for RIDE to provide feedback about any gaps that exist
- 51% will be a gap for all; RI Model will design this part and apply to district systems

AA reviews working group charges and how July 15 meeting day was structured

TPP Group Update (AA, with supplement by Marisa who was in the group)

- Most important: Classroom management and Knowledge of students as learners and individuals
- Other important competencies include: Content knowledge, instructional methods and strategies, collaboration with whole community, reflective professionals, respect for differences, student engagement
- Technology – debate whether or not this should be a standalone
- From RIPTS: Standard 6 and 10 particularly important
- Concerns: elementary v secondary, checklist of effective teaching strategies – could be an approach to use
- Next step: Figure out how to organize the competencies and how to rate (how many performance levels, will it be a checklist approach, etc)
- ACEES provides feedback

APP Group Update (AA with Keith supplementing)

- RIELS is a good foundation for the rubric, with adjustments/additions made where things were missing
- Admin evaluation should include input from others (ie teachers)
- Competencies discussed that may be priorities for admin evaluation: Management systems, school safety, goal setting and goal attainment, school progress and performance
- Discussion around what exactly an administrator does v what administrators should do; discussion moved into what process would be used but tried to stay focused on the “what” not the “how”
- Next step: Will react to draft framework to decide on the broad competencies assessed
- Concerns: From a universal standpoint – district rules and policies impact how some pieces of the rubric may not apply to all administrators
- ACEES provides feedback

PR Group Update (DS)

- Focused discussion on what’s important to measure, not how to measure

- Familiarized group with state standards and how to streamline and organize certain relevant standards
- Next steps: Draft component framework and begin revising based on it
- ACEES provides feedback

SD Group Update (LF with Lynn supplementing)

- Development process must be teacher-driven
- Development and evaluation must be connected; development dependent on evaluation outcomes
- Alignment of support program with effectiveness level
- Discussion around make up of team: Evaluator front-line person to begin working with teacher, then support teams that come into play as well- appropriate degree of support that should be provided as a baseline
- Concern: Administrator capacity to help with content-focused feedback - need individuals with content expertise to provide feedback and support
- ACEES provides feedback

EP Group Update (LF with Deb and Carolyn supplementing)

- Began discussion of who evaluates, how many times observations need to happen, who is ultimately responsible for how the evaluation process is carried out
- Discussed current practice in districts around RI
- Concerns: Content gaps, capacity issues with administrators, are there other people who could possibly be evaluators as well or help gather information
- ACEES provides feedback

SL Group Update (MAS)

- Context for thinking about student learning - educators are responsible for student learning
- Review of the SL framework - 3 categories of sources of evidence of student learning
- Opportunity to collectively map out what we're testing, why we're testing it, and where we're getting student data; also how to get a better handle on how students are learning and growing
- Have to map out categories of teachers and what combinations of student learning evidence can be used for each category of teachers
- ACEES provides feedback