



Task force on Teacher Leadership and Compensation Meeting Notes

September 21, 2012
9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Room B100, Grimes State Office Building

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Connie Boesen, Molly Boyle, Mary Jane Cobb, Michael Cormack, Paul Gausman, Jason Glass, Jessica Gogerty, Jodi Graham, Kent Henning, Andrea Jansa, Mike May, Isaiah McGee, Kent Mick, Diane Pratt, Dana Schon, Carl Smith, Don Zuck

AGENDA ITEM: 9:00-10:00 a.m. Mixed Sub-committee Work Time:

Select a pair of recommendations, which you want to work on revising
Ryan Wise welcomes committee. Briefly reiterates Task Force agenda for the day. Small groups work on revisions to DRAFT of report.

Jason Glass comments: Why are we doing this?

1. Effort is convergence of many different political forces. Left, right, center.
2. Want to create intentional conversation about structure. Do not want to leave it to chance.
3. Provide more pathways through, and less off ramps out of education. Need to reach out to great educators.
4. Not just performance based, also based on quality.
5. It works. Evidence shows it works.

9:00-10:00 - Small Group Discussion: First and Second Principle

- Review the principle and read any comments (look at the comments both on the “top line” recommendations on pages 11 and 12 and the comments within the report itself where it provides the details on the recommendation).
- Discuss if/how to incorporate the feedback
- Revise the principle accordingly

AGENDA ITEM: 10:00-12:30 p.m. Presentation of Revised Recommendations and Feedback Gathering:

10:00 – 12:00 Whole Group Discussion:

Recommendation 1: Dana’s group - Concerns with 1st one: add word opportunities to page 11, number one. No feedback on #2 Page 12 – add word opportunities in first paragraph. Language in line with legislative language. Concerns for parents that have twins, One with apprentice teacher and one in mentor teacher room. Teacher Leadership System – recommendation teacher leadership pathway. Perhaps note to legislators: recommendation to change language, instead of Master Teacher, say Lead Teacher. Perhaps use Certified Teacher, instead of Apprentice Teacher.

Question: Who knows who these teachers are? Initial license, vs. standard license? Insert comment about taking best teachers out of the classroom. Need to address it in an additional paragraph. Establish that Master Teacher will actually affect more children because of their affect on colleagues. Horizontal visual: Residency as certified teacher, Career teacher – then as Career Teacher may choose Model, Career, Mentor, Lead, Administration, then Emeritus.

P. 13 – Comment around evaluation, we are aware of other task forces underway. Include mentor and career teacher in evaluation. Have concerns about precluding master and mentor in the review cycle. Perhaps include choice about bringing in evaluation/observation by mentor teachers in conversation. Bottom page 13: Model teacher needs to be pulled out and add information of its own. More prescriptive about where student teachers are placed in the building.

Taskforce is recommending changing provisional license to 4 years(current is go from initial to standard in 2 years) Concerned with budget cuts that this additional requirement (having to teach in same district) will cause problems with teachers who lose their jobs due to layoffs and having to go to new district.

Emeritus piece- Did not spend a lot of time on that piece. Should have more information included on notion of Emeritus. Careful of how broad Emeritus encompasses. May be more out of touch with current education.

Recommendation of 3 and 4

Page 11: Connie Bosen - basically deleting the concept of 3., regarding existing allocations. Discussion of repurposing money is perhaps ripping up whole system of money in education. Recommendation says they would be reviewed. Must also consider implications of that change. Had conversation about what happens at local level. Must consider foundation formula for funding. How are the resources used by districts and is it the best gain.

Basically merging #3 and #4. 3 and 4 are required in legislative requirement.

Philosophy of 3 goes away, philosophy of 4 stays.

If we are going to look at funding, then we need to look at all of it. Need to be more forceful about looking at all of funding. Might need to recommend that we have a committee that reviews school finance funding formula, foundation funding.

If outcomes of committee supports outcomes of funds, there may be a way to do some blending.

With categorical funding, have silo money. Blending would open up categories of funding.

We need to be explicit.—recommending deleting section on graduate degrees, page 16.

Had conversation about limiting it so stopping pipeline of folks going into administration.

Implications of higher degrees are another discussion beyond this Task Force.

Might advocate for language that helps districts articulate what they are incentivizing. Sort of punting to local level, to how incentives are described relative to higher degrees and use of finite resources.

Naïve to think that this will all be funding with new money. Time to have strategic discussion about higher degrees.

Perhaps state should not abdicate totally to local level, maybe state could set a standard regarding higher degrees. State level might focus on simple recommendations, like boosting base pay, which will then trigger conversations locally about how to use resources to help pay for higher degrees. State will put in place a structured system that will trigger conversations at local level about resource allocation.

Recommendation 5 and 6:

Left 5 as is. #6, one change. Recommend TAP system as pilot as response to charge of having pilot. Page 18, recommend reversing order of those two sentences. Do not lead with a negative.

School Districts- recommendation commission endorsed and communicate best practices.

P. 19 – Recommend leaving as is, except believe commission should be appointed by the Director? To take away some of the political fights. Allows for more of a policy focus by having it come through the Director. Still needs level of accountability. Need to consider typical process by which commissions are appointed. Need to also go on to how it is sustained. Is it changed every year? How do we ensure its viability? How far do we go with our language now?

Maybe not called a commission to take out political bent. Dept. of Ed Director is more fine tuned, and focused on education, so in good position to request participation from around the state, and ensure varying demographics.

Regardless of who appoints, we need legislation that has the commission as standing, Need to identify how often roles need to change?

Some value in understanding how commissions are appointed. Be consistent. Some importance for Director to communicate with Governor. Right now, Director can appoint but has to meet all kinds of criteria. Director provides best chance of keeping policy. Aligns better when it is done by who is responsible for the implementation. Might consider recommending a commission on Teaching. Maybe need to address issues that State Board is not. Creating forum for the conversations to happen, then information brought to board.

Need more emphasis on individual, less on institution.

Make #6 more explicit, make it more directly connected to 6. Are we potentially putting things at odds by recommending TAP. Concerned with financial piece tied to TAP.

May need to change language to identify existing peer coaching systems in State already and reference looking at those, inclusive of TAP model, but not include them by name.

Recommendation 7:

P.11: Started with “incentivize teachers”

Added “based upon factors” Avoid nebulous use of funds by specifically articulating usage. Will amount of detail in statement be confusing compared to other numbered recommendations?

Recommendation 8:

Insert word “sustained” funding. Needs to be something more structural. P. 21, 22, add “but not limited to”.

Lots of conversation around top of p. 22, 5 to 6 thousand dollars being incentive. If it is big enough incentive, folks are more likely to do it. Study shows higher range incentives have greater impact. Higher incentives have impact on recruiting and retaining higher quality of teachers and impact student achievement.

Student loan forgiveness program – perhaps research results of it. Concept of market based pay for districts that apply? We will make winners and losers out of kids. We should have systems approach – like state program that defines high poverty areas. Commission could work on that area every year. Iowa College Student Aid Commission deals with very small amount of money. Impacts relatively small number of people. Efforts have to be data driven to avoid push back about why certain districts receive money. Incentives established around licensure for specific areas.

Recommendation 9 and 10:

No changes to 9. 10 includes teachers being equal part of decision making process. P. 23 no changes except needs reference to appendix, teacher advisory team. P. 24 top – say local districts MAY use talent banks. Who will hold data and information about where all the teachers are located? Commissions jurisdiction when district is looking for Master teacher in science, etc. Utilizing vs. creating gives districts option of utilizing functions instead of having to create it. “Nonnegotiable boundaries” – are they the bullets of #9? Do we need to clarify? Multiple people will ask. Need to repeat and clarify nonnegotiable. Rewording so that makes sure that teacher quality committee has equal number of teachers and administrators. Need something about using talent banks, how that will be done.

Recommendation 11:

Is it within our charge to make recommendation #11? Need guidance. As receivers and providers of professional development, not being provided consistently. Career and lead teachers are still going to need professional development support. Recommend adoption, because they appear in the technical guide. IPDM – most people are unaware of it. Professional Development affects instruction. Speaks to ongoing school process. Does having this in there help justify need to change professional development system. How teacher pathway fits in to professional development needs to be addressed.

Could Career, Mentor, Master teacher align careers with collaborative work of professional development if leadership roles are not tied to teacher getting better? Maybe need to be more specific in language about professional development, who is on each team at each school, who then make sense of professional development in the building.—instructional lead teams in buildings that would focus on instruction and professional development? Need provisions to make changes in fairly flexible, quick way? Perhaps part of districts Human Resource department. Evaluated annually or more frequently? System becomes ineffective quickly unless there is flexibility to make changes to staff.

Recommendation 12:

12 and 13 start to pull together. Add BOEE staff. Not any changes to details. Multiple ways for student teachers to pass through to receive licensure. Change to full school year of clinical experience. Clear implications for hiring and teacher prep schools. Concerns about making this a 5 year program. Believe injustice to future teachers not having full year student teaching that includes beginning and end activities of school year. Is teacher prep program recommendations within charge of this Task Force? Residency year as first year of employment- is it affordable? 5th year poses this problem. Student teaching year is not the same as full load. Could we link student teaching year link with Residency year? Extension of student teaching? Challenges in teacher prep program is a systems issues. How do we involve practitioners in field?

Recommendation 13:

Suggest residency year for apprentice teachers. Apprentice teacher as fully licensed teacher. Residency year is already graduated, fully licensed, paid. Evaluator training for those who are evaluating teachers. Should probationary period be 3 or 4 years?

12:30-1:30 p.m. Working Lunch

AGENDA ITEM: 1:00-3:00 p.m. Finalizing Recommendations: Whole Group Discussion and Decision Making:

Principle 1: On Mike’s computer. Did not address year 1,2 3. Need to address later. Jessica shares revised diagram. Concern about final document, need another opportunity for word smithing, minor modifications before individual commitment to document. Are we using initial or certified status? Initial.

Principle 2: On Mike’s computer Need to rewrite to be more inclusive. Will need to put out new paragraph, then put out electronic fist to five.

Principle 3: No change to what is written. Listened to earlier feedback, added word “all”. Moved sentence, deleted sentence about passing buck, changed finite to current. Reworded beginning paragraph related to graduate degrees, second bullet added administration. Left piece relative to new resources. Removed distracting, inflammatory language. Do we need to re include evidence/research and studies on this issue, impact of graduate degrees, even with some questions about quality control of advanced degrees? Fast and cheap degrees may be why research shows what it does.

Not completely happy with research. Is this the venue to put it out there – to fight this battle through this document. Do we want to use this vessel to send the message? Document should not be a forum about advanced degrees, but topic is relevant to conversation. Introduce questionable relationship with research around advanced degrees leading to student achievement. Cite research. Perhaps point out that evidence is mixed.

Principle 4: No changes

Principle 5: Isaiah, few changes. Emailed to Ryan.

Principle 6: Isaiah, few changes. Emailed to Ryan. Point of independent voice- to represent key stakeholders. Recommend name of commission? Name should be broad enough to relate to related areas?

Principle 7: Mike Cormack

Principle 8- Mike Cormack

Principle 9: No changes. Discussion of state level mechanism for data mining instructional leaders with teaching openings.

Principle 10: Few changes.

Principle 11- Change to top line, no change to details. Discussion regarding professional development standards and how to word it. Narrative needs to be cleaned up to correlate with changes made to line.

Principle 12— Teacher Preparation perhaps larger than scope of this Task Force. Discussion about depth of scope regarding Teacher Preparation programs

AGENDA ITEM: 3:00-3:30 p.m. Small Group Sessions:

Ryan – last hour:

- Where does original purpose and emotional orientation show in document? In introduction and conclusion
- Next steps
- Short and long term

What is public going to say: Are we losing student /teacher face time? Where is the link to student achievement, what do we as the public gain? Three points to keep in mind as we craft opening and closing statements for report.

AGENDA ITEM: 3:45-4:30: Presentation of revised introduction and conclusion and discussion of next steps:

Emotional connection, time is now. Theory of action needs reworking, reordering of it. Lead with motivators, follow with hygiene factors (i.e., compensation, etc.) Perhaps need to acknowledge diversity in districts – urban, suburban, rural. Try to capture in intro integrity of the process with this Task Force. From trust standpoint, can be important to constituents, rather than a quick sell job from the Department of Education. This is not a Department of Education Task Force. Task Force reports can be effective in helping to innovate change, or they can gather dust. Then follow up must occur.

Conclusion:

Add: Time for action is now. Iowans expect their children to have the best education in a global community. Some comments may be bit over the top. If we just engage readers and don't follow through, not good. Important to have narrative that starts at beginning and is reinforced in conclusion. Public needs to know it is consensus.

AGENDA ITEM: 4:30-5:00 p.m. Closing and Final Reflections

Next steps: Tuesday or Wednesday., revised report from Ryan. Have until Thursday to send electronic responses. Friday will have 10:00 – 2:00 p.m. meeting to finalize. Electronic fist to five on Teacher Emeritus #2 and #11. Important message that this was a collaborative effort – not from Governor or Director Glass, or Department of Education. Transparent process, all can contribute. Had way of summarizing what we did. Constituents need to know the process of creating.

Suggestions for October to November:

- Town meetings
- Webinars
- IPTV and Talk of Iowa and Iowa public radio
- Supt. Monthly meetings
- Blog
- Statewide conference call
- Talking points in form of flyer
- Video production team could interview task force members for posting on DE website
- Meet with teacher education staff
- Create FAQ power point
- ISEA
- PDI
- SAI
- Speak with education leaders in assembly
- Bumper stickers
- Non education interest groups will also be crucial in new year

Will need leadership as to how to organize getting the information out to public.
Final Draft for review on October 1, 2012. Final report submitted on October 15, 2012.