

## **EES 2022 Council Meeting Transcript – April 27, 2021**

The amount of work that goes into this, and that being charged with looking at the educator and administrator evaluation system, is a big deal.

I know, because I was on the receiving end, the last time it was revised, and I know the amount of work that goes into this.

So I simply want to jump on for a second to simply say thank you, and thank you for being a part of this work and agreeing to step up and, and work arm in arm with us at the agency is as we get this done. So, thank you, and Shawan, I'll turn it back to you. Thank you, doctor Tucker.

Thank you so much, Desi, for joining us and for your words of wisdom.

And now I'm going to turn everything over to Chris Taht Bureau Chief who will get us started with Phase one of the recommendations and from there.

We also have our facilitator, Paul Fleming who is present on the call. So I'll turn it over to Chris.

Good afternoon everyone. Thank you, doctor Tucker. Thank you, Desi. So, it's a pleasure to see everybody, again, this afternoon. I want to just take a quick moment to kind of walk through what our agenda is today and our two primary objectives for the meeting. So, really, the goal today is to focus on Phase one, which is to produce recommendations for the State Board of Education, regarding flexibilities for the upcoming 2021, 2022 school year.

Part of that process today, we will look at the feedback from the different organizations that were submitted, will have a kind of a conversation around what we are identifying as short term and long term parking lots. So those topics of concern that came up from the feedback that will look to address and either fight Phase two or Phase three of this work.

And then doctor Paul funding will walk us through kind of a consensus process and we'll spend some time looking at draft recommendations for the flexibilities. So today's objectives are really to review that, that bridge to practice, that everybody did. We want to thank everybody. We recognize it's a really truncated schedule for Phase one. And we know that you worked really hard to get input from your various stakeholder groups, and to kind of help inform this process and the decision. And then really, the goal is to find and build consensus around recommendations for the department to present to the state board. So, to kinda kick off today, just a few reminders regarding norms, and a couple of housekeeping things. So, we are recording the message.

So as you guys saw from the website that was shared, we posted everything within a couple days of our last meeting. So the recording, is there, a chat, transcript? Is there, all documentation?

Everything going along with that? We will continue that process moving forward. We ask that when you can. Please remember to mute yourself and be aware of background noise. And then we want to acknowledge and remind everybody that the chat box is going to be a continual feature feature for us to capture input, to capture wonderings, thoughts, and kind of commentary as we move through the process.

You aren't advanced Paul.

Additionally, you know, we want to acknowledge that everybody's input is important. Please be aware of airtime, and encourage all voices to be heard. We felt we had a really rich conversation at our first meeting, and we're looking forward to expanding that today. And again, as we go through today, if there's additional comments or questions you'd like to pose, and you don't feel that you have the opportunity to do so, please be, feel free to put them in the chat box. You know, ultimately, I think we wanted to start with our vision again. And just remind everybody that really the goal of this work is to, to have educators across the state feel as though the evaluation system is one that supports continuous feedback and growth, and that we're all working collectively to achieve that goal.

So, as doctor Tucker highlighted, really, today's work is going to be focused on the flexibilities for the 2021 school year. We had proposed the Bridge to practice process at the end of last meeting, asking you to really get feedback on a number. It's really three key areas regarding the flexibilities that have been implemented this year, particularly we're looking for specific feedback on formal and informal observation protocols and the use of multiple indicators for student and academic growth.

As I, as I'm sure you'll see from the feedback that we shared with you and from what we discussed today, we got a wide variety of feedback, both on kind of looking at the current flexibilities that were in place, and where we think that they were strong, where we need to make some adjustments, and and some considerations for moving forward, In addition to a number of organizations, took it as an opportunity to provide even more in-depth feedback on the educator evaluation system as a whole.

And so, really, what we tried to do, and, again, kind of a short turnaround, was we tried to capture all the feedback that the organizations provided.

We tried to build connections across the various organizations and across the feedback. And really, the goal of today is as we walk through everything, please know that each step of what we're providing was informed by what we saw were, you know, ongoing trends, themes, and kind of pertinent pieces of feedback from various organizations.

All organizational feedback is captured shared with you both through documentation. It's also going to be uploaded to the website. So as we're continuing this process of feedback, both

through this group and from other external stakeholder forums, will be using the website to kind of document everything.

If you want to move to the next slide, Paul.

So, as we discuss today's flexibilities, we do want to acknowledge that there are going to be some areas of concerns and topics that came up through the feedback that we feel may not be as pertinent to today's conversation.

But we wanted all the groups, and all of you to recognize that we did hear you.

We saw that as a concern, or an area, that we need to spend some significant timeout. We're just going to propose that we, we shift some of those topics to either our Phase two work. And looking at kind of the coming months, and what we would like to make in terms of long term changes, to the guidelines for the 2020 to 20, 23 school year and moving forward. And then, potentially some long-term shifts that would require some legislative proposals. So if we want to take a few moments, and just kinda both based on the feedback that we saw, we saw, you know, that re-assessing the four performance ratings was something that was consistently brought up across a number of the various stakeholder groups. And the feedback.

We see this as both a short-term and a long-term goal of our work, short-term being that we can make some changes, and we can make some proposed recommendations within the existing legislative statute and language.

But that ultimately in order to make some even more impactful, long term changes, we will have to propose some legislative language changes during Phase three on other topics that really jumped up, or restructuring, evaluation, component weightings. So that was something that we felt lives really strongly in.

Phase two: it's within the allow ability of this group to make recommendations for the weightings on informal versus formal observation protocols was a consistent concern across all the organizations as well as redefining multiple measures of academic growth and development which again, we believe similar to re-assessing the four performance ratings. We can make some recommendations and changes within the existing law but ultimately could ultimately end up proposing new legislative language.

And then finally, one of the other topics that came to the forefront was updated guidelines on professional learning and then some specific thoughts around the role and composition of PDE committees across the district.

Now we want to acknowledge that this isn't all encompassing.

So if there's, you know, if anybody sees an area of concern, or a topic that is missing, from either the short-term, parking lots, or the long term, parking lots, and as we go through the conversations today, please raise that concern.

Feel free to put it in the chat, or to raise it verbally, and we'll kind of keep building to those parking lots, and adding additional topics as we move forward, because we really see that these become the primary focus of conversation for forthcoming meetings as we move through this work.

And, again, as as kind of, I had previously said, really the two big areas that we saw that across multiple organizations that jumped out, that would require some legislative language changes were the four performance ratings and then redefining multiple measures about academic growth and development.

Yeah, additionally, the feedback also highlighted several areas where we feel it's important to provide some points of clarification.

And we say this, that we recognize that in the absence of direct guidance from the department, or a mandate for a particular requirement, or a particular process, we recognize that it also creates, oftentimes, some confusion in the field. So some of the points of clarification that we saw, and these were some misconceptions that had kind of come back through the various feedback loops.

But then, as Sharon and Kimberly ..., are, also points, clarification that have come out in the past from other districts. You know, one of the things I think people generally were supportive of the flexibility is there was a lot of discussion around the requirement of one SLO. And we wanted to remind everybody that the requirement of one SLO and multiple indicators has always been allowable under the existing guidelines on, you know, and that using a standardized assessment when available, inappropriate was always the kind of the terminology that the department has pushed out. Additionally, we've we've pushed out previous communications from the talent office, which really emphasize the ability to allow for one formal observation and one review of practice for tenured staff on an annual basis. So some of the feedback that we got from organizations was looking at how to differentiate the evaluation system for both tenured and non tenured educators. And we just wanted to, again, clarify that, there is the ability to do that within kind of the existing framework.

Um, there were some questions about whether or not the summative rating was required on an annual basis and we wanted to just point out that this was an area that we had addressed with our legal team And that well, all the statutes, there's multiple competing statutes in terms of what the superintendent's have to report on. And then there's also the statutes within educator evaluation. But an annual summative rating is required pursuant to the statute. So, again, I think it's an area of conversation for us to have in future meetings in terms of whether or not the interpretation of that statute is accurate and whether or not there's some flexibility to make a determination of,

What does that mean to have a summative rating? Is that the summative rating that's informed directly by the summative rating of the educator evaluation system? Or is it a summative rating?

That is compounded by a variety of other indicators or measures.

Um, wanted as kind of the ongoing theme that we saw across a lot of the organizations was that the systems are burdensome.

And so we just wanted to again, emphasize that the systems and the forms, and oftentimes some of the burdensome protocols are in a lot of ways locally generated, and they're not necessarily required by the guidelines or by the department.

But, again, we also recognize that when we're not specifically putting out a particular practice, it opens the door for that interpretation to take place.

And then, one of the concerns that did come up was the length of observations. And so, I think one of the conversations we'll be having today is either defining informal or formal observations.

And so, we wanted to kind of just highlight, that currently the guidelines do not have a formal time requirement for formal or informal evaluations. So that is something that, we, need, we need to address and, and thank you for the comment in the chat box. Yes, Kate, we completely.

So, at this point, I'm going to turn it over to our colleague, doctor Paul Fleming. And again, I think our goal today is to really open the floor to have much more meaningful dialog and conversations than we're able to have during the first meeting. So doctor Fleming.

Yeah, thank you Chris. And it's great to be with all of you again. And like doctor Tucker said and Chris, we really want to thank you collectively for the short turned Around and talking to your colleagues. Getting stakeholder feedback. Thinking about this bridge to practice around these collection of flexibilities, as we know how incredibly important this is. So, again, just really excited to be with all of you, and wanted to have about a 10 minute discussion based on those organizational feedback that you collected for the Bridge to Practice. And, again, I really appreciate the opportunity and your willingness to engage around this critical topic, and to see, you know, broadly, and I'll put this back up. I, I lost all of you for a moment of my monitor, so that was strange, but the idea of, you know, thinking on a couple of levels, Right. Thinking about the feedback you receive from your colleagues and from your stakeholders, in, from newer constituents in the folks that you interact with every day.

Where did you see more broad agreement around the flexibilities and their value? And should be continued for next year.

Then where did you see, you know, patterns if you've had a chance to look at the chart around the organizational flexibilities. There are lesser value and perhaps you know, stopping for next year based on the questions they were engaging with. And then second, what new ideas or questions were sparked from the feedback about the revised and or new flexibilities that you were thinking?

So, you know, we'd love to hear from ideally as many organizations as possible about what those conversations were like and what you heard in what you presented back to the department and also if you've had a chance to see how that compares to what others are sharing, as well.

So, just wanted to have an open-ended discussion for about the next 10 minutes or so, before, then, going back and doing a review of the flexibilities that are being proposed and thought about, based on your your thoughts and ideas and recommendations as well.

So with that, would open the floor and I'd love to hear from all of you in terms of what you heard.

What was the value?

What was maybe an emphatic no, right, and she should stop as well?

Yeah, Kate, if you want to start, Thank you for raising your hand on that. We appreciate that.

Thank you. I didn't call that immediately, but thank you.

So, I'm not entirely sure how the flexibilities have changed from what was offered this past summer.

It looks essentially to be the same as this past summer. So I'm hoping there could be additional clarification.

Because then I'm not really seeing how the flexibilities have adapt and adapted, based on our feedback.

And I asked owl.

I just want to stress that, when I was reading through other organizations' feedback, and we've worked really closely with many of you for months now, it seems like there's a startling consensus around a lot of big things.

And while I do understand that we are constrained, our hands are tied by it's late in the session, and we can't.

We can't change statutes.

I urge this entire Committee, which is filled with creative, bright minds, and, organizations committed to educators and students, that we can find a better way to make life substantially better for our administrators, for educators, and for kids next year.

And, I really strongly believe the current set of flexibilities do not do that.

While incorporating SEL is essential, giving teachers a rating based on how successfully they did that based on utterly unknown challenges.

That they have not been adequately performed to meet, Serves no one well, and I'm really distressed, I put together a lot of research that I was hoping to share with all of you.

I know that this stagnant grow academically of students, pre pandemic and skyrocketing anxiety and school disengagement, pre pandemic, which just happened to correspond with the past 10 years, the past decade, emphasizing standardized testing tied to teacher evaluation.

And I'm, I'm concerned that that tie I respect standardized test data.

I think it's useful, it's extraordinarily useful when you tie it to a teacher's performance, that takes a tiny piece of a puzzle and exaggerates its importance.

And that becomes the whole thing to the detriment of the quality of students' educational experiences.

And I think we're seeing a kindergarten to college, L prepared academically, and, even worse, prepared emotionally.

And I think we I think we are forfeiting our responsibility. If we don't do the best that we possibly can, tend to address that next year.

Thank you so much. Yeah. Thank you for starting us off, Kate, And maybe just, could you speak just briefly a little more about one?

Perhaps one idea, or thing that you perhaps didn't see right in the current flexibility that you would like to have added for next year, as well as one example, would be helpful. I just didn't see anything different, and I met.

You know, there is a lot of documents to read through, which is awesome. But I could have missed it, but it just looks like the same set of flexibilities. And I'm not.

I don't see how these flexibilities will ease the burdens on administrators is the burden on teachers.

And I don't see how it's meaningfully going to address completely new situation. Next year that we have never before.

In all of humanity faced, I don't see how the flexibilities are, aren't going to help with that. It seems like SEL is just added in. And that's the only thing that's really changed.

Yeah, well, OK.

Well, thank you for starting, and I know Sharon and Kimberly will be sharing in a moment, just a highlight of those proposed flexibility, so hopefully, that will provide more clarification to, sure, thank you, as well.

Yeah, it's so other other folks in other organizations thinking about what is providing value, and what did you hear that was also, wow, different or problematic. Yeah, Mary, thank you.

Thanks. I agree, I feel like this year, we added SEL goals in some districts, supposedly, with mutual agreement, and many districts did that.

And the tradeoff was that we weren't going to have an assessment.

Next year, it looks like we will have SEL goals, plus academic goals, and the Summative rating. And so, we've taken something in the name of making it less burdensome and more streamlined. And we've actually increased the number of requirements.

We're fairly troubled by the possibility of standardized indicators for use in SEL overall. What we'd, what we'd like to do is to make some adjustments about that summative rating.

I think if we have to have a summative rating, we shouldn't, because it's a very unstable situation. We don't know how to predict student outcomes when we hit the schools next year. And the



name of the game in teacher evaluation is making a prediction based on what we know about the students, about what the growth will be for the next year.

And I, I would propose that we aren't going to be able to that next year, so I think we really have some important things to work on there.

Thank you.

Thank you. Appreciate that, and Fran, thank you for raising your hand as well.

Yes, trying to unmute.

It looks like you're still OK, got it. Got it. OK, so, I just want to follow up and I want to say that these past years in teacher evaluation have been incredibly painful. For me, I have had many, many years in education. I know what, I think, I know what good teacher evaluation looks.

Like, I do believe that I would like someone to show me what the inclusion of, um, quantitative SLOS, what is the value added on that? But what has happened as a result of doing that, that has made the profession move forward and most importantly, our children move forward. So I think we really need to re-examine that. My members, my superintendents, are very clear on that they, they really want to re look at all of it.

And I think, I understand that some of this is legislation, but I also understand that time is limited. There's an urgency here, and I think that if we keep doing the same old thing, we're going to keep on getting the same old results, and I think that we have the opportunity right now to embark on something brand new. I don't know what that means, and I don't mean to drop it on Chris Todor ..., but I do believe that we need to be looking at we need to be looking bigger and bolder at what, um, What needs to change and we need If we can't change next year, we need to be very, very clear that. we're just We are we feel a sense of urgency and wanted changed immediately. I want much more emphasis on the CCT.

I want more emphasis on practice and how we go about be a partnership between the supervisor and the teacher so that we're both learning it's a partnership and and I'll stop there.

I know of course agree with SEL and all of that but I want you to know that last Friday I had the opportunity to spend an hour and a Zoom call with Linda Darling Hammond. And I was so incredibly inspired by her words. I specifically asked her about teacher about, and she came across a quantitative data, needs to go. You know, I mean, obviously, I made standardized on quantitative data. But I believe in portfolios, I believe, in showing progress of every child in your classroom. There are ways to do that. And I was just wondering if we could commit to perhaps, as a committee, when we're making these kinds of very, very important decisions? Maybe commit to reading her book together, getting teacher evaluation, right?

And, you know, having some common background around what we believe teacher evaluation needs to look like. I mean, I'm gonna read it anyway. But I'm just sending it out there and saying, you know, I, I feel like I learned, I need to learn more about what is working well in, practice out there before I jump in and, and make some profound decisions, guys, I really feel great responsibility here, so that's my 2% today.

Yeah, thank you, Fran, very much and appreciate, especially on the all those pieces in the book recommendation as well as the feedback on the SLOS.

And I know there was some feedback from some organizations about appreciation for teachers, having autonomy and the selection of those, but also used to rethink some very important concerns as well. Anthony, thank you.

Anthony, Tony, De Triomphe with casa.

Um, we did a little bit of a survey, actually a few weeks ago before we started the committee, and kind of fairly good response, and we I did not ask any of my members about the present organization and the present flexibilities.

So, that really wasn't something I captured. it was able capture in terms of how, how much they were worried.

I know myself, I spent 17 years using it, you know, or using well, as long as it's been here, I was We were part of the pilot district when we started this.

I don't think we liked it then. I don't think many of us like it now.

And everything, people I've been saying, it's wrong with it, and we we're so eager and so happy to find out that this committee was going to start.

And we'd have a chance to make it right again.

And I agree with Fran, that we need to take this very seriously. We need to study. We need to learn about what we're going to do because it chance won't come around again for probably another 10 years.

So, so, we need to do it right. We need to fix what we saw was wrong.

You know, if you remember, back when the plan was developed, it was largely developed in response to the federal government and having to qualify to get their funds, and we were required basically to have standardized measures and SLOS.

Those don't work.

The only way they work is if you get a principal or someone who is willing to de-emphasized that. and to realize that those more get in the way than they do help.

And take advantage of the meetings.

You do have with teachers and the, the feedback you get when you have those discussions with them and the information you gather.

We've got to stop reading teachers based on data. I'm a mathematician. I'm a math teacher by trade.

But I can tell you it. It's a very tricky slope.

And I, I would dare anybody to show me that they can make a direct connection between collecting data on S back and whether a teacher is effective or not that they could make a case that that actually works.

So, we've been dealing with a flawed system for a long time.

I appreciate the the feelings, and some of you are expressing about change you get for next year.

I rather focus on what we can do for the long term.

I think we can get by next year with the flexibilities.

We have the reality is this evaluation system hasn't changed ratings for teachers at all. I mean, instead of 90% of teachers are proficient or better.

So, I don't think it's an immediate problem.

I'm more worried, and I think my group is more worried about what it's going to look like in the future.

And that's where I want to put our effort in time.

Yeah. Thank you, Tony, and I think that echoes what the department's thinking right? with this this phases, right? For, as you noted, this phase about what has to be repaired and recommended for the State Board soon for next year with flexibilities, but then also, as you're noting, the longer term opportunities to re-imagine educator evaluation. And I think that's by design, with the department is, is thinking right, and how that can play out.

So, thank you for highlighting that, that need, I'm also thinking both, yeah, I think this Committee, the Council thinking both short-term and the long-term, to do that, and see if we have one more. Yeah, one more person. Thank you, Elizabeth, if you'd like to, and then we're gonna go to this next page to kind of review for this conversation.

I like the idea of looking long-term, and, to be honest, you know, I am an elected official, I am responsible to the public and my constituents.

So there's kind of like this inside, outside kind of thing.

And as a board member, quite frankly, we're not privy to all these evaluations and guidelines and technicalities you're talking about.

But what I am privy to is the results of of student achievement.

And I really liked what the CEA heard the last sentence of the first Paragraph says it is time to create a process that is not punitive, but rooted in trust and collegiality, committed to growth, driven by constructive feedback and focused on the needs of the whole child.

I think that is a beautiful vision, and I have to tell you also that part of this conversation, longer term.

I've been part of collective bargaining since my tenure over the past 10 years.

and collective bargaining process right now is not mission driven.

So I don't know whether that's because, you know, it's, it is collective bargaining.

And where, where do we start the conversation that we all agree as people working in a school district, whether you're a teacher or administrator or board of Ed member?

Whatever, that we're all on the same wavelength with the mission of student achievement and student growth and all those good things.

I think, I just think the platform that we're springing off of teacher evaluation, it's based on a very adversarial role.

And it doesn't work in education, as you said, to create a process that is not punitive.

So, to me, that means that CEA thinks the current process is punitive.

So, I just, I think, before, you know, we can we can talk, and I know collegiality and coaching.

But, to me, if we don't have a commitment to the organizational mission, and that's not reflected in, in teacher hiring, or in teacher contracts, I don't know how we move from punitive, perceived, or are true, to, to our collective mission.

So, I just say that as someone who's not in the weeds, if you will, of evaluations.

But I am committed to student achievement.

And I am committed to the teaching profession.

And I wish we could, could work collaboratively.

But it seems like it's set up to be adversarial.

So that's my 2% right now. And as we move forward, how do we break down those?

Those can strictures that we face right now?

That really moves us to this mission that we're all talking about, with the sense of urgency and all the rest of it.

So, I think my experience is very humbly that we're not set up to be mission driven.

Thank you, Elizabeth, for sharing that.

And I think that's wanna give an opportunity for any department staff to share anything based on what you're hearing. And then we're gonna move at this point after that to this next piece about the review of their kind of proposed what's on the slate of flexibilities right now.

Hey, thanks. Thanks, Paul. Yeah. I do want to just take a moment and acknowledge everybody's comments, you know? Like Mary Kay Friend.

Elizabeth, Tony, I think I want everybody on this call to know that the talent office here, you and the department supports this idea of really re-imagining educator evaluation as a package and moving it in the direction that we all want it to go in.

I think, well, and, you know, Tony kind of raised this point, and that where we're trying to do it in a manner recognizing that we can't address everything that we want to fix for next school year.

And so, we're trying to put together a proposal that that works for next school year, does provide some additional flexibilities, versus what's currently written in the law, and then gives us that opportunity through the Spring summer, and next fall, to really have more in-depth conversations around what do we want it to look like. So kind of that phase one phase, phase, two approach, but please don't think that, that is an acknowledgement of us not wanting to do that work. We, we very much are looking forward to this process, and we think that the people, and the individuals and all of you on this call, we have the right team to have those conversations. Because we also recognize that that requires a much larger input process than even what we have represented on this call. Right.

And more time than what we've allowed it, when we really think about, we've asked you, in two weeks, to provide us feedback, and then, you know, 48 hours of that feedback. We're giving you a draft document and then take a look as a result. So please know that we are with you 100% on that conversation to Kate's initial point. And I think that this is where sharing, and Kimberly can kinda help clarify.

When we got the feedback, we did see that overwhelmingly from organizations there's appeared to be a general acknowledgement that the flexibilities were better than what had currently been in place, and that generally, that the flexibilities, if we had to utilize them for the next year, seemed seemed to be OK.

So it was a better solution than what currently existed, then what we do. So we use that flexibility So Kate's point and Mary's point.

The language does look kind of similar, and if he didn't really dig into it, there might be, you might have just looked at it at the surface, and said, You know what? It looks exactly like what we had this year. What we then tried to do was we tried to build an additional feedback from each organization regarding the components of the flexibilities.

So, hopefully, I think what we're going to do right now is Sharon is going to walk through some of those specific pieces to try to pull out some of that additional thought process that went into the proposed flexibilities. But then that's really what the point of today's call is. And so, what did, like, what's missing? What do we need to go back and revisit, you know, and then, like, where do we need to kind of go from there.

We also want to, just, as we enter this conversation, keep in mind that if there are certain components within the recommendations that we, there's just going to need to be additional guidance or support around.

We have let's identify that today, and then we can use the upcoming meetings to really clarify what that means.

But we don't want to let a lack of guidance, necessarily prevent us from moving, you know, our potential flexibility forward. So, just as we're having those conversations, let's keep in mind what we need in terms of what's what's the recommendation versus where are we going to need to backfill with some additional guidance and support.

So, Sharon, at this point, I'm going to turn it over to you to walk through some of some of where we've tried to add to the existing flexibilities.

Thanks, Chris. And good afternoon, everybody. I'm guess, so, I just want to give a kind of an overview and highlight what we did change in the flexibilities.

But, as Chris mentioned, that the purpose was to get feedback from stakeholders in your organizations about, you know, what would be OK to move forward with base, starting with the current flexibilities, and what maybe could it changed allowable within the statute.

So the first component that I just want to touch base about is the student learning indicators. This component is basically the same as in the current flexibilities. We kept the options that educators have to focus on for their goals.

There is no standardized testing requirement in those options.

And we kept measures of accomplishment in order to determine the rating for the teachers and the administrators in the student learning indicator. So, measures of accomplishment as in the current flexibilities would be determined at the goal, setting khat conference through mutual agreement.

There is a new statement that we added, that student learning indicators should prioritize the students with the most significant needs that's been a topic of discussion through many forms, and, in many ways. So, we're just encouraging both teachers and administrators to consider the students who have the most significant needs when they're developing their student learning indicators.

Next slide, please.

Thank you.

So, the observation process is also very similar to the current flexibilities.

However, the draft includes just a minimum number of observations required in the current flexibilities.

We had a range of what that minimum would be, so we took out the range and just put, um, the minimum number.

But, we did add a statement encouraging evaluators to provide additional opportunities to check in with staff onboard, being evaluated regarding social and emotional well-being and support.

This could be addition of observations, if if the, if needed, or it could be another method, just to check in with staff, But we we felt very strongly that, um, you know, throughout the feedback that, um, it was important for evaluators to check in with their teachers and administrators. But it didn't necessarily have to be in an observation format that would require the written feedback. So we were hoping to lessen some of the burden in that area.

We did include a proposed definition of formal and informal observations, that was the request that several of the organizations had. So, it's just a proposed definition.

Definitely welcome some feedback on that.

Next slide, please.

Thank you.

Sharon, if we could just go back one. I think there's just one piece that we do want to highlight on, there was a number of feedback regarding non classroom based educators and, and kind of the use of the SES Rubric. So, one of the one of the proposed flexibilities that we did include was that those educators that were serving in a non classroom based role, and that are being



evaluated by the CSS Rubric could substitute reviews of practice in lieu of the informal observation protocols. So, recognizing that, you know, the, the actual classroom based observation might not be the best approach to capture that on. So couldn't, could we then supplement reviews of practice and instead, and take kind of more of a portfolio based approach to that piece. So, Sharon, I apologize for jumping in there now. Thank you for that clarification, Chris.

So, for the next component, each, both teachers and administrators have a component that's worth 5% in their overall evaluation.

For teachers, it's either whole school student learning indicators or student feedback, And for administrators, it's teacher effectiveness.

So, um, with with the consensus of district P decks, we thought that districts could have the option to either continue to implement these components within their current evaluation and support plan.

Or, they could choose a special area of focus to improve their professional practice, or to support a school wide area of focus.

This addresses feedback from your organizations about the need for overall change in the evaluation and support system.

And, while we can't change everything for next year's flexibilities, we thought that it would be an opportunity for districts to maybe focus on an area that they feel would benefit the district, the educators in the district this year, more so, than the current 5% component.

By keeping the 5% component, the 5% part, we don't anticipate this would require districts to change any of their data management systems, but it was just an area where we thought we could provide a little flexibility from the current flexibilities.

Then, didn't lack the last yes. So the four level matrix rating system. Can I ask a question? I'm sorry.

I guess I'm a little confused.

Between the 45% measures, There was language in that, above about.

So, measures have accomplishment? Yeah. So, measures?

what's the difference between measures of accomplishment, and then that 5%, that's learning that could be implemented whole school?

It's an area of focus, a whole school area of focus.

Isn't it a so, I'm sorry to be, ah, dumb, but I guess I'm wondering is: Measure of accomplishment is that? And, at teacher input, I'm trying to keep it simple for myself.

Is that currently in the flexibilities right? eight: Measures of accomplishment.

So, um, now, other than the requirement to focus on percentages and goals in, we, did we end to give a rating on some new learning in terms of implementing SEL strategies are focusing on SEO. We gave the flexibility that the evaluator and the educator could determine measures of accomplishment. So, that's what currently exists.

And, you're talking about for the student, and not a measure of accomplishment of what the teacher did.

No, it's a measure of accomplishment in terms of whether or not the teacher achieved their student learning goal.

OK, thank you. Sorry.

I'm just wrestling still with us.

Does that answer that OK, Yeah, I mean, I guess that my bias is, I, I, like this idea of measuring teacher input, you know, and so, I now, I, the inputs of teachers versus the outputs of teacher, so I wanted it to sound different. That's just my own bias coming in.

Well, let me just go through one more part, the four level matrix system K, and then we'll break into the two breakout groups, and that might be a great discussion to have in your group, and then we can summarize feedback from both groups when we come back together.

OK, thank you for bringing that up.

So, the last component that will be different will be the four level matrix system, and again, I want to echo what Chris said. We, we heard feedback from most of your organizations that this does need to change for the future.

So we want you to know that we, we hear you and that is certainly one of the topics that will be discussed and pays you. For the current flexibilities we are bound by this statute.

So these will return for the 202122 school year.

The flexibility here is an option for districts to use a holistic review of evidence that would be collected for each component to determine the summative rating.

And that would be in place of some of the numeric, kind of systems that have been in place prior to the pandemic, but the flexibility is the option of a holistic review of evidence. The rest of the process described here is just bringing back what is in our current guidelines.

Just to clarify a process for determining the summative rating.

Cause I think we're, we're all set here.

Right, Well, thank you, Sharon. And we knew, again, is key, you mentioned. And I think there's there's a lot of questions, and it's good for determining. And thinking about getting clarification right. It's going forward.

Also want to say just to referenced some of the earlier comments.

and just know that from what I've seen, especially from states that are going through a similar process, this is all really important for your feedback. And also really normal to be thinking about, both short term and long term, and making time to get it. Right.

Is, I think somebody shared about the perception of it, not being punitive, but around continuous growth and learning, as Chris, You know, also echoed in, in, in re-emphasize, as well. And I think that's really important.

And I knew New Jersey, I know Delaware have been two states that come to mind that have done this recently, and it takes, is all of you are noting, just takes a lot of, of thought and feedback. So again, want to thank you. I think this next piece is we do want to put folks into two breakout groups.

And I wanted to just briefly introduce my colleague, Nikki, for Learning Forward, who's much more resident expert on everything zoom and will be handling that. With the idea that, as you see, we know that consensus is not reached overnight, but we also remain dedicated to that for the council, that we hope that going forward, these guiding principles will be really key focus, right?

So one that you feel your voice has been heard and been listened to.

Because we know this is key for transitioning, as we said, in an educator evaluation system, core is the desired vision and goals.

Secondly, you understand their proposal around the flexibilities that will be recommended and taken to the Board in May, and then, and also long term, beyond this meeting. And then third, it's clear to you that the will of the group has emerged around this proposal.

And we know that, again, these things don't often occur overnight, but we wanted to be visible about consensus principles and the protocol that's there. So, what this is, what this means is, we, can, we're gonna spend about 20 minutes into breakout groups, and you will have folks from the Talent team and myself in those two groups, to had to continue this conversation, right?

Thinking broadly about these questions about, you know, where do you believe the things that have to be in there for next year, since we're focused on that in Phase one.

What are some of the flexibilities that may be nice to have, but not essential for next year, and also thinking about what could be clarifying guidance, both for next year and long term, and certainly against or anything missing that, needs to be included as essential, alright.

We're also going to ask of each group willing to take a volunteer to be the reporter.

So when we come back after 20 minutes, to share out those flexibilities and the rationale for what you decided on and thought about as well. So, Nikki, are we ready at this point to put everybody in those groups for the next 20 minutes?

Yes, they are. Great with that and we will then be back. The whole group in 20 minutes and reminder is to select a reporter. So we'll be ready to go.

Right. Thanks, Nikki.

Senior.

Not, we're the only ones back.

It always happens, right?

OK?

Yeah.

Well, thank you. and we do acknowledge that there's never enough time on this.

So we know that in the breakout groups, that the challenge of how to get this, but yesterday, whoa!

Only has graciously agreed to share out a little bit of what group breakout group one discussed, and so we're going to join him in a moment.

I know that there was a key piece that was reiterated thinking that sometimes the topic of a flexibility, like SEL, is not necessarily the problem, but the corresponding training and definition and guidance around the flexibility is where there's opportunities to continue to deepen it for on a greater understanding, Your support for educators. So, with that, we get back to you, is to share a little bit whilst was discussing. And we'll go to breakout group two things.

Well, actually, Paul, you just said it. We spent the entire time talking about SEL, we didn't move off of it, was a spirited conversation.

And did it seem to consensus was that having SEL as part of our flexibilities as it was for this year, was a good idea.

The problem is, how do you assess whether someone is doing an exemplary job and proficient job developing job on their SLO that they pick?

And we, I think, agree that when an administrator is, is, is using an SEL goal, that they have to be very careful about how they measure it.

And that it's more about whether a teacher implemented, what they were supposed to do, then, some sort of a measure, where you'd say they scored 4.2 on a scale, or are we passed out a form and got these responses. So, I think it was a concern about how it was going to be assessed more than whether we should be doing it or not.

That was agreement that the flexibility was nice to have, SEL has got a great future, but there's a lot of work to be done, and a lot of training to be done before we can really tie it to student achievement.

Thank you again, Tony, for doing that, and we'll go to breakout group two. And then we'll certainly tie that back into a whole group discussion, And so I know Chris and, Kimberly, you were there, too. Yeah, no, thanks Paul, a similar conversation, and I Bill, volunteer to kind of, report out for our group.

Thanks, Chris. So, I'll kinda pick up where the last group ended. Because that's kind of where our discussion ended, as well.

Talking about, um, if there were to be just one SLO with an SEL focus, to have that measured in a holistic qualitative way.

Looking at qualitative measures of accomplishment, but with the need to be very clear, and to have consistency from district to district, about, know what those measures are.

You know, and, again, we talked about teacher inputs versus student outputs and that kind of thing, but, and that's where the work needs to be done.

But definitely, it seemed to be there to be agreement that any kind of measure would be holistic and qualitative.

We talked about other things as well.

You know, kind of, kind of a basis of trust and accountability, kind of have to go hand in hand for any kind of evaluation system, Talked about training for those doing the evaluation, making sure that there's calibration, and really putting a focus and emphasis on that need for ongoing, actionable feedback with conversation seemed to be instances where that had been lacking.

Discussion of subjective versus objective factors, and in the evaluation process.

So many of those topics, kind of woven and out, but I guess our bottom line was, if, if we could move toward, at least for next year, no, Now one SLO, Hope SEL Focus, and then an overall holistic, qualitative way of looking at teacher, not only teacher performance, but teacher practice, as well.

If the matrix is not required, then let's get rid of the matrix, and really look at it in, in that holistic way.

Thank you, Bill, and sounds like a very rich discussion, as well. And I think a quick follow up question, maybe for Christian, the Department, is the talent team is based on what you heard about, the one SEO SLO Focus and SEO and other pieces.

Are there any of those areas that you're already thinking about are opportunities to provide additional guidance slash training right for next year with this kinda current set of flexibilities, right?

Going forward. I think regardless of where we've land, we recognize that there's going to have to be like an amended training for those that are going to be evaluating for next year, so that there is more clarity and consistency across the group.

Well, you know, we have a structure in place for training administrators, were looking at amending that to support whatever recommendations are put forth by the Council.

You know, I think it was clear in our group, you know, Bill did a great job of kind of peeling back some of the layers of our discussion.

But, now, measures of accomplishment, it was clear in our group that, well, that was well received across the state, not having a clear definition of what measures of accomplishment that created confusion across districts, and it looked very different in some districts and other districts. So, well.

Like, I think we, some of the flexibilities have some, when we recognize that we need to provide additional feedback, collectively as a group, around what, what that specifically looks like.

You know, one of the lingering questions that we had was, know, we recognize the emphasis on SEO, we also know that there were educators that likes maintaining, that focused on on kind of academic goals or other goals that they had been working on for several years.

So I think one of the questions we have for the larger group is there seems to be some agreement on this, on this council, about one SLO, which we think it we would support.

And so the question is, is it one SLO with a holistic, qualitative approach?

And then, allowing those categories that we had proposed within the flexibility is one of which being MCO?

Yeah, I'm sorry. Go ahead. Can see some nodding heads to, I would say, we want mutual agreement between the evaluator and the teacher, and And that is the conversation That should determine.

What was that one SLO should be?

It could be that it's highly appropriate for it to be an academic SLO with Standardized Indicators. And that may serve, everyone's needs, and promote the students' needs, above all.

And it may also be a totally appropriate thing for it to be an SLO SEL with, without a standardized indicator, with measures of accomplishment of teacher input, rather than student outcomes.

I wanted to just share 2 1.

I shared this in our breakout group, but I wanted to share it for the other breakout group as well.

We are currently working with our colleagues in the Office of Student supports to help us identify areas within the current CCT rubrics that are already aligned with some SEL practices.

So we thought that by highlighting where those indicators are that that would lessen some anxiety. Because teachers are already familiar with the CCT rubrics and if their districts are using another racquets there's some alignment because they all have to align to the Common Core teaching or teaching.

And we are working also with one particular school district who has been implementing SEL for several years and they are working to do the same for us, for the leader evaluation and support rubric. So, we didn't, we didn't, We don't have those for this meeting, obviously.

But we are hoping that we will have those resources for school districts for next year.

That's great. So, yeah, go ahead, Elizabeth, To have a question, and you know, I liked the idea of mutually agreed upon SL. But what if, what if you can't agree, then what happens?

I mean, I, I'm just asking, I mean, New Haven actually has a model that they've used for about 10 years. If the evaluator and the certified individual cannot come to an agreement, then they bring the disagreement to the teachers, Dave ..., the teacher's union president, and the administrator in Central Office who oversees the evaluation process. And in the 10, 15 years that they've done that, they've been able to have some high level conversations about needs and professional standards, and whatever it is, and have resolved each one without having to go to any further process with the superintendent.

Thank you.



Yeah, we had a similar in Tennessee and similar to what Mary said it, and that worked really well. That would be referred to like a local district committee that's set up around educator effectiveness, to help resolve, And it's, as she said, it's, I think that's a really effective way.

So it's not well, initially, Tennessee, we set up that the principal, the administrator to the evaluator, it did Trump, and they have the final say, And after a couple of years, you can imagine that problematic, depending on what the individual circumstances where, Elizabeth, right?

So, so, having that kind of local, focused on local council is a really great idea. It works.

So, at every district, just to clarify, every district has a dispute resolution process. So, OK, thanks, districts, that bad.

It sounds like right there is consensus on that goal set, mutually agreed upon goals that are holistic and have the CIO or academic focus.

Are there other areas that you're hearing now and seeing that surfacing better, important? And can go forward. Is it within the flexibilities?

All if I could just add, we had discussed, I think we need one more the SLO, the academic. But we also need to have the non traditional classroom type flexibility goals to as an option. And I'm thinking of our trade teachers.

Was that, was that language, then? Sharon? And Chris, remind me, was that language in there?

In this current draft of the flexibilities for next year, we have some options that, um, as we discussed in our breakout room that could apply to educators in the technical high schools, but, um, well, we welcome ideas jam because I don't work very closely with the Technical High School.

So, um, no, I think we would welcome your input on adding an additional option. Yeah, and just be clear, it's not just the technical high schools. You know, we have classes, you know, the or carpentry or ... and things like that in a regular school settings and it's very, very similar. You know, the way they know it's happened before is they actually put them in a classroom, and that's how they measure it, instead of what they're doing 90% of the time, which is the hands-on component. And, again, it's just a comfort level, you know, with the administrators that are evaluating them. So I do think we just have to be aware that there is a component, or there should be a component for those that are not in the traditional classroom.

And just to piggyback on that, is that, I think you said this, but with related services, I mean, they have a one-on-one.

The review of practices, so much more valuable, when we have to look at those e-mails, and really make sure that they're, they have the support they need to, to diagnose what is happening with kids and create plans that teachers then have to implement for kids. So, I don't think an observation of a related service in a room with one kid really gets us anywhere. I think the review of practice is much more powerful.

Right, so we have about five minutes remaining. I want to just ask if there are any other concerns and reservations or areas that you want to bring up before we get to the next steps? And a little bit at the timeline.

What's going to happen next from the departments in, in order to put this back out to all of you in the next few days, but I want to make sure, ask, are there any other issues or concerns that you want to raise with this point.

I would just like to put out there, one of the changes that I see in the new flexibilities compared to the August 11 flexibilities is under Observation of Performance and Practice at the end of that paragraph, they've changed out the words remote learning, changed it to student learning. And I am not sure that this is these flexibilities.

And our evaluation plan in general work well for remote teaching for virtual classrooms, I think we're heading back, for the most part, in a classroom.

If we have fully remote classrooms and full virtual teaching, or partly, I think there needs to be additional standards and concerns addressed, You just Kate or? Mary: Sorry. Would you mind just finding Where that was.

So that we, so on page two, F, Observation of performance and practice, 40%, justification, the bottom of that paragraph.

In comparison of the two documents.

It looks like that paragraph, except for the last word of that paragraph now says well-being of staff and students and student learning, it used to say, and remote learning.

And that was removed and changed to student learning.

I think that we need different protocols in, uh, virtual classroom.

I think we need different standards for a virtual for virtual instruction.

So, I am not, I just, It's just a concern out there.

A friend.

Ran, Go ahead. I think Did you raise your hand.

Just wondering if you could just Yeah, I did. I just wondered if you could share the screen again. I want to make sure that I have that.

I absolutely understand the flexibilities for 21 22, you want a particular area like with one of the slides.

That.

Afraid for, I just, I guess I'll say Yeah, these are just drafts.

So I just wanna clarify to the group that this is not, OK, This is now our decide like this, but what we had kind of tried to pull together, based on everybody's feedback, said, provide a framework for the conversation today, but this is just a draft.

This is not what we, we've all decided at this point.

Look at that slide, I'm sorry.

Glad. I'm sorry, OK, thank you. I see it, I think I call it Points, Social emotional Learning for Students, Student Engagement, Engaging Families, Cultural Responsiveness, and or Academic Achievement Culture.

I'm sorry, I have a I don't know if that echo is me? That looks like we have to do all four of those things plus maybe the last one. I think there needs to be a little word smithing there to make sure that nobody interprets that. We have to do all four of the initial bullets.

Good point.

Um, again, I just want to keep an eye, so we're honoring everybody's time, and we do have about two minutes left, so I know the team wanted to talk about next steps here for going forward. And so, this last slide is an opportunity to for that, Chris, if you wanna take that away.

Yeah, I think I'm going to throw something out. that a group and what you'd assign.

So our goal had been to get these to the State Board for May, which is next week.

Just so that we felt that that would provide Pete X and districts time to look at the flexibilities ahead of the upcoming school year.

However, based on the conversations today, I want to make sure that this group feels that they have time to weigh in on what we are going to submit back to you, based on the conversations that we've had today.

So our original plan was that we would take the Conversations Today, make changes to this document, and then send it back to everybody and ask for 48 hours, They kind of provide a way and on consensus so that we can bring it to the main board meeting.

If we feel that this warrants a further conversation, um, we would, we would miss them a board meeting, but we would be we would be able to utilize our next meeting to finalize discussion based on the draft. And then we would presented to the June board meeting, which again, I think as long as we acknowledge that it does truncate the amount of time that school districts will have to look at the flexibilities.

But given that there'll be somewhat in keeping with this past year, it shouldn't be entirely new to them. So, I'm gonna, I'm gonna put that out to this group.

What would you like to delay us bringing recommendations to the State Board so that we have time to reconvene at our May 11th meeting. So, what we'll do is we'll take all the comments today. We'll work on the flexibilities.

We'll send them back to you for time to review and discuss ahead of our May meeting, and then we'll be able to draft those recommendations to bring to the state Board of Education for their June meeting.

So that's Option A, Option B, is that we do our best to capture responses and kick it back to the group with a quick turnaround.

If you want to add that in the Chat, that's also fine, if you wanted to say Option A for the, as Chris was saying, or Option B, you can also, either verbally or in the chat, Jeff, you look like you are giving an early thumbs up that, right?

Yeah.

So, I'm, I'm a little bit more cautious here, so my feeling would be it'd be better to wait, probably, and do this in in June, rather than Rush, rush, and not capture all the conversation and everything that's been going on.

Thank you, Jeff?

I agree with Jeff.

And we might actually have consensus on something today.

Elizabeth, thanks for away again.

Anyone else want a second data around waiting and under, under Option A Do that for me.

Steve Bell shaking his head, Mary.

OK, so then, that, that will be our plan. So what we'll do is, we will take the feedback that we gathered today from the group, we will look at what we shared with you ahead of time, and we'll go through and make edits.

We will kick that back to the team with enough time to provide it. I think there are some and given that we're going to have some additional time. I think we would also behoove us to really think about some of those definitions that we're going to have to provide additional guidance around. So, measures of accomplishment being one, I, again, we proposed a very simple definition for informal versus formal on, that that's something that you would like to think about a little bit. And then I also think that if we are going to, you know, it sounded as though there were some consensus around, the summative rating would be a holistic review.

What we will do is, we will work to gather some some thoughts around what that potentially would look like, but if, if other individuals and committee members would like to do that, as well, to bring kind of that conversation to the table. And so, we'll plan that, That May 11th meeting, will really be focused on looking at the second iteration of the proposed flexibilities, and building some consensus around that. And then, additionally, as we're going through this, let's identify areas that we will need training, and we can start kind of mapping that out with our other stakeholders and partners, in terms of providing that.

So I just again thank you everybody for your transparency, for your approach to this. I think it's a really collaborative process. I hope you feel the same way. And we will make sure that again in the interim, we're going to do the best we can for next year but recognizing we're going to

implode aspects of the system moving forward so that it is more meaningful and and really does support growth and feedback for continuous learning. So thank you everybody.