

---

# Final Transcript

## STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top

April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

### **SPEAKERS AND ATTENDEES**

Eileen McDaniel, Bureau Chief for Educator Recruitment, Development, and Retention  
Kimberly Pippin, Program Specialist, Bureau of Educator Recruitment, Development, and Retention  
Tonya Jones, Program Specialist, Bureau of Educator Recruitment, Development, and Retention  
Kay Caster, Educational Policy Consultant, Office of Educator Preparation  
Jason Gaitanis, Department of Education  
Elisa Calabrese, Broward  
Susan McEachin, Dade  
Ana Blaine, Daytona State College  
Erin Harrel, Edison State College  
Catherine Boehme, Escambia  
Mark Howse, FAMU  
Adriana McEachern, FIU  
Tamara Perry, Marion  
Debbie Cooke  
Megan Pankiewicz, Seminole  
Gloria Pelaez, U. Miami  
Lance Tomei, UCF  
Jasmine Ulmer, Union  
Joe Joyner, St. Johns

## PRESENTATION

(The majority of “indiscernible” areas are due to participants speaking over each other)

Coordinator            Good day, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee Meeting. At this time, all participants are in listen-only mode and will remain muted for the duration of the conference. (Operator Instructions.)

I would now like to turn the conference over to your host for today, Eileen McDaniel, Bureau Chief of Educator Recruitment, Development and Retention. Please go ahead.

Eileen                    Good afternoon, everyone. Before we get started with the recording, we're going to do a roll call very quickly because we have a few of our committee members who have not joined the call yet. We think it's because you're not dialled in to the appropriate number. So, if as we call through and we don't hear from you, you are going to need to make sure you look at the WebEx recording and see the numbers for the chat box. Hang up and go to that number instead.

Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

So, we'll begin with Dr. Elisa Calabrese?

Elisa Present.

Eileen Dr. Susan McEachin? Ana Blaine?

Ana I'm here.

Eileen Thank you. Dr. Erin Harrel? Cathy Boehme?

Cathy Here.

Eileen Dr. Mark Howse?

Mark Here.

Eileen Dr. Adriana McEachern?

Adriana Here.

Eileen Debbie Cooke?

Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

Debbie                Here.

Eileen                Tamara Perry?

Tamara                Here.

Eileen                Megan Pankiewicz?

Megan                I'm here.

Eileen                Thank you, Megan. Gloria Pelaez?

Gloria                I'm here.

Eileen                Good. Dr. Tomei?

Lance                I'm here.

Eileen                Jasmine Ulmer?

Jasmine                Hi.

Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

Eileen                    Dr. Joe Joyner?

Joe                        I'm here.

Eileen                    Good. I think we've got everybody but one person or two persons on the call. So, if you weren't able to respond and me respond back to you, please look at the chat room and dial back in, please. WebEx team, could you start the recording?

Good afternoon, everyone. This is Eileen McDaniel, Bureau Chief for Educator Recruitment, Development, and Retention. I welcome all of you to the Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee Meeting, referred to as the TLPIC. This is a public meeting; therefore, I would like to welcome those who have joined us from the general public as well.

Participants from the general public have the capacity to listen to this meeting, but they're not able to comment during the meeting. All meeting materials are accessible on the website at [www.fldoe.org/committees/tlp.asp](http://www.fldoe.org/committees/tlp.asp). This site also includes an

area to submit recommendations for the committee's consideration.

Starting with the introduction portion of our meeting, I'd like to provide an opportunity for the department staff who have joined me today to introduce themselves and then proceed with introductions from the committee members who are participating in today's meeting. So, we'll begin with Kimberly Pippin. Kimberly?

Kimberly           Hi. My name is Kimberly Pippin. I'm a Program Specialist with the Bureau of Retention, Development, and Recruitment.

Tonya              Good afternoon. My name is Tonya Jones. I'm also a Program Specialist with the Bureau of Educator Recruitment, Development, and Retention.

Kay                My name's Kay Caster. I'm the Educational Policy Consultant in the Office of Educator Preparation.

Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

Eileen Thank you, everyone. Could we go ahead and have the committee members introduce themselves, please? Let's begin with our chairs. Dr. Calabrese, would you begin?

Elisa Yes, hello. This is Elisa Calabrese. I've been on this committee since the beginning as many of you. It's been a pleasure and it's nice hearing from all of you.

Jasmine Hi. I'm Jasmine Ulmer. I taught in Union County. I'm currently at the University of Florida as a Graduate Research Fellow.

Eileen I'll just call out your names and you can introduce yourself and tell us what district you're from. I'm going to start at the bottom of the list this time. Dr. Joyner?

Joe Hi. I'm Joe Joyner, Superintendent in St. Johns County.

Eileen Thank you. Dr. Tomei?

Lance Hi. I'm Lance Tomei, formerly of the University of Central Florida, now retired from UCF, and an educational consultant.

Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

W [indiscernible].

Eileen Dr. Pelaez?

Gloria Hello. I'm Gloria Pelaez from the University of Miami. I've been a member of the committee since its inception and it's wonderful to hear from everybody.

Eileen Megan Pankiewicz?

Megan Hi. I'm Megan Pankiewicz. I was a teacher at [indiscernible] in Seminole County. When I joined this committee, I had zero children. I now have two and I'm a stay-at-home mom now. And, I'm also executive director and program co-chair of the Florida Council of Teachers of English.

Eileen Debbie Cooke?

Debbie Hi. I'm Debbie Cooke. I have been with the committee since its inception. And, I've actually had the same job that I started on the committee with. I'm the Executive Director for the Florida Association for Staff Development.



Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

Eileen Tamara Perry?

Tamara Hi. I'm Tamara Perry. I'm a teacher in Marion County.

Eileen Adriana McEachern?

Adriana Hi. I'm Adriana McEachern and I am Program Director and Associate Professor in the Counsellor Education Program at Florida International University in Miami. I have also been on the committee since its inception. It's nice to talk to all of you again.

Eileen Dr. Howse?

Mark Good afternoon, everyone. Again, Mark Howse. I am Associate Professor in the College of Education and Director of University Assessment at Florida A&M University here in Tallahassee, Florida. I've also been a member of this committee since its inception.

Eileen Cathy Boehme?

Cathy                   Hi. This is Cathy Boehme. I also am one of the original members and still hold my original teaching job in Escambia County.

Eileen                   Dr. Harrel? Dr. Harrel, if you can hear us, but we can't hear you, if you'll try dialling into the number on the chat room, that would be helpful. Ana Blaine?

Ana                       Hi, everyone. This is Ana. I'm an Assistant Professor at Daytona State College. I oversee the clinical experiences and educator preparation institute. Like Megan, I, too, added an addition to my family since I've been on the committee, which you'll probably hear in the background. I've been with the committee since the inception as well.

W                       [indiscernible].

Eileen                   Dr. McEachin? Susan, it appears that I believe you are signed in to the webinar, but you may not be on the right conference call line so you can participate. So, if you'll look at the chat room, you'll see another number you can call.

So, I'm going to go ahead and proceed and thank you very much, committee members, for joining us today. We so appreciate it. We're going to go ahead and get started with the agenda. After presenting the meeting goals, Dr. Lance Tomei will present an overview of the performance metrics, which were recommended by the TLPIC to the Commissioner of Education and became a part of the State Board of Education's legislative agenda for the 2013 legislature. During the 2013 session, Senate Bill 1664 included these six performance metrics. They are currently in Section 1004.04, Section 1004.85, and Section 1012.56 of the Florida Statutes for each of the three state approved teacher preparation routes in Florida.

Next, Dr. Tomei will present proposals for studying performance targets for the teacher evaluation metrics and then provide time for the committee to discuss and come to a consensus. So, moving on to Slide 2, we'd like to begin this meeting by recognizing the TLPIC's primary goal as displayed on the second slide of the PowerPoint presentation. The committee is charged with providing input, feedback and recommendations

to assist the department with developing performance standards and targets for continued approval of Florida's State approved teacher preparation programs, as well as the school leadership programs. Today, our meeting will only focus on teacher preparation.

Since the committee has not met in about a year, I pre-identified the list of current participating committee members. This slide does not include prior committee members who were instrumental in the establishing of prior performance metrics and targets for continued approval in the teacher preparation programs.

On Slide 4, the goal of today's meeting is to review multiple proposals for establishing performance targets for the teacher evaluation metric to include in the draft Rule 6A-5.066 Approval of Teacher Preparation Programs. At this time, I will turn the presentation over to Dr. Tomei, who will present on Slides 5 through 17. Dr. Tomei?

Lance                      Thanks, Eileen. Hello, everybody. It's good to be back together again. Slide 5 is just kind of a recap of the six

performance metrics for teacher preparation programs that we had recommended as a committee, and which are now, as you've heard from Eileen, are in statute in the state of Florida. For all but one of those, we have also made the recommendations on what the different performance levels and the criteria for those levels would be. So, the one task that we still have at hand is to come up with recommendations for these criteria for the core performance levels for the teacher evaluation metric. That's why that one is highlighted in red. That's really the focus of the meeting today, and that's what I'll be concentrating on in my comments today.

When we first looked at this metric, we had agreed, of course, that there were going to be four levels of program performance and in this particular metric, we look at three years of aggregated annual teacher evaluation data. The specific three years that we looked at when we actually started to look at some proposed criteria and wanted to look at some [indiscernible] local data was teacher evaluation data for academic years 2008-2009, '09-'10, and '10-'11 for program completers who were still employed in 2011-2012.

Initially, the Florida Department of Education staff came up with a first draft, if you will, of some possible performance criteria. They actually sent those criteria to me and asked me to take a look at them and give them some feedback on what I was looking at. I just see a few things in there. Overall, I thought it was a pretty good approach, but I had a couple of recommendations for them.

If we go to the next slide, this was the original draft of the performance levels. What I did when I looked at this, I thought in general this was a good first stab at what the performance level criteria should be. But, I did have a couple of early minor concerns about some potential unintended consequences, and I wanted to make sure that when we established criteria or recommended criteria as a committee that the criteria collectively would encompass all possible outcomes and that the four different performance levels would absolutely be mutually exclusive so that we didn't run into any issues in assigning values.

If you look at the initial proposal for Level 4, it's clear what the intent there was. But, as I started thinking about that, one

example that came to mind was suppose you had an institution or a program that had 15% of its completers who rated highly effective and 78% rated effective? Technically, that particular program would exceed the intent of Level 4, but would not meet the criteria as they were originally written. So, it was those types of minor editing issues that I have that I tried to make some recommendations back to DOE on some things that we could do to modify this.

If you go on to the next slide, please, this was my edited version of what the first draft looked like. Again, I just tried to clarify, so I changed the first one to at least 10% receiving the highly effective and then a combined percentage of 90 for both highly effective/effective. Also, that no completers were rated unsatisfactory.

As you can see the different levels here, I'm going to give you a minute to go ahead and look through those. There's no reason for me to read them. Well, maybe I should read them because I guess we've got people listening that may not be seeing this. So, let me go through this quickly.

Level 3 criteria would simply state Level 4 criteria are not met, but at least 80% of the programs completers received either highly effective or effective ratings, and no completers were rated unsatisfactory. Unsatisfactory is Level 1 for anybody that can't see this slide. Level 2 at least 60% of the programs completers received highly effective or effective ratings and no more than 5% or no more than 1 for an  $n$  of less than 20 of the programs completers were rated unsatisfactory. Level 1 would be less than 60% of the programs completers received highly effective or effective ratings or more than 5% received an unsatisfactory rating.

But, those are the proposals that I sent back to DOE. Then, we ran some historical data. After analysing the historical data, and we'll go through that momentarily, I had one additional change that I recommended. That was that we increase that portion, the provision for Level 4 to at least 10% highly effective. The [indiscernible] that we needed to raise the bottom on that to 40% and we're going to show you the data that resulted in my drawing that conclusion in the next sequence of slides here; everything else remained the same.



So, let's go on to the first data slide, if we could. When we looked at the data for the 10%, the original draft two corrected draft, these were the results as you can see how many programs would have been rated after each of the four levels by program category. We looked at this both by program and in the case of ITPs, we duly also aggregated the data by institution. Of course, that doesn't matter for DACPs and EPIs. Those numbers don't change.

But, the next slide will show you what the results were by institution. But, before we go on to that, I want you to note that the concern – could we back up one slide? Okay. The concern I had when I looked at the results of the data is that I thought back to what we as a committee had discussed many, many times – that some of our underlying principles in the work that we've undertaken, some of the broad goals that I think we've all collectively agreed to is that our primary purpose of doing this work was to identify truly exemplary educator preparation programs, how the system [indiscernible] to identify programs that were underperforming, that should have desperately needed to improve the quality of their work, and between those two things to have the information we needed to be very

effective in promoting continuous quality improvement in educator preparation in the state of Florida.

So, when I looked at the data and I thought we're identifying over half of the programs as being highly effective, it seemed counterproductive to me to [indiscernible] broad goal of the committee. [People talking over speaker] [indiscernible]. So, I did some subsequent analysis at my end. I took a look at what would the numbers look like if we raised the bar to 20%. So, next slide.

This, by the way, this was a 10% slide at the program level. So, the only thing that's changed there is the ITP numbers are more aggregated because it's by institution and not by program. Again, you'll see over half of the institutions would have had an overall rating of highly effective.

Next slide is the 20% picture. It provides a little bit better distribution at the top end. Since the only thing I changed was a portion of the Level 4 criterion, the only thing that will shift here is between Level 4 and Level 3. There is no change in Levels 1 or 2 in any of these subsequent analyses because

none of the criteria for those two levels were impacted by the one change to Level 4.

So, at 20%, you see there's still a fairly substantial number of folks, in fact, it came out to 38% of all programs rated as highly effective. So, then I looked at 25%. That dropped the number down to 105, the percentage to about 33%. I went to 30%.

Next slide, please. That dropped the number down to 80, the percentage down to about 26%. Then, I looked at 40%. At 40%, I saw something that began to look more like the kinds of breakouts statistically that we've been looking for proportionately where we're somewhere in the 15, 16, 17% range in that highest performance level. So, that we really are able to identify those programs that are significantly outperforming other programs where we can then go in and look and see what is that they're doing, what great practices can we share with the rest of the community in Florida. This is where I hit a comfort level that the distribution looks pretty good to me.

Also, you'll notice that none of those changes, as I said earlier, increased the number of programs that are identified as performing at below Levels 1 or 2. Again, at that level, we really are looking for the two outliers and we're looking for ways to help them improve their performance so they can get at least up to Level 3 in the near term. Obviously everybody aspires to Level 4 in the long term.

So, at this level, I was pretty comfortable and we also took a look at what did that do for the ITPs at the institutional level? That's in the next slide. That's [indiscernible] because what you see here is now there's an incentive with aggregation at the institutional levels shows that there's room for improvement at every institution out there that's for current teachers. I don't think any of us would question that that's always the case. There's always room for continuous quality improvement. So, I wasn't particularly troubled by that either.

When I looked at all of the data, this is where I came up with a fairly high comfort level that now we're producing results that are consistent both looking at what we're trying to accomplish as a committee and looking conceptually at how teachers are

being evaluated across the state and what the percentages look like in the different levels of performance for teachers. So, I think this is, at least from my perspective, about where we want to be in this particular metric and this is why I went back to the committee and made that recommendation. This is just a repeat of that earlier third draft of the performance metrics that I recommended back to the department to bring it to the committee for our discussion and consideration to see if this is close to what we want to recommend to the commissioner.

Now, I think that's it for my portion of the briefing. It's a lot shorter than what the agenda called for. But, I think most of the time probably we need to reserve for discussion among the committee members.

W So, we're looking at Slide 17 as the third draft and this is the proposed performance levels that you are recommending based on the research that you have conducted? Correct, Lance?

Lance That's correct.

Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

W So, does anyone have any questions for Lance?

Gloria Yes, I do. Hi, Lance. This is Gloria Pelaez.

Lance Hi, Gloria.

Gloria The only question I have, so first of all, thank you for doing this and for making it so very clear for all of us. The only thing that I do have a question about looking at the language across all levels, I believe in some of our meetings we did say that we wanted to make sure that we had an addition after unsatisfactory that says if teaching in the area in which they were prepared by the institution.

Because, for example, we prepared an elementary ed teacher at UM. The student was hired to Teach for America to teach secondary math, and when we got our data back, she got an unsatisfactory. I never prepared her to teach math. I prepared her to teach elementary ed, with an ESL endorsement.

Lance Yes, I agree. I think the committee's position has always been that all of the data that's used in any of our metrics that involves

Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

teacher performance in any way, shape, or form the teachers have to be both in field and in program or they should not be included in the database. So, to me that's a data management issue, not a metric issue. We just need to make sure that that type or those types of teachers that are out of field or out of program are not included in the metric or in the calculation for a particular program. So, I agree with you wholeheartedly. We probably need to make sure that we have that caveat in there. Because it [indiscernible] performance level.

Gloria I would really like to have that caveat there, absolutely.

Lance I agree.

Adriana So, Lance, this is Adriana. For Level 4 based on the data you looked at at the 40% that about 33% of the institutions, the ITP ones, right, would be at that Level 4. Correct?

Lance No. Institutions there would be none at Level 4. If you look at Slide –

Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

Adriana Yes, I can't. I wanted to go back, but this thing won't let me.

Oh, here we go, thank you.

Lance Okay, at the institutional level, which again the only thing that changes there is data for the ITPs, of the 39 institutions for which we have performance data here, 6 were at Level 2 and 33 were at Level 3. There were no Level 1s and no Level 4s.

W But, we're not really looking at this by institution now. We're looking at this by program level, correct?

Lance That's correct. This is a program [indiscernible] metric. This is information that to me to look at this by institutional level might be of value to the Florida Department of Education because if an entire institution is performing at Level 2, obviously that's happening because a number of their programs are at Level 1 or 2. So, sometimes it could be things going on that are issues at the institutional level that transcend individual programs, things that individual programs that can deal with.

So, just being able to identify institutions that have that kind of overall rating of Level 2, I think this is useful. But, I think that's



more of an internal tool for the Florida Department of Education to figure out what they would do with that information. The only thing that this would be used for in terms of formal accountability that the report cards that are going out to programs would be Slide [indiscernible] which is program level data and we do have institutional programs performing at all four levels.

Adriana All right, so is that a 33%? Is that what I heard you say? I heard –

Lance No. There are 68 total institutions across all three program types. Out of 402 total programs, that represents 16.9% at Level 4.

Adrian Oh, okay.

Lance So, we're looking at top six and we've talked repeatedly when we discussed performance criteria for other metrics, we've had that conversation where we've been looking, just kind of I think our thinking on this was that at the top levels, at least in the early stages of this accountability program, we ought be

Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

shooting for somewhere in the 15 to 20% as probably how many ought to be in that top level. So, that's really what drove my thinking is from the collective belief of the committee and all the discussions we've had historically on the different metrics that that's kind of the range that we want to see that top level in in terms of percentages of programs that are attaining that level of performance.

Adriana                      Okay, thank you.

Gloria                        I have another question that perhaps should be answered or addressed by Eileen. How many states are setting this kind of benchmark at the 40 percentile?

Eileen                        How many states are setting this? Remember Florida is the only one, Gloria, that actually had these performance metrics in place right now in law. If other states are exploring similar metrics, I'm not aware of it at this point.

Gloria                        Okay, thank you, Eileen. So, Lance, your recommendation you said we go with the 40%?

Lance Yes, for Level 4 criteria. The only thing that's changed after I looked at all the data was that recommendation that was changed for requiring 10% to be highly effective, should we find 40% to be highly effective, and at least 90% highly effective or effective combined.

Gloria Lance, this is extremely high and I wouldn't like to start with a metric that no institution is at Level 4.

Joe Can I ask Eileen a question? I'm looking at – this is Joe Joyner. I'm looking at '11-'12 survey five data and it appears as though 22% of the teachers in the state of Florida were highly effective.

Eileen Yes, sir.

Joe So, that's overall. Do we have the – I've been trying to search for that paper. Do we have the '12-'13 data and do we know what percentage of the teachers in the state of Florida were given a highly effective rating?

Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

Eileen                    It is available on the web site, too, Dr. Joyner. It's on a separate link. And, I don't know that number right off the top of my head, no.

Cathy                    Eileen, this is Cathy Boehme. I just sent a couple of documents by e-mail. I'm looking at the '12-'13 and the bottom of the column it's 32.3%. So, I have concerns because I'm looking at the number of counties that have less than 40% [indiscernible] highly effective. It's highly variable. We have –

Joe                        That's the point I was trying to make in looking at overall state wide.

Gloria                    Thank you. That's the point I was trying to make as well.

W                         There's an e-mail from Cathy Boehme that she sent. It has the links to that data that you're speaking of. Here's many of us on the team now.

Gloria                    Unfortunately, I cannot access e-mail. It will throw me out of the webcast. [indiscernible].

Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

Joe                      Just a sense for where we are with the whole overall evaluation system for teachers, it is extremely variable right now and we're working hard in areas of inter-rated reliability. Remember, this system is brand new. So, when you look county by county you're going to see some wide variances. It really depends on how strictly the observable piece is being looked at by each county. So I think we're finding our way as a state, but to say that we're there when you look county by county, I think we're still finding our way.

So, what does that mean as it relates to teacher prep programs? I think at least initially because the teachers were learning a brand new system, in our case it was Marzano, we understood that you can be expected to be highly performing in a system you've not yet learned. In our case, this legislation passed in May. We had to have a plan to DOE by June, and we had to begin using it in August with zero staff development.

So, these scores that you see were obviously fairly low. So, you have some districts that just because you're assessing someone on something they haven't even learned, whether they learn it in college or their university program or their

teacher prep program or they learn it through staff development with us, it's all brand new to everybody. Because of that reality, we looked at it and said we need to bring some humanity to this judgment, especially in its initial stages. And when we felt that our inter-rated reliability and our training was at a high level, then we could expect more. But, I think that's an important understanding when you look at the overall picture in Florida.

Lance

I talked about that a little bit with DOE. We had some discussions. In fact, I recommended – Eileen and I had this conversation and I recommended that when these report cards go out that they not only provide the benchmark for educator preparation programs and what the averages are or what the state-wide statistics look like, but also for individual teacher evaluations.

Keep in mind, however, that I'm not sure that we need to have a percentage for programs, an average that is at or below the overall teacher because what we're trying to find is highly effective educator preparation programs so that we can look to them to see what are those truly exceptional things that they're

doing that we can use to help other programs identify opportunities for improvement.

Joe I don't disagree. But, just remember you are picking a number and you're trying to norm this thing. I just looked through this. When we create this and it gets published, there'll be a public records request the day it comes out. For those people who want to judge teacher prep programs, they are going to rank them and they are going to judge them. That is going to happen, so I just want to make sure that when we say this program is highly effective that we in our heart of hearts know that it's highly effective.

Lance Keep in mind that this is one of six metrics that will ultimately determine the overall performance level for an educator preparation program.

Elisa Lance, this is Elisa. I had this discussion with you in our pre-conference about talking about the differences between districts and their scoring method. You had an answer for me that perhaps you'd like to share with Dr. Joyner.

Lance                    Well, I'll try and remember what exactly we talked about. But, I think one of the issues is that you've got a lot of definitely different districts are going to have somewhat different statistics. Most institutions are supporting multiple districts and we know that it's not necessarily a level playing field, but we're also aggregating for all of the program completers across the program. Again, this is a somewhat different metric by looking at an individual teacher.

The other thing is I think that over time, we said all along that the metrics and the performance criteria for the metrics may need to be modified as we become more informed and have more data under our belt. One of the things I think ultimately that we need to do here is tie the performance metrics for educator preparation programs based on their completers' teacher evaluation statistics to those state-wide statistics, because my guess is those are going to change over time and I think that we've already heard that, at every level of this new accountability system where we're still having a pretty steep learning curve.



So, I think that at some point in time we're going to have to tie to those additional benchmarks. So, this is the first go-round and really what drove me was just a sense of where do we start to really isolate a fairly manageable group of preparation programs that appear to be outperforming many of their colleagues around the state and from whom we might be able to learn some best practices. That's really what we're after here.

Keep in mind that anybody that as we went through this drill, or as I went through this statistical drill, raising that percentage from 10 to 20 to 25 to 30 to 40, nobody fell lower than a Level 3. The only thing that changed was some programs that might initially have been classified as highly effective would drop into the effective range, which is not going to be particularly problematic for program accountability purposes. I understand there's a public perception. But, my goal, again, and I think our goal has always been we're trying to build a system here that will promote continuous quality improvement as our primary objective.

Gloria                    Lance, I understand what you're saying, but I need to go back to report what Superintendent Joyner said. Unfortunately, teacher preparation and teachers in general are in the public view on a national level in this country to an extent that is unprecedented from a historical perspective. I, for one, do not like this 40% benchmark for Level 4, because I in my heart of hearts do not believe that there is not at least one or two programs in the state of Florida that are not currently highly effective, understanding the premise that even if you're highly effective you have room for improvement.

I think that [indiscernible] –

Lance                    Well, at 40% we have 68 programs that are rated highly effective; 68 out of 432. That 40% are rated highly effective.

Joe                        Well, the issue is you're in a difficult position because you don't have a set of statistics that you know are reliable. So, and I'm not going to use the word "arbitrary", but you're basing our cut score, and again I'm not criticising the work, I'm just saying how difficult this is, on a variable measure that's given by school districts. So, it's just going to be very difficult because it is so

new to us. As school districts have to learn all of the rubrics and how to apply them, and then not only do we have to have inter-rated reliability within our district, but then we've got to form it across districts. That is ground that has not been plowed yet. So, it makes it very difficult, and I know you have to do it, but just as part of the discussion it makes it very difficult for us to set a bar that we're coupled with when the actual data that we're using is in flux.

Cathy

This is Cathy Boehme. Let me add to that. I just did a quick count. Sixty-one percent of the counties in Florida in '12-'13 did not have 40% highly effective. So, how can we hold the teacher prep programs to that kind of a standard? Right now, we're using all different kinds of evaluations and we have large counties and small counties that have everybody highly effective and then we've got a bunch that don't have anybody highly effective. I don't think that that's a measure that's meaningful.

W

Not only that, we're moving to Common Core standards so, I think as the superintendent said, we're starting all that training and some of the teachers have not been trained on the

Common Core. So, how is all that going to enter into the data and the statistics that are going to come out in terms of teacher effectiveness? I think we need a little bit of time, a little bit of wiggle room to really take a look at some of that data before we set. These are very, very high standards.

So, I kind of agree with my other colleagues to maybe reduce that 40% or increase it rather. Increase it to maybe 50%.

Joe

The issue, I think the problem where you see the variance when you look at county by county data is the variance between effective and highly effective. That's where we're struggling. When you've combined, which I like, Lance, in the Level 4 designation 90% are highly effective or effective, that should be 90% either highly effective or effective if 10% of the teachers that are leaving are unsatisfactory, that's unacceptable.

So, when you combine the two together, I think you increase you're reliability that that in fact this is a quality program, because our problem as districts really has to do, and if you're looking at the chart, it really has to do with what is highly

effective and what's effective, not necessarily what is needs improvement or what is unsatisfactory.

Debbie Hi. This is Debbie. I just have a couple of comments. One of them is let's begin our conversation by saying one of the givens as a committee we thought that we might all agree about at the beginning was that we did want to insure that we were able to separate out exemplary programs. So, I think that that's just one of the questions we have to ask ourselves is understanding the political ramifications and understanding that people are going to look to see who's rated a four, who's rated a three and that sort of thing. There's the issue of actually identifying exemplary programs by the numbers that we set and then there's the issue of trying to make sure that our programs are marketable because we've not been too harsh on ourselves. I understand that that's really hard. I would be in favor of setting a more rigorous standard so that we would be truly identifying exemplary programs.

The second thing I want to say is that Lance also pointed out that this is one of six indicators. It's not the only indicator.

There are other things that are going to inform our decision. I

would hate to see us be more lenient on ourselves rather than more hard on ourselves if what we're looking for are the exemplars. That's all I want to say. Thank you.

W But, these metrics could be changed in a couple of years.  
Correct?

W Yes.

Gloria I think we're being very premature because everybody that I hear, superintendents, teachers, principals, the expectation is, the Common Core or whatever we want to call it in Florida, scores of [indiscernible] will be going down at least for a couple of years until everybody gets properly trained, et cetera, and I would say to commit political suicide or a marketing suicide for our institutions. We are like a moving target, it seems to me. I just don't feel comfortable with setting these kinds of standards.

In addition, some of us, and I would love for my colleagues from FIU to also comment on this, we're down by one district. Our district, Miami-Dade Public Schools, doesn't use Marzano. They use another –

W They use another metric in their performance.

Gloria Another metric. They are not transparent with the use of the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices. Unfortunately, they're all over the place. So the variance within districts and how districts are evaluating their teachers, it's extremely wide. I would urge the committee to err on the side of caution.

Adriana This is Adriana. I have to agree with Gloria on that. I mean at least for the next couple of years because we really have to give the folks throughout Florida, these districts, some time to really implement these new standards and we're going to be seeing new assessments. So, you're going to be holding institutions accountable also for these metrics. I think that could be detrimental to some institutions.

Gloria I believe even for the teaching field to attract good candidates, I think it could be extremely detrimental.

Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

W Eileen, let me ask you a question. For these metrics, we're looking at the performance levels for the metric, but we did not assign weights to individual metrics for [indiscernible], correct?

Eileen I'm not sure what you mean.

W Will teacher evaluation be 20% of the accountability model? Will retention be 20% or 30%? Will performance of students be 10% or 50%?

Eileen You said, what you had recommended was that each of them be equally weighted except for [indiscernible]. Five would be equally weighted and the recommendation was for the production of critical teacher shortage areas would be a bonus.

W Oh, okay. That's right.

W So, we wouldn't even be given any kind of a bonus for this metric, right?

W Yes, this is a [indiscernible].



Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

W Right.

Eileen What I'd like to add right here is I've got the law in front of me and the law doesn't talk about any of that. These are all your recommendations. The law just lists the six metrics, whatever recommendation you want to do whether it's a bonus or what, that's up to you. But, this would be the metrics that need to be put in place.

And, while I've got you what the law says, going back to Gloria's point and agreed by many of you that you wanted to insure that this would be applied to only those who were in field, the law does not specify that it would be in field. There are two of the metrics that the law specified that it must be based on in field program completers. But, for this particular one, the law does not state that. So, that may be a recommendation of yours, but it's not what the law states.

Gloria Well, we could be penalized, Eileen, if I heard you correctly, for somebody who's hired out of field that's unsatisfactory?

M But, you could put that in rule, could you not, Eileen?

Eileen                    That could be a recommendation to the commissioner and on top of that realize that we don't know, we didn't write it this way, many teachers across the state have had their evaluation based on they're not necessarily in field and did that have an impact on their evaluation rating? I don't know. We didn't examine that.

Gloria                    Well, you know that's what I –

Eileen                    We still have over 97% that are effective and highly effective in this state, whether they're in field or out of field.

Cathy                    Eileen?

Eileen                    Yes?

Cathy                    This is Cathy Boehme. I have a different question about the criteria and it's the unsatisfactory. When a person teaches for more than a semester, they get a rating whether they finish the year or not. Is that correct?

Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

Eileen I've got Jason Gaitanis is here helping us with this. I think sometimes it depends on the district and how they determine it. How long are they actually teaching for the year?

Jason Ask that again?

Cathy What I'm wondering is if the teacher was to resign before the end of the year, would that unsatisfactory count? Would that actually be reported and recorded?

Jason I do not think so. Not if they resigned before the end of the year.

Eileen I think that would some [indiscernible] Joe, would that not necessarily be something that is maybe even within the district policy of how long a teacher is or when did they leave?

Joe It really, what you have is someone is going to get a bad evaluation and they choose to resign just because they know that, we will post it anyway just because. So, you're right. It really depends on when and the circumstances behind it. So, I guess you would have districts all doing it in a similar way.

Because what you would want to avoid, I mean teachers who are going to get a bad evaluation, they know it before the last day of school. So, I would imagine you'll see different ways.

You know, I wonder, Lance, if a safe number would be to look at the state average, even though there is wide variation. I don't know what they said, the survey five data center said it was 33% highly effective last year. At least you could have a reason. I would wonder how the numbers would come out if you did it at the state average.

Cathy

This is Cathy Boehme again. My preference would be to drop the highly effective part of the descriptor and just go with a percent highly effective and effective, because we're clearly not holding teachers to the same standard district to district to district. Some of us geographically have a huge impact on preparation institutions that we're around. Escambia County we really don't pick up many student teachers except from one university. Duval County is another one that's got around 10% highly effective. So, you've got an institution, several institutions over there that are doing teacher prep. I just don't think that geographic locations ought to effect teacher

programs because of the way the district chooses to evaluate their teachers.

Joe I actually agree with that for the time being; only for the time being because of where we are in our issues with highly effective and effective.

Debbie This is Debbie. So, Cathy, what you're recommending is that we take out the stuff before the "and". Is that what you said?

Cathy Yes. And, just remove the differentiator for highly effective.

Debbie So, Level 4 would just read, "at least 90% receive a highly effective or effective rating and no completers are rated unsatisfactory".

Cathy Well, and there we go back – yes, except for the no completers/completers unsatisfactory because I have the concerns that Gloria does about it's not restricted to in program/in field. I have difficulty just holding institutions accountable for students if they didn't train for those particular jobs.

Debbie                    So, you would take that out at every level?

Cathy                    Yes. So, I would leave it with just the percent effective and highly effective and to stop there.

Lance                    Can I jump again here? If we're going to include in our recommendation that the statistics be based only on the in field/in program, then I wouldn't want to make a change that's based on a concern about the impact of how the fields are out of program completers if we're going to suggest that they not be included in the data.

The other concern I would have if we eliminate or aggregate highly effective and effective, if you look at 90% and you just say either/or highly effective or effective, and Eileen just told us that across the entire state 97% of all teachers are rated highly effective or effective and now we're going to say if you're a preparation program and 90% of your teachers are rated highly effective or effective, then as a preparation program even though you're not getting close to the state-wide average, you're highly effective as a preparation program. That's my

Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

concern here is that I'm almost concerned that we're confusing what makes sense for individual teacher statistics versus what we ought to be looking for in terms of trying to identify those truly exemplary preparation programs.

We know we need to raise the bar in educator preparation. If we tone this down too much, in my mind, we're going to be counterproductive to one of our own primary goals. Maybe the right number is not 40%, but I'd be real leery about going to a collective 90% for highly effective when, again, 97% of the teachers state-wide are getting that rating. I think we're rendering this whole concept of identifying highly effective preparation programs at that point of very little value at all.

W But, Lance, what if we were to go to 50%?

W [indiscernible]

Lance You're talking about raising the bar, then I actually did crunch those numbers at the program level and the percentage of programs that would be rated highly effective would drop from

Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

16.9 to 13.4. I think most people what I'm hearing are actually thinking about going in the other direction.

W So, if we go, then what if we go 30%?

Lance Then, we're at 25.6% of the programs are highly effective.

W Okay. Well, see that sounds more reasonable to me.

W I would give the suggestion of tying it to the state average, the 33% number that he made, because –

W Yes.

W I'm not a statistician. I mean I taught English. And, I don't like that feeling of coming up with numbers and setting a bar basically to get the result we want. I like the idea of tying it to some sort of other number that makes sense; that correlates.

Adriana This is Adriana. I think 25% to 33% sounds like a more reasonable percentage to hold the institutions accountable for.



Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

Gloria I agree with Adriana. I agree. It's Gloria.

Ana Hey, guys. This is Ana. I'm sorry, hold on. My concern with tying it to the 33% state average that we have now is if that number's going to change every year, and then it's the expectation that the average for the next group is going to change every year?

Adriana Well, I think getting back to my point was, I think we need to give the districts and the teacher prep programs a little time to absorb what some of these changes are going to mean statistically-wise and data-wise. So, I think if we could –

Joe Maybe it should. I think as we learn how to become better teachers, you know this is the first time we've ever tackled a research based teacher evaluation system. As our teachers get better, we should expect more of them. When we created our performance pay plan, we've been doing this ranking for a dozen years now, so it has huge implications in peoples' assumptions of the quality of your work. I can tell you. The minute they create that list, if I was one of you guys, I'd want to know where I stood on the list because this has huge

Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

implications. I know it because we've been ranked for a dozen year now.

But, I think one thing that we realize is that we're brand new with a research based system, and yes, this is going to push teacher prep programs to go to more of this instruction. As we all learn to get better, the bar should get based. That's okay.

Gloria                      That's right.

Erin                         This is Erin. Can you hear me?

Eileen                     Yes, we can, Erin.

Erin                         Good. I agree wholeheartedly, but is that something in legislation that we know is going to change or to make a recommendation that we know is going to change that so far it's huge, but our state averages right now it's problematic.

W                             Yes.

Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

W Are you thinking the 40% exceeds the state average for highly effective?

Erin Right. We have 22.6% and what was just said here from Cathy Boehme and [indiscernible] to expect that 40% of our teachers will be highly effective [indiscernible] –

Joe That's two years old though. What was it last year? Because I know Cathy just sent an e-mail out. What is it now? What was it last school year?

W Thirty-five point three. It was [indiscernible]. Thirty-two point three highly effective.

Gloria Thirty-three? Thirty-two, thirty-three?

W Yes.

W Thank you.

W So, in one year, it's gone up 10%?

Gloria But remember, in one year it's gone up 10%. But, we will be changing to Common Core or the Florida standards, whatever, and we have new assessment with a new company doing the assessment.

W The other thing is you have to look at individual counties. We've got more than half of the counties where highly effective was below 40%. So, the mean is a number, but you also have to look at all of the other numbers that go into it. Just kind of scan through and look at the counties. Look at the difference in the number of highly effective teachers. I cannot be convinced that FAMU lab schools only had 6.9% highly effective and Okaloosa County has 85% highly effective. Those are two numbers off of this chart. I just have a lot of trouble with differentiating at all with highly effective and effective because district to district we are so inconsistent in the way that we apply the evaluation we're using.

Ana This is Ana again. This might be a clarification for me. I think because we're using the same language in our metric system as in the evaluation system of highly effective is where I'm getting confused, because I thought that the fours, the

institutions that scored four were those institutions were those institutions that went above and beyond the expectation. The institutions that scored at a Level 3 are meeting the expectations.

So, for example, if the state average of highly effective teachers was 33.2, then institutions at a Level 3 should meet that standard. Institutions at a Level 4 should be way above that because actually we only want to see a handful of institutions that we do want to recognize as distinguished, going above and beyond what the metric is. Am I understanding that correctly? I think the difference between a highly effective individual educator and a highly effective program is two totally different things.

W But, that's not what we're trying to say though.

Ana Are we uncomfortable that programs will be rated, programs that are doing exactly what they're supposed to be doing and producing quality educators are rated a three? Is that where maybe the problem lies?

Adriana                    Well, I think if we want to recognize these outstanding programs at the Level 4, then I think we need to give them some bonus points. So, what's the point then? What would be the incentive to try to reach that Level 4 if you're not going to get any incentives or extra points for that?

Gloria                    I'm sorry, but I think that having a very good program and having stellar teachers is incentive enough.

Adriana                    I know. I agree with that, Gloria. But, I'm saying I think that if we're going to hold programs accountable and we want them all at the Level 4, then there should be some kind of a reward. As we're at least giving bonus points for meeting critical shortage, then why can't we give bonus points for a certain percentage of our completers being highly effective?

Gloria                    Adriana, I wouldn't have a problem with that. Maybe I misunderstood the metric. But, I thought this was not a standards thing. I thought this was the rule; that we need to meet this in order to [indiscernible].

Adriana                    Well, we're coming up with bonuses for other metrics.

Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

Gloria [indiscernible]

Lance Part of the logic for that being a bonus metric, remember we discussed not wanting to incentivize poorly performing programs to increase production in critical teacher shortage areas. So, to be eligible for that bonus, a program has to be performing at Level 3 or Level 4. So, there were some special stipulations there that [indiscernible] why we had that conversation [indiscernible] bonus metric.

W So, to get that additional bonus for the critical shortage, the programs have to be at Level 3 or Level 4. Is that what you're saying?

Lance It has to be effective or highly effective. If you have Level 1 or 2, you would rather they're focusing their efforts on improving their preparation program rather than increasing production of teachers.

W Correct.

Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

W Well, I really want both.

Lance Well, fix the program first, then increase production. That's what I think our other underlying theory there.

W Just by having this metric, I'm just thinking out loud here, by having this metric and saying that they're at a Level 4 or a Level 2, what's specific to the metric will actually give them, give these programs, these individuals at higher ed that design the programs, what type of information, how detailed of information will there be for them [indiscernible] program components? How do they know which components to change that will move them from a two to a four?

Lance Well, I think there's a lot going on here in terms of the collaborative work that's done in educator preparations throughout the state of Florida. We've got a couple of very active organizations, state and fact-based where there's a lot of collegial activity taking place. One of our goals, I think, in being able to identify those highly effective programs is that they could then share their best practices or their effective practices, the things they're doing that are setting them apart, share that



information with the colleges around the state and that gives everybody additional information to help inform their decisions about continuous program quality improvement.

So, there's a lot of underlying stuff going on here, I think, in what we're trying to accomplish. [indiscernible] that we really do try and make sure that the highly effective label is being assigned to those programs that truly are exceeding expectations.

W I think there's just a lot of variables that go into that. Even just the different professors that a student may get during the course of their academic career could be different from one year to the next.

Joe That's the world we're living now, and have been living in. They don't care.

W [indiscernible]

Joe They won't care. Admittedly, of the six areas, this is the squishiest. It's no fault of the colleges because this is squishy.

It's brand new. That's why I'm saying if we roll the tide with what the districts are seeing on average, granted some of those districts that have a very, very low percentage of highly effective and they're going to be hurt. But, at least it would give you some justification, and this is just one element.

And to answer that question, there will be a tremendous amount of data and feedback based on this particular result, because when you look at the teacher evaluation system in Florida, it could be test scores. It could be very specific areas that teachers from a particular university or college are not performing well in, and you can get down to actual strands of where that weakness is. So, of all the things, rehiring or retention, of all the things that will give you specific data on the actual instructional practice and methodology, this will be it.

It always worries me. It's just like with school grading or grading with FCAT. If you call a child a failure, are you absolutely certain in your heart of hearts that that child is a failure? I understand if it is, it is. But, are you certain? So, are we certain when we label a university's program, are we certain

that we are calling somebody out who's highly effective? It's very difficult to do because it's squishy.

W Yes, I agree with that comment for sure.

Debbie This is Debbie. I would agree that that is true. We have five other elements that are helping point the arrows in that direction as well. So, this isn't the only indicator that we're looking at. We're looking at multiple indicators. Really the conversation that we're having here is exactly the same ones that we have in school centers when we changed our teacher evaluation systems.

Ana said something earlier about what the target is. We live in a world the best is where we've always wanted to be. The reality is we're trying to help our entire constituency understand that what we're looking for really is effective: effective teacher ed programs, effective instructors. That's the goal. That's the gold standard.

The conversation that we're having now is what we're really about finding those institutions that meet that gold standard and

Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

then go above it. I think that's why, I know all of your ramifications and the whole "nobody will want to come to our school if our teacher prep program isn't rated a Level 4." We have to help people understand that our target is effective programs at the teacher level and at the teacher prep level. That's hard for people to understand. I understand that.

Gloria I think that's a very wonderful goal; however, the reality is that the way that the chart reads where there's nobody that has a stellar program bothers me. Because [indiscernible].

Debbie I didn't see that. I didn't see that, but Lance said that wasn't true, didn't he?

W Where do you see that, Gloria?

W The 40%. There are no effective/highly effective. There's nobody in the highly effective. That's right.

Lance You're looking at the institution levels, ladies.

W If you look at the program.

Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

W The program level.

Gloria Oh, I want to look at the other slide: 16.

W Oh, we're not using –

W We're not using 16, we're only – that was just additional information to look at. What we're really looking at is slide 15.

Gloria I think it's unrealistic to expect teacher prep to produce at this level when the state doesn't.

Cathy This is Cathy. I agree. It's too much research that shows that teachers get better over time, for us to expect that the first year teachers are going to perform better than our veterans.

W Right.

Lance Well, let's put that in context, though. That's exactly right. So, if we held it to the most recent year, I think I heard the number somewhere around 33% of all teachers state-wide received

highly effective. So, let's use that benchmarks and now let's say okay, we've identified at the 40% level, we've identified 68 educator preparation programs in Florida that includes program completers in their first three years of practice are exceeding state-wide averages in teacher evaluations.

Or, we go to 30% and we say we've identified I think the number was 100+; let me go to Level 3 at the 30% slide. One hundred and three programs whose completers who are not quite leading the state-wide average, but they're getting close is 30% highly effective versus the 33. Which is the more compelling statement about truly identifying the highly effective programs?

W Forty percent.

W Yes.

Lance Which is what I think we're after from a program perspective. So, to me, I'm going to raise the bar. My mentality is to raise the bar. It's what's happening with teacher preparation accountability across the country. It's what's happening in

accreditation in teacher preparation. And, the bar is being raised and some of the expectations are being raised exponentially.

If we accept the bar at 40%, and then at the program level saw the same thing we see at the institution level for ITPs, nobody's there, I'd be concerned because then we're not achieving our own goal of finding those programs that are doing something that's leading to realistic steps of their new program completers during their early years of teaching. I think we want to find those programs that are doing something right, and then do the qualitative follow-up research to figure out what is it that they're doing that we can share with all programs to raise the bar in performance across the board. [indiscernible] about this.

W Yes, the follow-up is [indiscernible].

Cathy This is Cathy again. I hate looking at averages and applying a general statement to that because I still go back to how many districts are holding teacher evaluation highly effective bars very high? The way our district is going right now, I'm not ever seeing us having 40% highly effective because of the way we

apply the evaluation. That's the way we're using [indiscernible] plan and highly effective is where you lose it. So, I think it's not realistic.

But, the other thing is I think it's deceptive if we say the big programs are not highly effective and these other programs are at the Level 4s or the Level 3s. Trying to differentiate with a measure that is not meaningful doesn't help anybody determine what's going on.

Gloria                      Agreed.

Tamara                     This is Tamara. I haven't said much, but I've been looking at this. The 33.3% that you're talking about is all teachers, not just your new teachers. You're looking at 33% of state, of all of the teachers, us veteran teachers included. You're going to use, I think that number 40% is high if 33% of all the teachers including veteran teachers are highly effective.

W                             Just to reiterate, we're using a metric that we don't even know what it looks like yet. So, to set the bar that high, and Lance, I agree with what you're saying we want to set those institutions



Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

apart, and I'm all for accountability and I think that's great. But, I don't think we can set a metric that's almost unreachable for new teachers, let alone if we were looking at our veteran teachers five years out.

Lance                    Except we [indiscernible] 68% of the programs that [indiscernible] at historically for the past three years. That's the difference.

W                         Did you look at data for those in the first three years of their employment?

Lance                    Yes. It was 2008-2009, '09-'10, and '10-'11 completers who were still employed in 2011-2012. [indiscernible].

W                         Okay.

W                         So, you are looking at the –

Tamara                 But, that's a whole different metric than what they're being looked at now. I mean my position, I was outstanding all those years. And, now the way they do it, I have to take the school

score because I teach more than one level. It's just that 33%, you know, that includes everything. And, I think that's awfully high with the new metrics that we have.

W Yes, and that's another good point, because some teachers are going to have to, they're using the score of the entire school.

Tamara That's right.

W Counselors included.

Tamara That's where I sit after all these years of teaching.

W Well, with 1664 we are moving towards individual assessments.

W But, we're not there yet.

W Definitely not, that's for sure.

W I don't know. This is a brand new thing for the state of Florida and I think we're all in flux with this. We just don't have all the data available to us. So, I think –

Joe                                      That's the bottom line. It's a problem. Quite frankly, it's not your problem. It's the inconsistency that we're finding ourselves in. Honestly, it's not pointing fingers, it is brand new. You don't know, for instance, those of you that are looking at districts that have a low number, you don't know that the district's not going to look at that and set their bar.

The bottom line here for us is are we identifying highly effective teachers? Or, are we letting numbers try to drive us? Are we letting some sort of number drive us; some sort of research number? At the end of the day, who are your highly effective teachers? Are they being identified?

We go to the next step to pay based on this now. So, we've got to, again, look at our inter-rated reliability. So, it's not your fault that it's difficult to set this. I think you're just going to have to understand that there's some flexibility that's going to be needed and move forward with a decision, because you're going to have, being university and college people, you do not have all the data to make the kind of decisions that I know you want to make. And, the data you have is not necessarily

reliable. So, you're just going to have to do something and if it has to be adjusted and realize that it may not be there forever.

Eileen                    This is Eileen. So, there are several proposals on the table, even though there was a recommendation for 40%. Lance has shared with you several different versions: 10%, 20%, 30%, 40%. Does anyone want to make a recommendation at this point of what to do next? Do you want to look at one of the others instead of 40%? Do you want to look at 30%? Do you want to look at 20%? Does anyone want to put something on the table?

Gloria                    Yes, I would like to look at 35%.

M                            Second.

W                            I would recommend 30%. Thirty percent you're still looking at 10% of your institutions that remain in that category. I don't think that's an unrealistic. I think at 30%, which was slide 14, I believe, you're looking at 100 institutions. That's 10%. Ten percent of your institutions are performing at that level.

Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

Lance                    That's 25.6%.

W                        I'm rounding because I'm not using my calculator. Wait a minute, Lance. How are you figuring 25%?

W                        Well, there's 400 –

Lance                    One hundred and three of 402 is just over a quarter.

W                        Yes.

W                        Sorry.

Lance                    I have all the percentages written down in front of me here because I had a feeling we'd get into that conversation. So, I did all the calculations ahead of schedule.

W                        [indiscernible].

Lance                    [indiscernible] of 30%.

W                        Did you do the 35%, Lance?

Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

Lance I didn't do 35.

W Okay, just a question. But, it would be somewhere between, I'm going to guess. It'll be somewhere between [indiscernible]?

Lance Well, we're at [indiscernible]. You have to look at it in some detail because you can have, well. Yes, essentially it's going to be somewhere in between that number.

W You've got it.

Lance [indiscernible] that much of a difference. It really boils down to, and we've heard it several times. This is not highly scientific at this stage of the game.

W Yes, we're probably going to have about another fifteen.

Lance [indiscernible] trying to come up with a number that gives us a reasonable comfort level while not lowering the bar so much that we defeat our own desire to identify exemplary programs that might help inform continuous improvement across the

state. So we're looking 30%, we've got 25.6% of the programs that are at that highly effective level. At 40%, it's 16.9. We could crunch the numbers for 35, but would a number in between there be so compelling it's close to one of those two choices that we ought to delay to look at those [indiscernible]?

W Right.

W No.

W Is nobody struggling with the fact that we're saying only 25% of our teacher preparations programs in the state of Florida are highly effective?

W Well.

Eileen I think that what we are saying is – I think that what we are saying [indiscernible] for the metric that this is where they fall. Remember, it's going to be a variety of metrics and that's always going to change each year because next year you'll have another year of evaluation, it's always a three year cohort looking at what the evaluation ratings are and they'll get a score

each year. In one year again, you'll get a rating that is not deficient for continued approval at that point. That's over whatever a period of time we're talking about. So, we need to keep that all in mind; put this all into perspective.

W I hear what you're saying, but I want to go back to what Dr. Joyner said that this is going to become a very public process. So, I get that it's part of a process, but if you isolate that metric that's in essence what we're saying.

Megan This is Megan. I'm thinking of the 33% number again, not just because of the state average. But, if we simply looked at it as a third, like one-third of the people being highly effective might make more sense than saying 30 or 35%.

W Would you say that again?

Megan Yes, sorry. I was just thinking if we said one-third of the group. So, going back to 33% – I know it's 33.3 – so that would make more sense because exactly one-third needs to be highly effective as opposed to necessarily 30 or 35%.



Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

Tamara                    This is Tamara Perry again. I really think you need to think about that 33% includes the veteran teachers. I will really think you need to take that in consideration. I know all the facts and statistics that were done, but they were done before the new evaluation system. I know my score and of the teachers that I work with around the county how it has affected them. These are highly effective, wonderful teachers. I worked at one of the best schools in our district and it's affected everybody; this new metrics, and I think the 33% includes the veteran teachers.

Cathy                    This is Cathy Boehme. I agree with Tamara. I think we should not use a highly effective as a differentiator. I think we need to just combine effective and highly effective. We are not, again, I've said this five times I think, county to county we're not consistent in our use of that measurement for it to mean something.

Gloria                    I think I'm going to agree with the colleagues who recommended we do this at the 30%. This is Gloria from the University of Miami.

Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

W                                So, Eileen, we have various suggestions on the table, recommendations. We're trying to reach consensus I see here on the agenda.

Eileen                        Yes we are, and I'm not sure if that was a proposal by Gloria as something for consideration.

W                                Right. What I'm getting at is we hear various different proposals. So are we going to take a vote or are we just still going to try to reach consensus?

Eileen                        We are going to go ahead and put something on the table for a vote.

W                                Before we vote, can I ask a clarifying question?

W                                Sure.

W                                Well, I know we talked about this a couple of times, but I don't know if we've gotten a straight answer. Are these numbers something that we as a committee two or three years down the road are going to be able to look at, look at the new data and

be able to really change it if we find that it's not working the way that we intended it to work?

Eileen Yes. It will be something that we as a state and you all as the public will need to continue to monitor from year to year to see where it is. It will go into rule. You've already made recommendations on five out of six. This is the sixth one. That's part of the next step.

The rule language then can come out with this recommendation. We'll get more public input. Once it goes into rule, is we abide by it until such time that we need to revisit that rule because of data that we continue to monitor over time. So, yes; the answer is yes. We will certainly need to monitor it from year to year or whatever it needs [indiscernible].

Cathy Eileen?

Eileen Yes?

Cathy This is Cathy. I have one more question, because I'm not sure you really answered the other question. Does this committee

Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

go away at the end of this year when the Race to the Top funds are gone?

Eileen We are going to talk about that next steps.

Gloria I'd like to put a motion for a vote that we consider the stats of the 30% as indicated on slide 14.

Adriana This is Adriana. I second that motion.

W So, now we're going to have a simple vote of yes or no.

M Would you repeat the motion, please?

Gloria The motion is to use the teacher evaluation metric at 30% as indicated on slide 14.

Lance Well, if you look at slide 17 which has the narrative for the four levels, for Level 4 we would be changing 40% to 30% and everything else would remain the same.

Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

Gloria I do have a caveat prior indicated where it says “No completers were rated as satisfactory.” Hold on, I have my language here somewhere.

Joe Eileen, I’ve got to run to another meeting. This is Joe Joyner.  
I’m a yes.

Eileen Thank you, Joe. Thank you for joining us today.

W Thank you.

W Thank you for your comments.

W Thank you for your wisdom.

Gloria I’m seeing “No completers were rated unsatisfactory if in field.”  
You know unless they were teaching out of field. I’m sorry, I said that before and I can’t find my notes.

Lance Yes. Gloria, don’t we want that filter on everything here? In other words, [indiscernible] included in this [indiscernible] would be those in field and in program.

W Yes, in field, yes, right, [indiscernible], correct.

Gloria If teaching in the area in which they were prepared. Correct.

W In field, in program.

Gloria [indiscernible] in program. Thank you, Lance.

Lance By the program being held accountable, remember we have the in field issue and we've got the in program issue, because the most recent institution gets credit for an individual and they may be teaching in a field that they were taught at another institution. So they have to be both in program and in field.

Gloria Correct.

Erin This is Erin. Does mean – this is a clarifying question – mean that the EPI program if we no longer have an EPI that aren't EPI completers were included in this year's data, does that mean that those will be pulled out of our ITPs?

Lance                    They're not in the ITPs. EPIs a separate category.

W                        They shouldn't be in your ITP.

W                        Yes, they shouldn't be.

W                        Okay.

W                        I think what Erin is pointing out is that pretty much if this is in field, which I totally agree with, but EPI numbers would probably not reach [indiscernible]. And, I don't have numbers. I'm pulling this out of the air, but in most programs only because if we're looking at in field with their statement of eligibility that they're coming in with, it's very difficult. Sometimes they come in with two or three subjects. Which one are we picking and do they remain teaching in that field. So, EPI becomes a real big issue here. I didn't want to mention it earlier, because it's a big mess. But, I don't know how that would look with this data.

W                        [indiscernible].

Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

Lance Well, the good news that if you look at our data for EPIs, there were none at Level 1.

W But, Lance, I don't think it was aggregated in field.

W Right. But, we'll address that issue separately.

W Thank you.

W Eileen, are you going to do a roll call for a vote?

Eileen Would you like me to do that?

W I think we should record it.

Eileen We will do that. I'm going to start at the top this time – no, I'll start at the bottom again. We already have Dr. Joyner's vote.

Jasmine?

Jasmine No.



Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

Eileen Lance?

Lance Yes.

Eileen Gloria?

Gloria Yes.

Eileen Megan?

Megan Yes.

Eileen Debbie?

Debbie Yes.

Eileen Tamara?

Tamara Yes.

Eileen Adriana?

Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

Adriana            Yes.

Eileen            Mark?

Mark              Yes.

Eileen            Cathy?

Cathy             No.

Eileen            Erin?

Erin               Yes.

Eileen            Ana?

Ana                Yes.

Eileen            Susan? Elisa?

Elisa              No.

Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

Eileen Give me a second here; I'll tally it. Ten yes, three no's.

W So, it will be the 30%?

Eileen That's correct.

W Okay.

W And you were striking "No completers remain unsatisfactory"?  
Correct?

W Correct. And, what are we replacing it with?

Eileen That's not what I heard. I heard about unsatisfactory about being in program, but not striking no unsatisfactory. So, can somebody repeat what we just voted on?

Gloria I thought we were voting that it was going to be Level 4 would be at least 30% of the program's completers received a highly effective rating. But, I never mentioned that unsatisfactory being taken out.

Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

W That's correct.

W No, because we were going to make a committee recommendation that the data is considering in program and in field completers.

W That's it.

W Correct.

W Yes.

W Right.

W Okay.

W That will go for every one of the levels.

W [indiscernible].

Lance Correct. It's the same filter that we put on the VAM data.

Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

W Correct.

W Same filter; correct.

W All right. Then, we accomplished our main goal today.

W Thankfully, yes.

W It was a good discussion.

W Very good.

Eileen It was a very important discussion, and we are appreciative to everybody. Thank you, Dr. Tomei, in particular, for your work and with working with the department and coming up with these proposals, and the committee and Dr. Tomei for your work today. We will be sharing this recommendation with the commissioner immediately.

So, what are the next steps for TLPIC? This will answer your questions from earlier, too. This concludes the work of the TLPIC on this first primary goal providing input, feedback, and

recommendations to assist the department with developing performance standards and the targets for continued approval of Florida State Approved Teachers Preparation Programs. We still need to continue to work on, the work on refocusing and developing those performance standards and targets for the continued approval of school leadership programs.

As you noted that Race to The Top does end on June 30<sup>th</sup> of 2014, our next steps with the commissioner is to speak with her, not only to share this last recommendation with her for the sixth performance metric, but to talk about the continued work of the TLPIC and what is the place for the department as to the continued involvement of the TLPIC, particularly with working with these recommendations for school leadership programs.

So, in May, we will schedule another conference call with you to talk about your continuing role, particularly with developing the school leadership accountability system, and perhaps we can also talk in May about whether you wish to continue to work and look at teacher preparation programs in the coming years.

In addition, in May the department will incorporate into the draft rule language this last performance metric. We will be then releasing that draft language to the public, which includes all of you, during May. We hope to by mid-May have that out for public review. We will have rule development workshops, which are required for you. We will walk through the draft rule. I will remind you the draft rule is very extensive. It will include not only these performance targets, but they will include all other aspects of continued approval and initial approval for the three types of teacher preparation programs. So, as you participate, we strongly encourage you to participate in those probably webinars in the beginning and we'll see if we need to have face to face meetings that you will participate as well.

Once the draft rule public workshops have been conducted, we will go back to the rule again and revise the language as needed. And, because of this going out for public review in May, we will not meet the June deadline for a review or approval by the State Board in June. The board does not meet in July and August. So, the earliest this will go to the State Board is in September. But, that will allow public comment all throughout the summer.

The commissioner will then review the proposed draft rule language and make a recommendation to the State Board of Education for approval. So, that's what it looks like for May and June, in particular, and throughout the summer. Not necessarily, but there could be additional rule development workshops during the summer if the rule language changes after it goes through a public review process, so you'll have another opportunity. And of course everybody has an opportunity for public input all the way up through the State Board rule meeting itself for public comment at that point.

So, are there any more comment from the committee? Does anybody have any other questions before I bring this to a close?

Gloria

This is Gloria Pelaez. I would like to thank Eileen and all her staff members for taking the magnificent leadership and all the professional development that the committee received. Lance, thank you for today, and for always being so clear in sharing information with us. On a personal note, it's been a privilege



and a pleasure to work with each one of the committee members. Thank you so much for the opportunity.

W Thank you, Gloria. Ditto on all of that.

Megan Eileen, this is Megan. Are we as a committee not meeting face to face again?

Eileen No, I guess not. If that's what I was relaying, that was not what my intent was. The next step is to go the commissioner, remind her that Race to The Top is drawing to a close. Your commitment that you made it was to serve at the pleasure to the public through the Race to The Top period. What we were going to go to her was that she have a recommendation to continue the work of this committee beyond June 30<sup>th</sup>.

We will certainly want to then give you an opportunity to hear what she has to say and to give you an opportunity, if the decision is to go beyond June 30<sup>th</sup>, for you to be able to decide if you wish to continue to participate or if we will start adding new committee members to the committee again. So, we will

Final Transcript  
STATE OF FLORIDA: TLPIC Webinar: Race to the Top  
April 21, 2014/1:44 p.m. EDT

---

have a phone call in May about that so that you will have an opportunity for your input for the discussion about this.

Megan I was just asking for purely social, selfish reasons.  
[indiscernible].

W I for one would like to meet again face to face.

Eileen There is not a planned meeting for face to face in May at this point.

W Okay. Well, we'll have an unofficial one then.

W There you go.

W Megan will do a rule development workshop [indiscernible].

W There you go.

Eileen Any other comments or any other questions or concerns? All right. Well, thank you again for joining us today. We sincerely appreciate your leadership of Dr. Calabrese and Ms. Ulmer as

well. The work of this committee is extremely important and your contributions toward these recommendations are very much valued.

Thank you so very much for all that you do, each and every one of you for focusing on what is most important: the insurance that Florida is doing everything it possibly can do to insure that all of our teacher and leader preparation programs in Florida are preparing the most effective instructional and administrative personnel for our Pre-K through Grade 12 students. That is Florida's most valuable commodity as we all know.

Thank you very much and we will talk to you soon.