

Performance Evaluation Advisory Council (PEAC)

February 22, 2013

Meeting Minutes Webinar¹

Members Present

Kurt Hilgendorf, Kristen Adams, Michelle Standridge, Dr. Bette Bergeron, Dick Spohr, Don Daily, Dr. Diane Rutledge, Ben Boer, Dr. Gail Fahey, Dr. Steve Ponisciak, Vicki Phillips, Joseph Matula, Angela Chamness, Dr. Stephanie Bernoteit, Dawn Conway, Jodi Scott, Audrey Soglin, and Dr. Randy Davis.

Observers Present

Amy Alsop (Illinois Federation of Teachers), Kathy Shaevel (Illinois Federation of Teachers), Christi Chadwick (Illinois State Board of Education [ISBE]), Janet Tate (Illinois Education Association), Mary Jane Morris (Consortium for Educational Change [CEC]), Lynn Holdheide (The Center for Great Teachers and Leaders), Brandon Williams (Illinois State Board of Education [ISBE]), Matt Martin, Paula Crane.

Facilitators Present

Gretchen Weber, Larry Stanton, and Jenni Fetters (American Institutes for Research [AIR])

Meeting Called to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m. by Vicki Phillips.

I. Approval of the January minutes²

Dr. Diane Rutledge proposed approval of the January minutes and asked any members who opposed to indicate through the webinar chat features their opposition. No oppositions were raised and the minutes were approved.

I. Welcome, Announcements, and Updates

- **a. Local Assessment Support Update:** Angela Chamness provide the PEAC committee with an update on ISBE's plans for supporting local assessment development. She described the goals and purpose of the effort and highlighted their hope that it would help to align assessment work across multiple initiatives including RTTT, Performance Evaluation Reform Act (PERA,) and the shift to the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). Ms. Chamness describe the framework and training that are being developed. They are designed to support educators in selecting or developing assessments for multiple uses. RTTT districts will be using the framework to develop Type II and III assessments, which will be vetted through a peer-review process and made available through a shared collaborative space.
- **b. Communication Update:** Vicki Phillips reported that all guidance documents will be posted on the updated website in the next couple of days.

¹ The meeting was changed from in-person to webinar format due to threatening weather conditions.

² Note: this sequence is slightly different from the agenda. The discussion is reported here in the order in which it occurred.

- **b. Race to the Top (RTTT) Update:** Christi Chadwick provided an update about Race to the Top. RTTT districts recently provided mid-year reports, which revealed that districts are feeling most comfortable about implementing the Common Core State Standards; however, they felt least comfortable with developing assessments for the Common Core State Standards and for Type II and III assessment requirements for teacher evaluation. The RTTT districts have been using PEAC guidance and have needed assistance in digesting the information. Ms. Chadwick indicated that several webinars are being planned that demonstrate approaches in use across the state, as well as additional supports to assist districts to plan pilot processes that will best suit their needs and contexts.

III. Stage 1: Introduce. Illinois Shared Learning Environment Presentation by Brandon Williams

- Vicki Phillips introduced Brandon Williams, from the Illinois State Board of Education.

Mr. Williams described why ISBE has decided to participate in creating the Illinois Shared Learning Environment (ISLE) and inBloom (formerly the Shared Learning Collaborative): Education has not experienced the type of “disruptive innovation” that has dramatically changed work, health, and many other aspects of our social and economic life. Education needs to shift to more personalized instruction and learning. The hope is that technology, like ISLE, can help teachers to provide more personalized instruction. Mr. Williams provided an overview of what inBloom has learned through focus groups and surveys with educators, both in Illinois, and across the states in the collaborative. ISLE has used this information to identify what the biggest obstacles to personalized learning are and what the top priorities should be in designing ISLE. Specifically, the five priorities are: creating a dashboard, building learning maps, tagging and searching content, tracking interventions, and creating and accessing assessments. Mr. Williams provided an overview of the timeline and steps for developing ISLE, proving it as a concept, piloting the platform, and then scaling up for wider distribution.

- **Mr. Williams stated that there were several critical benefits to participating in this multi-state initiative.** First, it creates better access to the application marketplace. A common platform makes it easier for developers to reach a broader audience at lower costs and allows teachers and students to create and share their own applications. Second, it simplifies access to richer content. Content developers can focus on going deeper into the Common Core State Standards and the content can be shared across districts and across states. For example, the state of New York is currently investing \$12 million in a video library that teachers in Illinois will now have access to through ISLE. Mr. Williams indicated that ISLE was currently working to develop training and professional development plans for educators. He emphasized that they envision this training as much more than a brief webinar. Instead, they are hoping to develop professional development that will encourage teachers to think about how they might change their classroom instruction in light of access to ISLE.
- PEAC members asked a few clarifying questions about ISLE.

One member noted that in Chicago Public Schools, teachers have used a platform very similar to ISLE; the member wished to remind the Council that technology itself was not the solution—it is a tool rather than an end in itself. Some of the challenges mentioned at the beginning of the presentation, like the need for more time and collaboration, are not resolved by technology. The member indicated that system in use in Chicago did not transform the work in his classroom but rather re-enforced the professional judgments he was already making.

Vicki Phillips asked the member how similar the shared platform in Chicago was to what Mr. Williams had described in ISLE. The member noted that many of the functionalities seemed similar but deferred to Mr. Williams.

Mr. Williams noted that a key difference between ISLE and the system used in Chicago was that ISLE connects beyond schools in Chicago to districts across the state and beyond the state itself. He also indicated his agreement with the member's statement that technology itself does not create transformation. Rather, it's the teachers and how they use the technology that creates change.

One member asked what "proof of concept" means. Mr. Williams indicated that it meant taking the first release of the platform and actually testing it out in classrooms to understand how to roll it out, what professional development teachers will need, and the most effective ways the technology can be used to change classroom instruction.

One member asked if ISLE would include IRC data. Mr. Williams indicated that IRC was an important partner in the ISLE project and there were plans for that data to be available through the system.

One member asked what measures were being taken to ensure privacy and confidentiality of student data in the system, how parents and guardians will be informed about it, and whether a parent or guardian could restrict access to their student's data. Mr. Williams indicated that the question about the ability of parents to restrict access would be left up to the districts. Ownership of the data remains with the district and ISLE will not change this; the districts retain ultimate control over whether they want to share their information data with the larger inBloom collaborative. On the question of privacy and confidentiality, the collaborative has made this a key concern from the beginning and has been working with a large team of legal advisors to ensure that ISLE and inBloom are FERPA compliant and includes a secure data structure.

IV. Stage 2: Discuss

Larry Stanton noted that because of the limitations of the webinar format for in-depth discussion, items currently in Stage 2: Discuss and Stage 3: Decide would be pushed back to the March meeting. In their place, the PEAC members received updates on next steps for two topics:

- **a. Evaluating Teachers of Special Education Students (Guidance)**

Lynn Holdheide, from the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders, provided members with an overview of a document shared with the Council in advance of the meeting titled, "Guidance Concerning the Design and Implementation of Teacher and Leader Evaluation Systems that Support the Academic and Social Growth of Students with Disabilities." The document is designed to provide guiding considerations to the Council and suggested next steps for each consideration. Ms. Holdheide walked the Council members through each guiding consideration and suggested the Council form a small working group to collaborate and develop Illinois-specific guidance on this topic area. PEAC members representing IEA, IFT, and Illinois Association of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE) agreed to participate in forming this working group.

Next Steps: PEAC members will review the document and be prepared to discuss specific decisions at the March meeting. AIR will work with IEA, IFT, and IAASE on getting the working group formed.

- **b. Peer Evaluation (Guidance)**

Gretchen Weber provided the PEAC an update on feedback AIR had received on the draft Peer Evaluation guidance document. She gave an overview of the revisions that were currently underway and indicated AIR would be reaching out to IFT and IEA representatives to provide examples. Members were encouraged to provide any additional feedback or comments before the March meeting.

- **c. Summative Ratings Definition (Model)**

Larry Stanton noted that this topic had been introduced several times in the past; however, because PEAC has created the summative scoring matrix, he suggested that rating definitions are no longer needed. He asked members to consider this in advance of the March meeting. One member indicated agreement with the proposal.

V. Public Comment

Dr. Diane Rutledge asked whether there was any public comment. There was no public comments.

VI. Next Steps and Adjournment

- a. **Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) Study update:** Gretchen Weber stated that several PEAC members had requested a presentation on the final MET Project study. AIR will be contacting the MET Project to try to set-up either an in-person or webinar presentation.
- b. **Proposed Addition to the Strategic Plan:** Vicki Phillips indicated that several districts have contacted ISBE requesting guidance on how to provide professional development for teachers who are in particular situations. She recommended the Council discuss at the March meeting whether an item on guidance around professional development should be added to the strategic plan.

The meeting adjourned at 12:05.