

## **Performance Evaluation Advisory Council (PEAC)**

**March 22, 2013**

### **Meeting Minutes**

**Illinois State University Alumni Center, Normal, Illinois**

#### **Members Present**

Kurt Hilgendorf, Kristen Adams, Michelle Standridge, Don Daily, Dr. Ben Boer, Dr. Steven Isoye, Dr. Diane Rutledge, Dr. Hector Garcia, Dr. Steve Ponisciak, Vicki Phillips, Joseph Matula, Angela Chamness, Dr. Linda Tomlinson, Paula Crane, Dawn Conway, Dr. Gail Fahey, Dr. Stephanie Bernoteit, Dawn Conway, Dr. Richard Voltz, Janet Tate (representing Audrey Soglin), Dr. Randy Davis.

#### **Observers Present**

Amy Alsop (Illinois Federation of Teachers), Kathy Shaevel (Illinois Federation of Teachers), Peter Goddard, Christi Chadwick, Mary O'Brien and David Osta (Illinois State Board of Education [ISBE]), Shelley Taylor (Consortium for Educational Change [CEC]), Rachel Trimble (Midwest Comprehensive Center), Brandon Williams (ISBE), Dr. Judy Hackett (Northwest Suburban Special Education Organization [NSSEO]), and Vanessa Greer.

#### **Facilitators Present**

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

#### **Meeting Called to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m. by Dr. Linda Tomlinson.

### **I. Welcome, Announcements, and Updates<sup>1</sup>**

#### **a. Race to the Top Update**

David Osta reported that the Race to the Top staff are focusing on helping districts prepare to pilot their evaluation systems in the fall. The districts are piloting the full PERA system but with no stakes attached to the outcomes. Full states implementation is scheduled for 2015-2016. Mr. Osta noted that Race to the Top districts are required to implement peer evaluation as part of their systems and this has generated extensive discussion and conversation about how to design and implement this well. Niles Township 219 shared an example of their integrated Peer Assistance Review (PAR) during several webinars that currently available through the Race to the Top website. Mr. Osta noted that the districts will appreciate the PEAC Peer Evaluation guidance document.

One PEAC member asked for clarification on whether joint committees are currently meeting in RTTT districts. Mr. Osta noted that informal meetings were taking place but formal meetings would start November 1, 2013. Another member asked for clarification on the distinction between formal and informal joint committee meetings and questioned the legality of this distinction based on the legislation. Mr. Osta noted that there is language explicitly making this distinction and explaining it in the PERA non-regulatory guidance.

#### **b. Growth Through Learning Update**

---

<sup>1</sup> Updates of various kinds were introduced at several points during the meeting, despite the fact that the agenda planned for updates only at the beginning of the meeting. They are reported here in the order in which they occurred.

Shelley Taylor (CEC) provided the committee with a copy of the most recent *Growth Through Learning Newslines* and a written report on completion rates for the teacher and principal evaluation training. For teacher evaluators, 95 percent of individuals have completed Modules 1-3 and are certified to observe; 91 percent have completed Module 4 and 55 percent have completed Module 5. For principal evaluators, 83 percent of individuals have completed Modules 1-3 and 74 percent have completed Modules 4-5. Most user licenses for the Teachscape portion of the training will expire on May 30, 2013. In addition, CEC has been hosting network sessions on measuring student growth. Districts come as teams to work on adding student growth measures to their already existing evaluation designs. The session provides six different models for districts to consider and begin making plans around as a team. Two sessions have taken place and two more are scheduled for April. Because the April sessions area already full, CEC plans to hold additional sessions this spring.

Vicki Phillips noted that with respect to the completion rates for the training, it is impossible to reach 100 percent because more people are registering and will continue to register over time. The percentage always includes these new registrants.

#### **c./d. ISBE Updates/Communications Updates**

Vicki Phillips reported that all the PEAC Guidance and Model System materials have been posted and are now available on the PEAC webpage as well as the ISBE Facebook page. ISBE is working hard to get the word out about the documents. Mrs. Phillips encourage PEAC members, as the document authors, to also spread the word. She also noted that while the documents certainly take time to read, it is important to remind everyone that there are no “quick and easy” answers to many of these questions. Larry Stanton asked PEAC members whether they have been able to distribute the resources to their own constituencies through their own communication mechanisms. Many members indicated they had not yet done so. Mr. Stanton suggested members work on this effort over the next month and be prepared to share about their progress or challenges at the April PEAC meeting. One PEAC member asked that ISBE provide some introductory language and instructions that can be used to ensure everyone is communicating the same message. Mrs. Phillips indicated that ISBE is currently working on such language and it will be included in an upcoming Superintendent’s Weekly Message.

Vicki Phillips also noted that the Local Assessment Support work was approved at a recent board meeting and will be released soon. ISBE is hoping to have a strong framework for districts to use in developing Type II and III assessments. The framework will be used to help make decisions and to convene content area groups. ISBE hopes to have a contractor announced in 3 months to begin this work over the summer.

## **II. Approval of December minutes**

Dr. Gail Fahey moved to approve the minutes. Dr. Ben Boer seconded the motion.

**SM: Require**

## **III. Stage 3: Decide**

State Model for ELA/Math for Type I Assessments (Model)

Dr. Arie Van der Ploeg explained that the document on growth models that was distributed to the PEAC members in advance of the meeting was designed to provide information and guidance to the PEAC to inform their discussion in selecting a student growth model to recommend for the state model system. The document was not intended as a draft of public guidance to districts.

Mr. Van der Ploeg began the discussion by suggesting that the core decision in front of the Council was what statistical model was consistent with legislative definitions of growth, makes reasonable sense in the Illinois context, and allows districts to make reasonable decisions about personnel. The state model needs an approach that will generate comparable personnel decisions across districts. The model also needs to be inclusive (covers as many students and teachers as possible) and proportional (provides a fair comparison with respect issues that can be controlled).

Mr. Van der Ploeg provided an overview of the guidance document and asked the Council if they were comfortable with the recommendation that the model PEAC selects does not need to purport to describe causal effects. Several Council members expressed concern over this recommendation because the use of student growth as an accountability measure for teachers implies causality; and yet, most of the models do not take every variable relevant to student growth into account. Mr. Van der Ploeg attempted to clarify the point—his reference to causality was about the limitations of the methodological approach. The statistical models available to the most districts in the state do not allow for claims about causality. Without randomized assignment of teachers to classrooms, statistical models cannot provide causal evidence. Some statisticians would argue that a complex multivariate statistical model can sufficiently correct for non-randomized assignment, but only a very limited number districts would have the assessments, technology, and skilled staff to implement these more complex models.

Dr. Ponisciak noted that regardless of the statistical argument, the student growth model that PEAC selects will be used for human resource decisions and therefore, will be used to make causal claims. Mr. Van der Ploeg responded that personnel decisions can be made with or without making causal claims and it is important to communicate clearly about the terms used and that everyone understands the distinctions in the model. One PEAC member noted that teaching is a professional job and is based on professional judgment within the classroom environment; focusing on teacher practice in the classroom is more informative than defaulting to a statistical model. Student growth measures confirm evidence about classroom practices but should not be presented as determinative causal evidence.

Another PEAC member asked whether the model PEAC was expected to recommend was intended to be a best practices model or not. Isn't it PEAC's responsibility to recommend the best option—whose responsibility is it to ensure districts have the capacity to implement the model? Mr. Van der Ploeg noted that Illinois does not currently have enough continuous standardized tests to do a full, multivariate model, which would require an extensive number of tests scored longitudinally over time. The member noted that this explanation does not discount the desire to eventually have a strong model. Another member agreed and noted that PEAC recommended multiple measures expressly because they distrust the accuracy of anyone measure alone. Nevertheless, in our recommendations, it's appropriate to recommend the most feasible, strongest model we can and then point to where we would like to eventually go with future assessments. Another member asked if a best practices model would have to account for background variables and other factors, which would automatically mean it needs to be a value-added model (VAM). Dr. Van der Ploeg noted that most statisticians would argue that VAM approaches provide a better approach.

Dr. Linda Tomlinson noted that PEAC's mandate was to recommend what they think the state model should be. One PEAC member noted that PEAC had already had this discussion about whether to recommend an exemplar or most feasible option during the Type I assessment decision making process. There are certain state and district realities in terms of infrastructure and finance that limit what we can recommend. PEAC's intent is to recommend a model that districts can actually implement. Another member agreed, noting that "platonic ideal" of evaluation is false and evaluation depends heavily on the context it is implemented in.

Another member expressed concern about the struggle to understand and communicate about complex, multi-variate statistical models, which are also expensive to implement. The member also felt the

causality discussion was misplaced because the professional practice piece of the evaluation was supposed to speak to causality and that was why it is weighted higher. Mr. Van der Ploeg noted that many psychometricians would argue that classroom observation is a less reliable measure. Dr. Ponisciak disagreed stated that the inferential reliability of observation is unknown.

Dr. Van der Ploeg next presented a table that illustrated that most districts in the state of Illinois cannot meet the minimum requirement of 400 students that is required for most student growth models. One solution is to have districts collaborate and pool their data; however, this requires covariates to be included in the model, which also has implications for district capacity. Districts would need to know whether or not their assessments are constrained. Covariates cannot be specified upfront, they must be determined at the district-level.

Dr. Van der Ploeg next presented several tables demonstrating the challenges of making rating decisions for the majority of teacher's student growth scores that do not demonstrate a narrow enough confidence interval to accurately distinguish their scores from other teacher's scores. If PEAC chooses to recommend a high confidence interval (95 percent), only a very small percentage of teacher's student growth scores will be truly distinguishable.

PEAC members expressed extensive concern over the ranking of teachers that was implied by the tables Dr. Van der Ploeg displayed. Members wanted to know why this approach required ranking teachers against other teachers' scores rather than simply to help inform teachers about how their student's performed relative to a national norm or compared to previous years. Members expressed a strong consensus that the student growth model should not rank order teachers because what PEAC ultimately cares about is how a teacher improves against their own performance.

Dr. Van der Ploeg stated that the tables and graphs he presented were examples of an analysis intended to illustrate the challenges that PEAC will need to address in deciding on an appropriate confidence level interval. The growth score data can be presented in multiple ways; however, he stated that any model operates under the assumption that some teachers are better than others and that this model gives you information about that. The teachers at the low and high end of the scale are different from one another. The problem is how do you distinguish the teachers in the middle whose confidence intervals are too wide to be meaningfully differentiated. In order to increase differentiation, there are two options: shrink the confidence interval or second, be more precise by using a scale with more points (and therefore, increasing the variation within the data). PEAC will need to decide what level of confidence is acceptable in Illinois. One Council member noted that other approaches using quintiles were possible.

Another member asked how many members felt comfortable understanding the charts they had seen. Only two members indicated they were. The member explained the graph again and noted that it was impossible to tell whether the teachers in the middle of the graph were meaningfully different in terms of their impact on student growth. Mr. Van der Ploeg concurred and noted that the state requires you decide what the confidence interval should be. One PEAC member noted that given the very many constraints of both the assessments being used and the models available, the decision needs to be made with an eye towards doing no harm.

One member noted that there is no requirement in the law to rank teachers against a specific distribution. If a teacher demonstrates grade-level growth, then 90 percent of teachers could be distinguished because they all hit that mark. Mr. Van der Ploeg stated that this would not fit the state's growth requirements for two points in time. The member noted that the difference in student learning at two points in time can still be used if you establish cut-off points. Dr. Van der Ploeg stated that teachers needed to be able to compare themselves with others in order to improve.

Dr. Ponisciak noted that the challenge with any assessment is looking at the results against an absolute versus a relative point of comparison. Scaling or benchmarking scores against the previous year's data is one way of getting around the problem, if you have assessments available. Members re-stated that they do not want a model that will result in rank ordering of teachers, especially within the same school or district, which would undermine collaboration. Members suggested using a national norming approach was better and would allow every teacher the chance to be distinguished over time.

Dr. Ponisciak asked whether there was any expectation that ISBE would provide the state model to districts using MAP. He noted that his recommendations depend on the answer that question because there is a difference between explaining a model versus having to actually calculate a score. In general, Dr. Ponisciak does not support more simple models because they automatically disadvantage better students. Dr. Tomlinson indicated that no decision had been made about that question as it rested largely on whether or not the state had the capacity to do so. Dr. Van der Ploeg noted that the less state support for the delivery of the model, the more variation you will see implementation, and therefore, comparability.

One member noted that because the Council had opted to recommend MAP assessments, it was critically important that all guidance on the state model come with clear caveats about the problems and flaws with the assessments (e.g., ceiling levels in certain grades). The caveats need to be provided in great detail.

Mrs. Phillips noted that give the challenges discussed today, particularly around relating Type I assessments back to classroom instruction, perhaps the Council should re-visit earlier decisions to include these types of assessments in evaluation.

Dr. Ponisciak noted that removing Type I assessments would made the state's evaluation model even more precarious because the reliability and validity of Type II and III assessments were even less assured. One PEAC member concurred, noting that less measure would create less precision.

Mr. Stanton summarized what AIR had heard from the Council: 1) caveats about the assessments being used must be included the guidance on the model; 2) the model should not rank teachers against each other; 3) at the next meeting, AIR should provide concrete options for the model and discuss the strengths and weaknesses of each.

One PEAC member asked if there were more slides in Mr. Van der Ploeg's presentation (there were not). The member noted that based on having read the document provided in preparation for the meeting, he had anticipated talking about the different models, their pluses and minus, and digging in-depth into them. The discussion today left most of us confused and the document did not prepare me to effectively engage in this discussion. Dr. Van der Ploeg stated the purpose of the document was to show that the models were largely similar but they are part of a larger issue about making decisions among staff. PEAC needs to focus on the assumptions and decisions that need to be made in order to use it in HR decisions. The member noted that this purpose did not come through clearly in the document or the discussion today. Dr. Van der Ploeg explained that in the document, the purpose was to point out that while the third family of models is the best, they are not practical for implementation in Illinois, which leaves PEAC with choosing from the models in the middle. The member stated that this summary helped but he wished the conversation had started there.

Mrs. Phillips brought the discussion to a close and noted that engaging in challenging, sometimes confusing discussions is just part of the process.

#### IV. Stage 2: Discuss

##### a. Evaluating Teachers of Special Education Students (Guidance)

Dr. Judy Hackett (NSSEO) provided a presentation for PEAC members on the work the NSSEO has been doing since last spring around the evaluation of special education teachers. Dr. Hackett noted that their work started from the perspective that evaluations for special education teachers is more similar to evaluations of other educators than it is different. In addition, NSSEO believes that student growth measures for special education students can reasonably be included in evaluation and is an integral part of a continuous improvement plan.

NSSEO has worked to develop customized rubrics for both school leaders and special educators. The customized rubrics are not substantive changes in the rubric. Instead minor tweaks are made to the language in some areas of the rubric. NSSEO held reflective conversations about what good instruction looks like for special education teachers and their specific roles and responsibilities. These conversations were used to make minor tweaks to the rubrics in terms of the nouns used and examples of evidence. The conversations between administrators and staff about measures of student progress for diverse learners have focused heavily on connecting the “why” to the decisions being made: what is the purpose, what are we measuring, and how is growth data to be collected. NSSEO has hosted professional development workshops focused on understanding types of assessments, how to improve assessments and how evaluation fits in as part of a larger system. Dr. Hackett noted that clearly defining what good instruction looks like in different context is important: co-teaching, for a teacher with students with significant needs, etc. Dr. Hackett noted that observers are more likely to rate special education teachers higher because of empathy.

Dr. Hackett provided a graphic that described how NSSEO views the connection between evaluation, professional growth, and improved student outcomes and noted that the relationship between professional practice, artifacts, and student growth measures tell the full story of teacher performance together. Dr. Hackett shared that they had found pre-conference conversations to be especially important and NSSEO is creating videos to help evaluators learn how to hold better pre-conferences. During training sessions, NSSEO has found that rater reliability is all over the map and this remains a significant challenge.

Dr. Hackett noted that measurement of professional goals is a crucial area. In some districts, similar goals are used across staff but there is variation in the types of artifacts submitted to demonstrating goal attainment. In addition, clear baseline data for student growth, especially for students with disabilities is a another challenge. For teachers with special education students, eight months is not a long enough time to demonstrate growth. It needs to be measured using a multi-year approach. This is especially true for measuring student growth for administrators. NSSEO is still looking for ways to align IEP goal achievement and multiple measures. Dr. Hackett noted that NSSEO has begun to do extensive work with developing videos for use in evaluator training.

Dr. Ponisciak noted that appreciated the emphasis on taking a multi-year approach but asked how NSSEO addressed staff turn over. Dr. Hackett indicated that this way a major challenge but NSSEO is working on doing more frequent progress monitoring with midway points and/or goals.

Another PEAC member asked about the word “tweaking” with respect to changes to the Danielson rubric. Dr. Hackett explained that the changes were made to the critical attributes and examples not the performance level descriptions in the rubric. For example, in some cases they replaced the word teacher with therapist or classroom with educational environment.

Dr. Van der Ploeg asked how NSSEO was addressing multiple attribution in linking teachers and students. Dr. Hackett noted that this problem was not unique to special education. NSSEO uses both a group rating and individual ratings. Dr. Van der Ploeg asked if it made sense to think of a school's impact on student learning rather than individual's impacts. Dr. Hackett felt that the answer to this was dependent on the department or school's focus and the degree of shared, similar individual goals.

Next, Gretchen Weber, as the PEAC members to provide their feedback on what specific considerations they would like included in the draft guidance material on evaluation for educators of special education students. Several members suggested getting feedback from teachers and administrators who support special education students on the proposed considerations. Another member suggested the early childhood through 3<sup>rd</sup> grade group at Illinois State University collaborate with NSSEO on these considerations to ensure that it fits both types of teachers.

Mrs. Weber suggested that AIR move forward crafting guidance around considerations 1 and 2 and have NSSEO work intensively on it as well as the Danielson Group. One PEAC member asked what the ultimate outcome or product would be? The current list of considerations seems to cover areas for which resources and guidance already exist they are just in different places. The member expressed support for Lynn Holdheide's recommendation at the last meeting to try to bring together all these resources. Are we giving guidance for the evaluation process or for the growth measure? Dr. Tomlinson noted that the state student growth model must address teachers of special education students but PEAC also needs to provide general guidance for districts that do not default. ISBE has asked NSSEO to expand the scope of their work to provide recommendations to PEAC for the default model.

Mr. Stanton noted that this conversation was partly about what do you see as PEAC's role for special educators. Does PEAC want to be the single source for this information or do you want to share this role with other organizations? Mrs. Weber also asked if it made sense to collect all the different existing resources and provide them to the field as a set of resources or whether the resources should be combined into a single guidance document.

Dr. Hackett noted that provide a set of resources can be challenging because people feel like they have to pick and choose and make sense of it on their own. What most people really want is a sequenced plan that walks them through picking resources—so it would be idea if you provided a framework and accompanying resources. PEAC cannot provide a set of targets for special education students, its simply not possible.

Mrs. Weber asked if there was anything in the list of considerations that should not be included. One PEAC member stated that the eight considerations seem like a good outline and it seemed like all the considerations are things a district should think through.

Dr. Rutledge suggested that NSSEO come to PEAC with a recommendation to react to, this would be more efficient than having PEAC generate the guidance.

Mrs. Weber summarized the next two steps: NSSEO will develop a model or framework and work with AIR to start drafting guidance around the eight considerations. The Council agreed with the proposed steps.

## **VI. Stage 2: Discuss<sup>2</sup>**

### **a. Discussion of ISLE and PARCC and implications for Educator Evaluation**

Mary O'Brien provided PEAC with an update on progress around the development of the new Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) assessments. The governing board met with the U.S. Department of Education, who is very interested in holding both Smarter Balance and PARCC to their original schedules. PARCC was off schedule, partly because of the level of rigor that item writers are being held to in developing the assessments. An item tryout will take place but Illinois is not one of the sites participating in that. Full field tests for the summative assessment is scheduled for winter/spring 2014 and Illinois will participate in this field test. On April 15, an accommodations manual will be released for public comment. PARCC also released a tool two weeks ago that allows a school to calculate their readiness for implementing PARCC given their existing technology and capacities.

One PEAC member asked about the status of the formative assessments and if they would be tested at the same time. Mrs. O'Brien explained that the formative assessments are further behind in development and it is not yet clear when the diagnostic, mid-term assessments will be ready. Another member noted that the whole point of the diagnostic tools is to inform instruction and better prepare students for the summative—why are they not being prepared and tested together?

Mrs. O'Brien indicated that the original plan was to do so, but unfortunately the summative assessments right now are just further along than the diagnostic and midterm assessments. The diagnostic assessments will absolutely inform instruction but we have to be realistic about where they are in the development process. PARCC is going to be a dramatic improvement over the assessments we currently have.

The member asked if it was true that the summative assessments are given at two portions of the year—one at the 70 percent of instruction mark and one at the 90 percent of instruction mark. Mrs. O'Brien confirmed this was the case and stated that the two summative assessment scores would be combined to create a single summative score.

Mr. Stanton asked about the implications of PARCC for evaluation. Is it more robust for designing growth models?

Mrs. O'Brien noted that as a Type I assessment, it will be much more robust than what Illinois is currently using—that's one of the reasons for the delay. The test items are being held to a very, very high standard and the assessments will measure the breadth and depth of the Common Core State Standards. PARCC is required (according to the federal grant agreement) to develop growth metrics for the assessment. Illinois can adopt PARCC with or without the growth metric.

Dr. Ponisciak asked whether the timing of the release of the testing results would be a better fit with the current evaluation cycle. Mrs. O'Brien stated that because the assessment is computer-based, scoring and release of the data will be very fast once the standards are set. There will be a lag in time release only in the first year.

One member asked when the speaking and listening section would be administered. Mrs. O'Brien indicated no decisions had been made about that yet. The member also asked what was ISBE's plan about continuation of statewide ACT participation and noted that it is imperative that we prepare students with

---

<sup>2</sup> The order of topics presented here is different from the order listed on the meeting agenda. Portions of the meeting were re-arranged to accommodate presenter's schedules. The order presented here reflects the actual order of the presentations during the meeting.



information as early as possible about whether they will have access to the ACT. Mrs. O'Brien agreed but indicated that no decisions have been made at this time.

One member asked about what would happen in districts that could not afford to purchase the technology upgrades required to use PARCC by full implementation. Mrs. O'Brien indicated that the proposed budget has capital funds for technology specifically related to that issue. The member noted that its about more than just the technology infrastructure—some communities do not have broadband access. Mrs. O'Brien noted that ISBE has some data around that issue but it would best if districts use the capacity tool to figure where they are at and then we can work with them to identify supports. One important point ISBE needs to be considering is our broader focus on technology and instruction. It's concerning that as a state we are only addressing these technology gaps because of the new assessment. There will, however, be access to paper and pencil versions of the test if a district can prove they do not have the capacity needed for the computer-based assessment.

One member noted that despite her district's efforts to do everything possible to integrate technology into instruction (such as smartboards), getting access to computer labs is still very difficult. Dr. Tomlinson noted that ISBE is looking at those concerns very closely. The member re-iterated that districts are not technology adverse—the central challenge is access. Mrs. O'Brien noted that with PARCC the approach to testing will be very different. The expectation is that you send two students to a computer lab to take the reading assessment while you continue on with instruction. The hope is that the new format will free up new possibilities. Regarding broadband access, the PARCC assessments will be cached so you won't need to be online to take the assessment.

Mr. Stanton noted that it would great to continue to hear updates from ISBE about the timing of the assessment, frequency of the summative tests, etc., Is there a timeline for some of those decisions? Mrs. O'Brien indicated that was not clear yet but she would let the PEAC know as soon as the information is available.

One member re-iterated the concern raised earlier about timelines. If the testing dates do not line up with the evaluation system timelines (and it appears they will not), the evaluation timelines need to be re-visited. The focus should be on opportunities for educators to learn.

Next, as a follow-up to the webinar in February, Brandon Williams took questions from the PEAC members about the Illinois Shared Learning Environment (ISLE). One PEAC member asked whether the ISLE could provide web-based tools for teacher evaluation. Mr. Williams indicated the capacity for that was a possibility, however, no specifics have been determined. A large number of things need to be decided and requirements for additional uses are still being developed out. ISBE wants the platform to be a one-stop shop, so if it is used as a portal then absolutely evaluation tools could be added. It's not one of the top five priority areas right now, but it could be added is one after the top five are completed. Mr. Williams noted that he was curious to learn more about other state's efforts in this regard. For example, Massachusetts is doing something similar and got the project funded but when they tried to incorporate teacher evaluation uses, they received extensive pushback from teachers who send they would refuse to use the new platform if it was linked with evaluation. There are some real lessons to learn about situating this with teachers.

Several PEAC member noted that combining the two platforms would require balancing the efforts and ensuring that joint committees communicate clearly about what assessments are being used for evaluation, which would help allay some of those fears. Dr. Rutledge noted that Massachusetts had districts involved in that project. It might be good for the PEAC to have a subcommittee that could help make decisions about what assessments could be used.

Mr. Stanton asked when the first five use-cases would be complete and new ones can be added. Mr. Williams responded that the timeline for new cases depends entirely on how the implementation for the first five goes.

### Guidance

## VII. Stage 3: Decide

### a. Peer Evaluation (Guidance)

Mrs. Weber provided an update on revisions to the Peer Evaluation guidance document. An example from Illinois (Niles Township District 219) was included and revisions were made to clarify the language in the document based on feedback from PEAC members. One PEAC member noted that Niles Township had recently participated in a RTTT webinar series and suggested including a link to the webinar in the resource. Another member suggested adding a qualifier to a sentence the document.

The PEAC members were asked vote on approval of the document (including the webinar addition) and all members agreed to approve the document.

### b. Summative Ratings Definition (Model)

Mr. Stanton recalled that he proposed during the February webinar to remove this decision from the PEAC strategic plan. The definitions were now unnecessary because the summative matrix describes what the ratings mean. The PEAC members agreed with this proposal.

## VIII. Stage 1: Introduce

### a. Teacher of Record Guidance for Districts

Peter Goddard provide a report on ISBE's work in developing student-teacher data linkages as part of Illinois efforts to develop a statewide k-12 longitudinal data system. ISBE established a subgroup to tackle this problem, and the group began by identifying the purposes for establishing the linkages. The purposes are to ensure that 1) teachers get access to the right data for their students to support their instruction, 2) to make it possible to accurately provide data for reporting out or conducting research about the effectiveness of different learning activities, and 3) to ensure that at the district level, districts know how to connect teachers and students for evaluation purposes.

One PEAC member noted that VARC has resources that provide a nice description of the processes required for creating student-teacher data linkages. Dr. Ponisciak noted that VARC worked with Battelle for Kids on developing the resources. He also noted that one of the key questions that needed to be addressed was what happens with team teaching, especially with teacher mobility.

Mr. Goddard asked the PEAC members how much of the student-teacher data linkage decisions need to be made at the state-level. He indicated the working group was open to feedback about the proper role for the state in coming up with rules and guidance versus staying out of the discussion and allowing districts to make their own decisions.

PEAC members asked for clarification about what constitutes a "teacher of record" in a high school setting where students take multiple classes in the same subject. Mr. Goddard noted that this was one of the areas the working group was considering. Another member asked what was meant by "evaluation research." Mr. Goddard explained that it was research that assessed program implementation. Another member asked if the student-teacher data linkage information was subject to Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Mr. Goddard indicated that the Family Education Rights Protection Act (FERPA) does not

protect individual teacher information, it only protects student information. It is therefore possible that the link itself would be protected, but he would need to check. The member expressed his strong concern that the information would eventually be made publically available and the implications of creating such linkages need to be more thoroughly examined. Mr. Goddard noted that ISBE is currently responsible for creating the linkages in order to comply with several grant agreements already in place; however, it is critical that it be done in a responsible way that meets the needs of the three priorities mentioned earlier.

One member asked if the working group was going to address how much time a student has to be in the class in order to attributed to the teacher. Mr. Goddard indicated that they did not have anything specific on that topic yet but it is on their agenda, as well as questions about student mobility.

Mr. Stanton noted that PEAC is issuing guidance on these questions and suggested that the guidance be shared with the working group for comment. If the subcommittee has specific questions that PEAC should address, this should be communicated so that they can be included in the strategic plan.

Mrs. Weber asked if the subcommittee had a timeline for developing the student-teacher data linkage. Mr. Goddard indicated that there is a timeline. The subcommittee has the data needed and hope to have the project completed by July so that next year clear guidance can be issued. The subcommittee, however, does want input from the PEAC to ensure the subcommittee's work does not overstep the appropriate boundaries.

One PEAC member asked why PEAC needed to be part of this conversation and expressed concern over PEAC's role in issue guidance on the topic. Dr. Ponisciak responded that because PEAC must recommend a state model for student growth, they must also provide guidance and recommendations on these questions about linking students and teachers for the purpose of attributing the student's growth to the teacher. Mrs. Phillips stated that the purpose of the conversation today was to avoid creating alternative conflicting information. The member stated his rising concern over how the information might eventually be used.

Mrs. Weber summarized the discussion and noted that PEAC would look forward to hearing additional questions from Mr. Goddard at the April meeting.

**Public comment:**

Amy Alsop (IFT) expressed support and anticipation for the work that Dr. Hackett and her staff are conducting around evaluation for teachers of students with disabilities. She asked that as guidance was developed, the writers keep in mind that the final product needs to reflect all of the geography of Illinois.

**SYMBOL KEY**



= General guidance to all districts (includes topics related to principal evaluation, re-calibration of evaluators, etc.)



= Required element of the state teacher evaluation model; any district unable to reach a collective bargaining agreement would default to these required elements of the state model.



= Recommended element of the state teacher evaluation model; all districts can use these elements as guidance and can adopt, adapt, modify, or ignore them as best fits their district needs.



= Communications document from PEAC to LEAs (shorter overview documents).