

## **Performance Evaluation Advisory Council Meeting**

Minutes from the March 23, 2012 meeting

Alumni Center  
Illinois State University campus  
Normal, Illinois

### Meeting Called to Order

The following were present: Kristen Adams, Josh Anderson, Dr. Bette Bergeron, Dawn Conway, Dr. Gail Fahey, Steven Isoye, Joe Matula, David Osta, Steve Ponisciak, Dr. Diane Rutledge, Jodi Scott, Audrey Soglin, Dick Spohr, Michelle Standridge, Dr. Linda Tomlinson, Dr. Richard Voltz, Vicki Phillips, Shelley Helton, and Henri Fonville.

The following were also present: Colleen Ezzo and Mary McDonald from Consortium for Educational Change, Sue Walter and Amy Alsop from the Illinois Federation of Teachers, Bruce Smith from Pearson, Brad White from the Illinois Education Research Council (IERC), Erika Hunt from the Center for the Study of Education Policy, and Jessica Handy from Stand. Margery Yeager from Education Counsel was also present by conference phone.

Mr. Matula made a motion to approve the minutes from the February 24, 2012, meeting as written. This was seconded by Ms. Scott and approved by the Council.

### Rules update

Ms. Helton reported that the Part 50 rules will go to JCAR April 17<sup>th</sup>. If no objections are found the rules will go in effect.

### Presentation – Teacher Rating Definitions: Options for Illinois

Ms. Phillips introduced Margery Yeager from Education Counsel. Ms. Yeager made a presentation entitled, *Teacher Rating Definitions: Options for Illinois*. The goal of the conversation was to investigate rating definition options from peer states, explore fundamental underlying questions to frame approach, identify key distinctions among various state approaches, review several potential Illinois options, and come to initial consensus on approach to take back to stakeholders for feedback and input before a final decision is made. In order for stakeholders to understand the new principal and teacher evaluation standards they must understand the rating definitions.

During the course of the discussion the following concerns were voiced by members. Who will PEAC write definitions for? Will what is shared with parents/guardians be the same or different than what teachers or school personnel may see? Will data collected and posted to district web sites match data posted by ISBE – maybe, maybe not – so we may need general definitions and need to know how to get to that. How do you balance local control? Concerning the rules, each district will determine their own definitions. Districts will need to clarify the label; a blend of components that needs to be explained, how this is figured.

For the April meeting Ms. Yeager will take what was discussed today along with summative ratings and put these elements together. She will also continue the discussion concerning what specific student learning objectives should look like, what in regulations constrains you, and what options remain.

#### Evaluator Training update from Consortium for Educational Change

Erika Hunt from the Center for the Study of Educational Policy gave an update on evaluation training developments. A logo has been created, guiding principles to state the purpose of the work have been developed, and the roles of program partners have been determined. The DuPage County Regional Office of Education has agreed to coordinate statewide communications with school districts and co-facilitate an advisory council. The ISU Center for the Study of Educational Policy has agreed to help with technical assistance and co-facilitate the advisory council. Teachscape will create the framework for the Teaching Proficiency System. The Danielson Group will be a critical friend and support for the performance evaluation program. Value Added Research Center (VARC) will work on student growth. The Consortium for Educational Change has created a new website for this work. The web address is [www.growththroughlearningillinois.org](http://www.growththroughlearningillinois.org). Ms. Hunt shared the timeline for this work and discussed the time commitment for the various modules of training. Ms. Hunt also talked about the Train-the-Trainer program requirements and process. The program is scheduled to launch April 2 with Train-the-Trainer registration beginning April 16.

In the discussion that followed it was asked if anyone can get the e-training or if people will need a district recommendation first? The answer was that they are trying to prioritize principal evaluation trainers first due to time and funding. The registration process is still being developed. Higher Ed will need to wait until September for training. Another member commented that the field does not like the idea of a 32-hour online training and would prefer a facilitator for discussion purposes. Another concern was the need for an assurance statement of some kind that people will have to agree to/accept when they register guaranteeing they are who they say they are and completing their own training modules. A last question was whether or not others will be allowed to train? The answer was yes, others will be allowed to train but will have to pay for the course.

#### Race to the Top 3

David Osta made a presentation concerning Race to the Top 3. Illinois has been awarded \$42.8 million from the third round of Race to the Top. One half of the grant will go to participating LEAs and the rest will be used for the evaluation trainings, the work of PEAC as well as other ISBE school improvement initiatives as outlined in Illinois's Race to the Top 3 proposal. Mr. Osta explained that so far 101 districts have expressed interest in becoming LEAs but all districts have until March 30 to decide. After March 30 a map along with a list of participants will be released. A handout was shared that explains the expectations of participating LEAs and what state supports will be available. A web page has also been created containing the details of what Race to the Top 3 is about [www.isbe.net/racetothetop/default.htm](http://www.isbe.net/racetothetop/default.htm)

#### Discussion – PEAC priorities for the future

During the discussion the following items were mentioned as priorities as PEAC moves to the next phase of their work.

- How to measure student growth for students in non-tested groups and special education. Need to keep the conversation going with six southern states working with CCSSO on non-tested populations.
- How will ISAT data be used for evaluation of new principals? New principals will not have student trend data for three years. This was a big issue during sub-committee work and the rules need to be changed to address this.
- Would be helpful for PEAC members to know when decisions will be made during a meeting or when the meeting will just be discussion. If decisions will need to be made it would be helpful to have any materials pertinent to the topic available prior to the meeting so people can come prepared.
- Asked to have a webinar prior to the next meeting concerning definitions then during the April meeting have a discussion and possibly make a decision on adoption.
- Danielson model – one member would like this to be posted to PEAC's web page.
- Want experts to come in to discuss how to measure student growth for English Language learners and special education.
- Split priorities into small sub-groups or sub-committees to get the work done.

The April PEAC meeting will be held in Chicago. The time may be delayed an hour because of the train schedule. Arrangements for the location are being worked out and will be shared when available.

#### Public Comment

An announcement was made concerning Great Lakes TURN Forum to be held in the Chicago area May 3 and 4.

Another public comment was made concerning the evaluation trainings. The unions want an assurance/validation for participants doing the online training. Want multiple safeguards to keep the training clean and credible so people will have faith in the system. This is critical to the training being successful. There is a need to publicize the consequences for lying or misrepresenting self during the training registration.

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned.