
Final Transcript

STATE OF FLORIDA: Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee Meeting and Webinar

May 8, 2013/3:00 p.m. EST

PRESENTATION

Coordinator Good day, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee Meeting and Webinar. My name is Severlee and I'll be your coordinator for today. At this time, all participants are in listen only mode. At this time, I would now like to hand the presentation over to your host for today, Ms. Julie Orange. Please proceed.

S. Hoy My name is Sean Hoy. I'm with the DOE. Please do not put your phones on hold. We will hear your institutional message. If you could, please put your phones on mute at this time. WebEx team, could you please start the recording? I will turn the meeting over to Julie Orange. Thank you.

Final Transcript

STATE OF FLORIDA: Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee Meeting and Webinar
May 8, 2013/3:00 p.m. EST

J. Orange Good afternoon, everyone. This is the Teacher and Leader Implementation Committee Meeting. Wanted to first start by taking the roll call for the Committee members. Vivian Posey? Alisa Calabrese? Susan McEachin?

S. McEachin Here.

J. Orange Ana Blaine?

A. Blaine Here.

J. Orange Lizzie Peeples?

L. Peeples Here.

J. Orange Erin Harrel?

E. Harrel Here.

Final Transcript

STATE OF FLORIDA: Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee Meeting and Webinar

May 8, 2013/3:00 p.m. EST

J. Orange Mark Howse?

M. Howse Here.

J. Orange Adriana McEachern? Adriana, are you still there? Susan Moxley?

S. Moxley I'm here.

J. Orange Great. Greg Adkins? Valerie Storey? Tamara Perry? Debbie Cooke? Megan Pankiewicz? Gloria Pelaez? Lance Tomei? Jasmine Ulmer?

J. Ulmer Hi.

J. Orange I see that we have Cathy Boehme on the WebEx. Have you joined us Cathy? Debbie Cooke? Greg Adkins, again? If those Committee members could go ahead and dial into the

Final Transcript

STATE OF FLORIDA: Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee Meeting and Webinar
May 8, 2013/3:00 p.m. EST

meeting, and Operator, if you have Cathy Boehme, Debbie Cooke or Greg Adkins in the participant line, if you could please make sure that they are added to the speaker line because they're Committee members.

We're going to go ahead and get started. Just wanted to remind everybody that this is a public meeting. Welcome those who have joined us from the public. If you're looking for the meeting materials, they are posted on www.fl DOE.org/committees/tlp.asp. I'll repeat that: www.fl DOE.org/committees/tlp.asp. All the materials will be found at that location.

We're going to go ahead and get started with our agenda and just wanted to make sure folks are aware of the plan for today. We're going to start out doing an update with recent legislation that was passed. We also have University of Florida joining our call so that they can give you some brief history on the project that they're working on with us and they have some questions. You should have received those via e-mail a little bit earlier.

That will be, again, a Committee discussion with University of Florida.

We're going to share with you the example Annual Program Performance Report that we've worked on since our last meeting in February. We'll round out the call today with teacher evaluation data and time for Committee discussion. Just wanted to point out that there is not any requirement on today's call for there to be any decisions being made by Committee members. This is a call that we're sharing information with you and just wanted to reiterate that.

Specifically, we're going to go ahead and start with looking at what the primary purpose of our Committee is. Again, we've been working on these tasks since March of 2011. We've made great progress. We'll be able to review that with the updates from Kathy in a minute. But, I just wanted to always take you back to our primary goal. That, again, is providing that input, feedback, and recommendations on helping us develop performance standards and targets for continued approval of

our state approved teacher prep programs as well as our school leadership prep programs.

Now, today our focus, again, is going to be on teacher prep. As you know, each of our meetings we have been one dedicated to teacher prep and another dedicated to leader prep so that we're not confusing the two. So, today it's going to be our teacher prep path. Again, just pointing out the timelines from the TLPIC work. As you know, as we met earlier in the winter, we continue to look at teacher prep data and recommending performance targets.

At this point, we're in the timeframe for the summer of 2013 and we are working on the pilot annual report. Again, we have those available for you to take a look at. Again, these are samples and we'll be going over some of the specifics there. The purpose for releasing this information is for feedback this year. So, I just want to make that clear that these aren't going to be used for any decisions for continued approval. This is strictly for feedback purposes.

Final Transcript

STATE OF FLORIDA: Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee Meeting and Webinar
May 8, 2013/3:00 p.m. EST

Also, throughout this summer considering recommendations for continued approval standards for teacher prep is going to be a priority for the Committee. Again, this is not where you're going to be making decisions on behalf of the Department. This is where you're going to be giving us feedback. We'll be coming to you for some specific recommendations and we'll move forward with your input. Also, rule revision workshops: We'll be working through that process this summer.

If you look at our focus for today, again, we're going to start out with the update on the legislation. I see some numbers coming in, some messages coming in on the WebEx side that we have a few Committee members that are trying to log in. I want to stop here real quick and see if we have Debbie Cooke on the line?

D. Cooke

Yes, ma'am.

Final Transcript

STATE OF FLORIDA: Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee Meeting and Webinar

May 8, 2013/3:00 p.m. EST

J. Orange Great. Greg Adkins? Operator, if you can check to see if Greg Adkins is on the participant line, he should be switched over to the speaker line if he's available on the other line. Cathy Boehme, are you on the line?

C. Boehme Yes, I am.

J. Orange Okay, great. Gloria, have you joined us? Great. We're going to go ahead and move forward to our next slide and I'm going to turn it over to Kathy Hebda.

K. Hebda Thanks. We're on slide 5, Legislative Updates. I just want to spend a couple of minutes today, not take a lot of your time because I know you have some other things you want to get to ... on your call. But, I wanted to express our thanks to the Committee in helping with what turned out to be Senate Bill 1664. You know the companion was House Bill 863. That's where a lot of the work started. I think all the input that was provided by TLPIC members, additional input provided by

members of ... , and others, the end result was a really, really good product.

It's pretty exciting to see all those recommendations in legislation that quickly. Those of you that have been around for a while and maybe worked on legislative things before know that you can try for several years in a row before anything ever happens. So, we are just very, very indebted to all the TLPIC members and everybody else who provided input on the legislation.

The final results of Senate Bill 1664 is that after all the amendments were done back and forth, the essential pieces of 863 are seen in 1664, meaning once 863 was amended with the additional language to talk about faculty qualifications that I know that TLPIC started a recommendation on that. In fact, they picked it up and modified it a little bit. That's the end result that's in 1664. So, that Bill does have that, the final version of the faculty qualifications in that; not the original version that was in the first draft.

It does have the recommendations for Uniform Core Curriculum. One modification of that was like we saw earlier in the Senate Bill, if you were keeping track earlier in the year, school safety was left as a separate item in the Uniform Core Curriculum, which is understandable after ... that have happened on school campuses.

The performance metrics that were your recommendations have stayed intact, plus they reflect the amendments that were made to 863 so that placement data includes private school data that's available and that the evaluation data would follow the timeline for educator evaluations that are provided in that section of law. So, we can work into that data for purposes of using it for teacher preparation program review.

So, all of those things are now there. Now, by the time 1664 got passed, there were some other bills that got latched onto it. What was Senate Bill 980 that had three paragraphs concerning some clarifications around teacher evaluations and

principal evaluations, that is also in 1664. As we had earlier in 1664 when it was first initiated there is a section in the Bill that talks about the revisions to what was called the Teachers Lead Program that the money provided for classroom supplies for teachers, the name of that program has now changed to a much longer name that includes the words “classroom and supply”. Some provisions were changed. That’s in this Bill also.

M. Howse Hello to Kathy.

K. Hebda Yes, I’m sorry.

M. Howse This is Mark Howse. I had a quick question. The teacher and principal evaluation components: Can you speak to the essence of those paragraphs you spoke about? What are the implications of those?

K. Hebda Those were basically put together when they were original in Senate Bill 980, which traveled along on its own for a while.

Then, again like things happen, got amended onto this particular piece of legislation. They were set forth to do a couple of things.

They were set forth to clarify that educators, teachers should be evaluated on their own students even if you're using team data it should be your own students, to provide some flexibility for non-classroom instructional personnel and what districts can use for student outcome measures for those individuals for evaluation purposes. Then it also reiterated what's already in law with regard to performance pay beginning in '14-'15 school year for teachers to be on the performance salary schedule rather than on the grandfathered salary schedule. They would have to be evaluated using their own assessment data, specifically with district-wide assessments or state assessments. Otherwise, they would remain on the grandfathered salary schedule. That's basically what that section of the law does.

M. Howse

Thank you for that. I just wanted to know.

K. Hebda Yes. The rest of the stuff that is in 1664 was what we were already familiar with. The only other piece I was going to mention is the provision that was amended on 1664 that was specifically for Teach for America as a route to certification on its own. That was amended back off the Bill. So, the final version of 1664 does not have a special provision for Teach for America as a route to certification on its own.

The new plan for an option to gain certification in educational leadership does remain on the bill. So, the next thing I want to talk about really is not so much of what's in the Bill, because everybody needs to keep reading that just like we're doing to see what really, really, really happens and what all it might mean is the next thing we have to do is rule development. That's what Julie was talking about just a minute ago with regards to functions of TLPIC and what the University of Florida is getting ready to talk to you about.

We have to go back to 6A-5.066, that administrative rule that implements all of our teacher preparation programs – the teacher prep at prep institutes and district all cert programs – and provide that rule now based on these changes in the law. For example, your recommendations from TLPIC for the six areas for data reporting for continued approval, what now has to happen is we have to go into rule development to really set forth in rule what kinds of data are we going to report, what are those performance targets. All of that will go through the entire rule development process before it's implemented. So, there will be a lot of opportunities for TLPIC members to continue to think about these things, lots of opportunities for faculty and other folks that work in teacher preparation programs to weigh in and provide input.

That part will probably announce rule development pretty soon. But, that process will continue throughout the summer and into the fall. The State Board of Education does not meet, at least they have indicated so far, they will not be meeting in July or August. So, we anticipate a fall adoption for rules. We have time to work on it during the summer and time to work on it

again in the fall. We'll be announcing some timelines and opportunities for input through that process very soon.

In the meantime, there are a couple of things that this Committee is working on. Number one, as Julie mentioned earlier, you're looking at or at least you helped us devise an example report that would go to institutions, a progress and performance report. The report, as Julie mentioned, is really a pilot. It's really to get feedback. This would not be the final version of the report.

One of the things we've learned in the past, and we try to get input from folks, is if you just ask them a question, say "What would you like to have on a report?" and you don't give them an example to look at, it's difficult to collect feedback. What we've started with is an example of something that then people can now react to and say, "I like this part. I don't like that part. Here's what you should add here. Here's what you should take off there." That's what we want to hear from people.

At the time that this report goes out to institutions, it'll be for feedback on the report. That's exactly what we're looking for. Be on the lookout for that as Committee members and institutions that might be listening on the call and others. Be on the lookout for the sample report to get feedback on what that might look like.

Also, as Julie was saying, it's not the responsibility of the TLPIC to feel the weight on its shoulders of coming up with the State Board rule to implement this law. That's not the responsibility of TLPIC. We've got a whole rule development process that everybody is going to want to participate in to get that done. But, certainly, anything that TLPIC feels comfortable with making recommendations on and giving input for that's certainly what we want you to do. It's going to take a lot of people out there looking at their own institution data and things like that to get really good feedback on how these rules will work.

So, I wanted to reiterate what Julie was saying about that, the role of TLPIC and take some of that weight off your shoulders

Final Transcript

STATE OF FLORIDA: Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee Meeting and Webinar

May 8, 2013/3:00 p.m. EST

so you don't feel like, in case you still thought it was up to you, come up with an entire State Board of Education rule to implement this law now. It's not. So, don't worry about that.

G. Pelaez This is Gloria. I volunteer.

K. Hebda Okay, then that drops on Gloria.

W Of course she does.

K. Hebda Then administrated weekly, right away. Yes, that doesn't mean we don't want you to participate. Things ... your total possibility to get it done. We want your participation, believe me.

There were certainly lots of other things, too, that happened during Legislative Session. There is a major bill, 1076, that revised in a really significant way graduation requirements for kids entering high school beginning next school year and things like that that everybody is sifting through and reading with a lot

of attention. We just in fact got our full list of bills that have something to do with the Department earlier today. So, there's a lot of work to be done around those things. We don't by any means have all the answers to everything yet, but certainly are in the mode of taking questions.

If you have questions about things and you want to get an answer or at least get your question on the FAQ list for any of this stuff, then send it on in. We'll put it with the rest of them. Are there questions about anything else ... before that we might or might not be able to answer?

G. Pelaez Kathy, this is Gloria Pelaez. Any word on the state agreement with CAPE?

K. Hebda I don't have anything new on that. Eileen is not able to participate today. I'll take that question back to her and we'll see if we can get you anything back on CAPE.

G. Pelaez Thank you.

Final Transcript

STATE OF FLORIDA: Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee Meeting and Webinar

May 8, 2013/3:00 p.m. EST

K. Hebda Sure. Okay, if that it on legislation, then just one more thank you to everybody who worked really hard. We really appreciate it. Back to you, Julie.

J. Orange I just wanted to stop real quick. I know we have a few other Committee members that joined us. I have you down, Gloria, and Greg Adkins, are you able to hear us now?

G. Adkins Yes, I can hear you.

J. Orange Great. Are there any other Committee members that have joined us that since ... ?

J. Joyner Joe Joyner.

J. Orange Great, thank you. We're at the point in the presentation now where I just wanted to introduce the folks from the University of Florida. I believe we have Elayne Colón and Tom Dana on the

line. Is that correct? Can you hear us, Elayne and Tom?

Elayne, are you there. Operator, if you have Elayne Colón and Tom Dana on the participant line, if you could switch them over to the speaker line, please.

I'm going to go ahead and introduce the project and hopefully they'll be able to switch over. I see them on the Webinar. We just want to make sure that they're able to join us. But, I just wanted to give you some background on this project.

As Kathy was mentioning, it's not the expectation that the TLPIC – can you hear us, Elayne? Is that you, Elayne?

W She says she can hear you. Maybe her line is muted?

W They've messaged us that they can hear us, but we can't hear them.

J. Orange Operator, can you unmute their lines?

Coordinator ... have the participant press star-zero so that I may identify their lines, please.

J. Orange Push star-zero, Elayne and Tom. Okay, I'll go ahead and finish that introduction. Hopefully they'll work that out with the Operator so that they can be on the right line. I apologize for this technical difficulty today.

As far as the specific project that they're working on for us, rather than the Department going out and seeking input from institutions and bringing back that information and sharing it with the TLPIC, we felt that it would be important for colleagues from another institution to be able to gather that input and that we're not going to be involved in that process of gathering the input so that folks can speak freely, share information with, again, colleagues that are doing the same work that they are. So, we do have a contract with the University of Florida and part of the deliverables that we built in is to make sure that they

are soliciting feedback first from the TLPIC. That's what we're going to do today.

Also, you've gotten information that's been sent out through deans and directors of institutions that they have upcoming face-to-face meetings where they're going to be collecting input. As TLPIC members, you're more than willing to participate in those as well, or sharing your information today and doing follow-up as needed. But, in the big scheme of things, what we want to make sure that we gather from this project with the University of Florida is a draft of the initial and continued approval of teacher preparation guidelines. We want a revised set of those so that we can move forward with the Department on those recommendations knowing that this has gotten by and throughout the state so that it can be a process that's collaborative moving forward.

Part of what they're going to be doing is not only developing those guidelines or revising those guidelines I should say, but also providing/developing training materials so that in the future when the Department goes out to do the training that those

Final Transcript

STATE OF FLORIDA: Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee Meeting and Webinar

May 8, 2013/3:00 p.m. EST

materials are developed with input from our institutions. We're excited about the project and we wanted to make sure that we provided a forum so that they could interview the folks from the TLPIC. I know that some of this work, particularly for the teachers that are on this Committee may not be as close to home with your day-to-day activities, but definitely join in as you have feedback. We're going to allow Elayne and Tom to take it over from here with their questions.

E. Colón This is Elayne. Can you hear me?

J. Orange Yes.

W Yes.

T. Dana This is Tom. Can you hear me?

J. Orange Yes.

Final Transcript

STATE OF FLORIDA: Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee Meeting and Webinar

May 8, 2013/3:00 p.m. EST

W Yes.

T. Dana All right, yea.

E. Colón Well, we really, really very much appreciate the opportunity to spend a little time with TLPIC today talking through some of the things that we've been thinking through. As Julie mentioned, our focus for this work is on the guidelines documents for those initial and continued program approval. Within that scope are both annual reporting pieces, what institutions or state approved Initial Teacher Preparation programs. I want to distinguish that from EPIs and district all cert options; but, with Initial Teacher Programs for now report on an annual basis in what site visits look like in terms of materials and review processes.

Julie forwarded to you earlier today our preliminary questions. We thought maybe we could go through those and just open it up. If any of the conversation spurs other only slightly related thoughts, we're happy to take any feedback or insights you can

offer to us around the guidelines. Tom, is there anything you want to add before we jump in to the first question?

T. Dana No, I think that was a great introduction. Thanks.

E. Colón The first question that we had for you, and I'm just going to read it verbatim, is "What are your reactions specifically related to program approval about the recently passed legislation" and that's Senate Bill 1664 that Kathy just highlighted "in light of your deliberations over the last few years?" So, your reactions to the recently passed legislation.

G. Pelaez Elayne, this is Gloria Pelaez. Personally, I'm delighted. This has been a working progress of extreme transparency and collaboration. Even the first iteration of the bill had some ... some issues and the Department and TLPIC ... and other stake holders worked collaborative, together. We've seen our work in the legislation, which is very satisfying as Kathy mentioned before those of us who've been here a long time, this is very rare.

D. Cooke Elayne, this is Debbie Cooke. For me personally, I think what it does is it's been a great deal of work as Gloria said, and to see results just makes, and I think the rest of us, that much more committed to do the rest of the work that it's going to take to get what's now in legislation actually being operationalized at the college and university level.

M. Howse Hello, this is Mark. I want to echo both the comments by Gloria and Debbie that number one, it's refreshing to see that this work is not in vain and that the legislators took into consideration a lot of the recommendations that came from our Committee. I'm particularly excited, as you can imagine, with the components in the legislation related to monitoring of the performance by students by sub-groups, as well as I'm also excited about the fact that we were able to work through the amendment process to deal with some components especially related to the credentials of faculty supervisors for the clinical experiences that even when the first draft of the bill came out, there were some alarming pieces in that that we were able

through the political process to bring about an effective change in that. So, that was also rewarding as well.

E. Colón Any other comments around that first question?

A. Blaine Hi, this is Ana Blaine. I also echo everyone's comments. I think that we ... fabulous thing where everybody worked really well together. But, I do want to say that we encourage, and we're all going to be also, take into consideration feedback from everyone: institutions ... individuals alike because it gives us even more of an idea, an insight into what everyone is doing. Although our, to me it's a very diverse, we're still just a small little group of sample representation of ... so, we really, really welcome feedback from everyone else in Florida.

E. Colón I'm going to move us forward to the next question. In thinking about revising these guidelines for both initial and continued approval expectations for annual reporting and site visits, you all have done so much work already and have spent a greater part of two years having these really difficult conversations and

deliberations about how to move things forward, so we want to be sure that we're mindful and to not reinvent the wheel and really want to hear your perspective on lessons learned. So, if you could share with us your lessons learned in terms of data analyses and conversations that you've had since this group was formed in March of 2011, what comes to mind for you in terms of continued program approval processes and specific insights you had?

M. Howse

This again is Mark Howse. I wanted to just draw our attention to something that was very ... for me and that is the grounding that happened when we had the lofty ideas of linking everything to the data and it was not until we actually looked at the data that were available to really discover that we may not be able to get the information that we thought we could because of some various factors. So I guess there's a lesson learned is that although we want to make evidence based decisions about the quality of program, but we have to balance that with the reality and the limitations related to the data that are available at that particular point in time. So, I think it's very important to always keep that in mind.

E. Harrel This is Erin. I'm going to ... one step further with what Mark just said because I think it's a really good ... often create things without the implementation in mind. I think it's really, really important as these continued approval standards and guidelines get finalized to see what that implementation looks like. Can you get your hands on the appropriate data? Is it going to come at a time before the reporting of this is required? Those types of things, so really keeping in mind the implementation of whatever that looks like.

The second piece is we have so many standards that we're adhering to. We have so many frameworks, institutional frameworks, state, national, whether it's competencies or standards, to streamline it to processes, for example where you just talked about CAPE or if the institution's in CAPE so that we're not doing multiple steps repeating data over and over and over again, so that those data census that we're requiring looks similar to national standards if your programs are nationally approved.

Final Transcript

STATE OF FLORIDA: Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee Meeting and Webinar
May 8, 2013/3:00 p.m. EST

D. Cooke Hi, Elayne. This is Debbie again. I think the lesson learned from my perspective was we started out with a much longer list of things that we thought we could measure that would matter. When we actually ran sample data sets, the things that we ended up with, I think, were actually the big ticket items. So, when this goes out to a variety of places and they say, "Well, why didn't you include this or why didn't you include that?" one of the things that might be helpful to you is to take a look at some of our recommendations early on that we made to Rebecca and Juan and when we actually got data back them, we realized that some of the things that we thought would make a big difference in ratings and scorings really didn't matter as much and that they would have been very difficult to measure with little impact.

E. Colón I guess when you say that, one of the things I'm thinking of, I noticed you all had satisfaction survey results from employers on there. It was close to the end. It remained on there, and then I noticed it dropped off here in this last iteration. So, I'm thinking that's one example of something you're talking about?

Final Transcript

STATE OF FLORIDA: Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee Meeting and Webinar

May 8, 2013/3:00 p.m. EST

D. Cooke I would. Yes, I think that that would be pretty safe to say there was lots and lots of stuff at the beginning that when it all came down to it, didn't matter as much as we thought it would.

M ...

D. Cooke I'm sorry. The only other thing I want to add to that is not that institutions may not choose to continue to measure those kinds of things for their own purposes, but they just didn't make it into the final draft.

T. Dana Yes, this is Tom. I was going to make a similar comment in appreciating that you looked across institutions and made some determination about data that would make sense across institutions. But, there probably would also be data that a particular institution finds valuable or has easy access to for some reason that they don't consider it to be important. I guess I'm hearing the Committee suggest that data that's institution based might add some value, to be careful I'm using those

words, might add some value to the approval process. Is that correct?

D. Cooke And, it may inform some programmatic changes that you make in terms of your own needs. But, for continued approval or initial approval, it may not matter as much in terms of your approval process.

T. Dana In terms of continuous improvement activity and may be important in the, got it.

D. Cooke Right, yes.

G. Pelaez Elayne and Tom, this is Gloria Pelaez. One of the things for me that was very revealing was the diversity, which in our state districts in terms of what some of our students especially at the field experience level are allowed or not allowed to do. It was very validating to have practitioners from the districts from, for example Dade County Public Schools, validated some of the comments that I made, some of the challenges that those

institutions in South Florida have in terms of placing our field experience students and having them participate in teaching specific lessons, access to students during FCAT testing or standardized testing, etc.

So, I think that was a big moment, at least for me, when some other district said, "Oh, but you know the people in our area are able to do this." Unfortunately in my area, that's not. So, it kind of made it a level playing field within initial teacher prep as to the reality some of us face in our own districts just due to the sheer size of it.

T. Dana

Gloria, thank you. Those are really good points. It's important that we look across the state and see what is possible as we're moving forward because the lessons learned as a committee you've thought about the different conversations that you've had. It's really important for us to understand and others, our colleagues, around the state what you've considered and what you've chosen to park aside and what the reasons are that you've chosen to do that.

G. Pelaez Thank you. Another thing that has been learned, at least for me, and I think those of my colleagues who attend national conferences, and kudos to the Florida Department of Ed, but how far ahead Florida is ... the data available in terms of tracking ... learning at so many different levels that so many states don't even have an inkling that they know they're going to have to do eventually, but that eventuality is very far off. I would say for at least five years for some states where we're already there.

E. Colón I'm going to move this on to the next question, and feel free if something comes to you to share it later even though it might not be applicable to the question that we're on. This question applies primarily to a subset of TLPIIC. We had a chance to review the notes from this site. Is it Protocol Sub-committee of TLPIIC? So, this question is specifically about those notes.

We understand that the Sub-committee supported a two-phase site visit protocol similar to that used by NCATE and ... CAPE.

Who knows what that will be? So, the idea that there's an offsite phase and then an onsite visit at a later date. Are there any insights from the Sub-committee or others that could inform the program approval process and our thinking about these guidelines?

M. Howse Again, this is Mark Howse. I'm not sure if this is an additional insight as much as it is an exclamation mark on the suggestion that we align the site visit protocol to what we already do for accreditation with now what's referred to as CAPE. Because, again, with the enormous amount of work that it takes to prepare for these, to maintain the data that's necessary to demonstrate our compliance with these guidelines that it is going to be very, very impactful, going to save a lot of money, a lot of manpower if we can synchronize these efforts. So, it's just really reemphasizing this recommendation that we move to a similar protocol.

G. Pelaez Another think, Elayne and Tom, and I echo Mark's comment. Elayne mentioned it, we really have no clue what CAPE is going to look like, and why I felt the question about the state

agreement was important to some of us or to our candidates, for example, ... no longer exist which is I'm very confident that the guidelines put in place or recommended by the Committee are now in the legislature are going to really help us have very meaningful feedback to institutions that are going through that process of the site visits.

I served on that smaller committee for the protocol and the conversations were very collegial to provide institutions with true guidance to have the continuous improvement loop to get early feedback so if there's something that perhaps they're doing but they're not articulating in those ... reports that they can address such. I feel very confident that we're going on the right direction as we progress towards they need this new protocol because Florida has traditionally been an NCATE state and our peers in the state universities have to have national accreditation. I think this is going to be quite helpful for everybody, but especially for those who have to have the national accreditation during this historical when the accreditors are completely kind of going by the seat of pants, if you will, because they really don't know what they're doing right now.

Final Transcript

STATE OF FLORIDA: Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee Meeting and Webinar

May 8, 2013/3:00 p.m. EST

E. Colón I'm going to go off script here for a second and ask you, anyone who has an opinion, do you believe that site visits should be an integral part of the review process?

D. Cooke Absolutely.

G. Pelaez Yes.

M Without question.

W Absolutely.

D. Cooke This is Debbie. I'm involved with an additional site review process. It's a trust and verified kind of thing in some instances. I don't know that that's necessarily the only reason that we would advocate for that. I think there is a great deal of information.

If we were in a two-phase process and we've got information from a physical review of evidence or documentation or even online video that we can take a look at, when the team goes onsite, we've got a laser-like focus for some specific things that I think you're looking at. I think a two-phase process allows you to be very efficient in that site review process. I feel very strongly that it is an essential piece of the entire process.

E. Colón Tom, anything that you want to ask or add before we go to our last question?

T. Dana Yes. I'd like to clarify that what I think I'm hearing is the desire to have any review processes include a significant formative component so that the continuous improvement process is imbedded in the actual review activity that occurs from peers. Did I hear that correctly?

G. Pelaez That's what my intentions were. Those of us in the site visit protocol, if you could chime in, I would appreciate it. But, I believe that's what part of what we came up with.

T. Dana Great. Okay.

G. Pelaez One of the concerns we had, Tom, was that sometimes institutions weren't getting all the information they needed right before a site visit or they were getting it too late when there was nothing they really could do. It could have been something perhaps that they had, but it just was not in the appropriate manner that it should have been presented to make it more helpful for the reviewers. Also, that impacted the way that the recommendations for the timeline for the review process and the site visit was set up. Does that make sense?

T. Dana Yes, very much so. Thank you for clarifying.

E. Colón So, last but not least, we want to understand the relationship between the Annual Program Performance Report that you are in the middle of working on and the eIPEP, the annual Electronic Institutional Program Evaluation Plan and Process. If you could talk a little bit about your thinking in terms of the

relationship between these two pieces; how you envision these two reports being used for both annual and continued program approval.

G. Pelaez This is, again, Gloria Pelaez. The way I think I personally see this is that the Annual Program Performance Report is a subset of the EI set. It's elemental to eIPEP that should be reported on perhaps on a yearly basis where there other elements on the eIPEP that should be reported – since the eIPEP is not always given feedback, the Annual Program Performance Report is basically a subset of the eIPEP.

It should not be an added layer of work. We should be able to, if you will, pick up pieces from the eIPEP and put it in an Annual Program Performance Report and submit. At the same time, there are parts of the eIPEP that we felt we should not have to report on annually. It's too redundant.

Final Transcript

STATE OF FLORIDA: Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee Meeting and Webinar

May 8, 2013/3:00 p.m. EST

T. Dana This is Tom. The Annual Program Performance Report seems like I could possibly describe it as a dashboard of some key variables of interest. Would you agree with that description?

G. Pelaez If the dashboard is coming from the universal eIPEP, yes.

E. Colón But, it seems like you're moving toward drawing some conclusions based on this report, annually or however it's used. You're going to draw some conclusions about a program based on these pieces of data. Is that accurate?

G. Pelaez Not the way I understood it.

E. Colón Could someone talk a little bit more about that?

D. Cooke Elayne, this is Debbie. I don't normally live in the college and university world. But, I did sit in on the Sub-committee when they did that work. I know that the eIPEP, I'm not familiar with

it, but I know that it was mentioned a lot because I remember hearing that phraseology often.

What I remember my friends in the college and university world saying was that much of the information that we talked about that we would want to look at in a program approval or continuing approval process would be information and data that was reported in there anyway. You will remember that we talked early on about trying to limit redundancies. I believe that's one of the reasons that this Committee was of the opinion that that report would inform the continuation of program approval because of the elements that would be congruent with what we would be looking for.

E. Colón On an annual basis?

D. Cooke As often as we did the site review. Now, I don't recall that we got into a discussion about how often the eIPEP should be done. But, I do know that we felt that that information would definitely inform the site review process.

Final Transcript

STATE OF FLORIDA: Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee Meeting and Webinar

May 8, 2013/3:00 p.m. EST

G. Pelaez Oh, wait a minute.

E. Colón I guess my question –

G. Pelaez I think I better understand your question. The eIPEP is something we all have to do on a yearly basis.

E. Colón Right.

G. Pelaez The Annual Program Performance Report is something that we would need to do the year before a site's visit. Correct?

W That's what you all said.

G. Pelaez Yes.

K. Hebda Hey, Gloria and everybody, this is Kathy. I mean to insert too much in this process, but just remember we just had legislation passed that may have changed some things that were maybe different under the old system. So, I think continue the discussion on what everybody has already worked on, but just keep in mind that some things may be different. I think Gloria made a good point earlier when she said that the Annual Performance Report, those metrics would be part of the eIPEP.

G. Pelaez Thanks, Kathy.

A. Blaine Hi, this is Ana Blaine. I think we're just a little bit confused ... a while ago that we can't get ... to discuss the Gloria, and you can help refresh my memory, but I do remember talking about sort of a summary report that would –

G. Pelaez Ana, we can't hear you.

A. Blaine Sorry. It was a summary report that we talked about having institutions complete. It was either six months before or a year

before the site visit that we would be able to review. Part of that was first phase. I think where there may be some confusion is that we're calling it an "annual" report. I don't think it was something that we talking about ... once a year.

G. Pelaez ... program performance. Right.

A. Blaine We even talked about using the three years of the eIPEPs before the visit as part of that report. Am I correct?

G. Pelaez Yes. I think that I don't know if somebody changed the name or if we did and I don't remember it. But, I thought that Program Performance Report was basically taking the place of the self-study that institutions embark upon ... visit.

A. Blaine Right ... right. That's what I thought we had talked about. I know we had made some recommendations, but we hadn't really gotten into the nitty-gritty of what everything is going to look like.

G. Pelaez Right. But, I don't think we ever called it "annual" because it was supposed to be I believe eight months out before a site visit. So, this would take the place of the old self-study.

A. Blaine Okay.

J. Orange Let me jump in real quick. This is Julie. I just want to make sure that we're not confusing things because this Annual Report that we're about to present is something separate from that summary report that you're referencing. So, I think what we might want to do is have opportunities for the committee members from the Sub-committee to have some further discussion with UF so that we can move forward with the rest of the agenda and honor everybody's time. These are two different reports. This is the performance metrics that are included in the sample Annual Program Progress Report and we're about to get into that right now. That might clear up some of the confusion because we're about to cover it right now.

G. Pelaez Oh, Julie, thank you.

J. Orange Right. I just didn't want everybody talking in circles and think we were talking about the same report. But, that's two different things.

G. Pelaez Okay, great. Thank you.

J. Orange I wanted to mention that I had mentioned to UF that I knew Lance Tomei as the chairperson for the Sub-committee could not be on the call today. They're going to reach out to him independently to make sure that his feedback is included as well, because I know he was an integral part in those recommendations. You may be hearing again from Elayne and Tom from UF to get some more information from that Sub-committee. Knowing that this work from the Sub-committee was done last fall and there hasn't been continuing discussion about that, so some of these conversations we're all trying to bring back to our ... we've all been living in multiple worlds ... this conversation.

D. Cooke When we don't know what we had for breakfast, that's kind of hard.

J. Orange Right. Elayne and Tom are you okay if we ahead and move forward?

Elayne Absolutely. We don't want to take up any more of your time. I saw Debbie had written something before. I just wanted to be sure that the Committee members knew that they were invited to take a survey that we developed around the guidelines. I believe Eileen sent that out to deans and directors yesterday. So, if you want to contact me or Julie or Eileen, we can make sure you get the link to that survey if you did not receive it.

Additionally, we have two face-to-face meetings that we're hosting. One next Friday, May 17th at Rollins in Orlando. The second is on May 22nd at the FAU Davie campus. So, I'm happy to provide more information. You are all more than welcome to attend and we would love to have you there to give

Final Transcript

STATE OF FLORIDA: Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee Meeting and Webinar
May 8, 2013/3:00 p.m. EST

us some more feedback as we think through these things.

We'll also have a webinar at a later date for those of you unable to attend the face-to-face meetings and we welcome any e-mails at any time with your feedback. Thank you.'

W Thank you, Elayne.

T. Dana Thank you all so much for your assistance.

W Thank you.

T. Dana Your job will not be finished yet.

J. Orange Thank you. We're going to go ahead and move on. We're on slide seven of the PowerPoint. Again, we're referencing this – I'm going to stress the word "sample" – Annual Program Performance Report.

Remember that this is a pilot year. This is the first time we'll be using this process. This is a public report that will be released. It will be accessible through eIPEP. Our deadlines to Race to the Top are to have these available by the end of June. This discussion, I just wanted to stress, is that it's for feedback purposes to make sure that there are opportunities for folks to provide feedback.

Now, if you recall our meeting back in February when we had our face-to-face down in Fort Lauderdale, we had a copy of the sample report. We gathered some feedback and folks had some great areas that you wanted to add and amend to the template. We made those changes at that time.

If you look at the template now, there are three areas that we particular focused in on that you wanted included that we have removed at this point from the template and that's simply because first year we're just going to be reporting on the basic areas. We do have plans to add these areas back in, one being the Institution Overview and Highlights and the Program Highlights area. In those particular fields, it would require us

getting input from the institutions and the programs to write those areas. We know that at this point to go and ask for that information before June 30th is going to be burdensome with all the other requirements on everyone's plate.

This year, there was no requirement within your eIPEP to do the Executive Summary. So, we can't pull that information from anywhere. We'll make sure that in future years that that information we can at least pull it from the Executive Summary and then have institutions have an opportunity to add to it. Again, that is on the radar for future years. You also mentioned that you wanted FTCE and FELE information included on the report. Those are areas that we can address in future years.

So, what I want to do is go ahead and just pull up the sample report and I'm going to turn it over to Mindy and she's going to walk through those areas. ... have that as an attachment.

D. Cooke

Right, Julie. Is that called "Institution Example"?

Final Transcript

STATE OF FLORIDA: Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee Meeting and Webinar

May 8, 2013/3:00 p.m. EST

J. Orange Yes.

D. Cooke Thank you.

M. Fike I can actually do it off the PowerPoint if you want to do that.

J. Orange Okay. If you have the "Institution Ex" handout, you can follow along there. I'm also going to pull up the PowerPoint because the same information is pulled into those slides.

W Great.

J. Orange That will start on slide eight.

M. Fike The next section of the report will be on the continued approval period. This will vary from institution to institution. The initial approval date is the year the program was initially given state approval. The second box, the latest approval date is the year the program was last evaluated by folio, site visit, or program

approval board and was approved or given an approval status meaning conditionally approved, fully approved. The last box is the approval expires date. That's the year the program is up for a continued approval review or the year the institution has informed the Department that the program will be discontinued.

For this particular program at Institution X, the initial approval date was back in 1969. The last continued approval evaluation of this program was in 2007. The institution and its date approved programs are due for another continued approval review in 2014, which is seven years since its last review.

The next section displays the number of completers for each of the three years needed to complete this year's report. We are doing 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11. Then, there's also the total number of completers over these three years. In looking at the same program for Institution X, we can see the number of completers this program had each year.

The first metric to receive a score is placement. The TLPIC defined placement as the percentage of completers who become employed in an instructional position in a Florida public school district, their first or second year after completion of a Florida state approved program. For this year's report, we had to go back to completers that completed a state approved program in 2009-10 and were employed in either 2010-11 or 2011-12.

So, there are two charts on this slide. The first chart in blue displays the target the TLPIC set for placement. We calculated the mean in the first and second standard deviations for each program. Any program with a placement rate one standard deviation above the mean and higher will receive a Level 4. One standard deviation below the mean up to one standard deviation above the mean will receive a Level 3. Two standard deviations below the mean up to one standard deviation below the mean will receive a Level 2. Any program with a placement rate below two standard deviations will receive a Level 1.

To see Institution X's placement rates, view the chart in green that's on this slide. Institution X's placement rate for this particular program was 94%. The statewide aggregate for this program is 85.16%. After calculating the mean and standard deviations for the statewide aggregate in this program, Institution X would receive a Level 3 for placement.

The next metric to receive a score is retention. The TLPIC defined retention as the percentage of completers continuously employed in an instructional position in a Florida public school district at the third and fifth year mark after completion of a Florida state approved program. For this year's report, we had to go back to completers that completed a state approved program in 2008-09, and were continuously employed in 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12. At this time, retention data is only available up to the three-year mark.

Again, there are two charts on this slide. The first chart in blue displays the target the TLPIC set for retention. We calculated the mean and the first and second standard deviations for each program. Any program with a retention one single deviation

above the mean and higher will receive a Level 4. One standard deviation below the mean up to one standard deviation above the mean will receive a Level 3. Two standard deviations below the mean up to one standard deviation below the standard mean will receive a Level 2. Any program with a retention rate below two standard deviations will receive a Level 1.

To see Institution X's retention rate, view the chart in green on this slide. The retention for this particular program was 72.41%. The statewide aggregate for this program is 71.76%. After calculating the mean and standard deviations for the statewide aggregate in this program, Institution X would receive a Level 3 for retention.

The next section on the report is Value Added Model data, or VAM data. We're still calculating the VAM data for the progress report. This section will house the average VAM score completers one year following program completion. It will be aggregated across three years and will use in-program and in-field data when possible.

The blue chart displayed here shows the target set by TLPIC. To receive a Level 4, the score falls above the standard for evaluation with a high degree of confidence – 95%. To receive a Level 3, the score falls above or below the standard for evaluation, but one cannot conclude that the score exceeds or misses the bar with any degree of statistical confidence. To receive a Level 2, the score falls below the standard for evaluation with some degree of statistical confidence – 68%. To receive a Level 1, the score falls below the standard for evaluation for the high degree of confidence – 95%. Again, we're still calculating this portion of the sample Report card, but the green chart on this slide shows you the layout of this section.

The next section is evaluation data. While we don't have a sample for Institution X to show you, we have a few charts just showing statewide data at the end of this presentation for your discussion.

The last section to receive a score is student performance by sub-group. The program has to have at least ten completers trained in-program and teaching in-field. We will use the same eight sub-groups identified for federal school performance reporting and the minimum number of sub-groups for consideration is three.

The blue chart displayed here shows the target set TLPIC. To receive a Level 4, at least 75% of sub-groups, for example six out of eight or three out of four, must exceed the state standard for performance. To receive a Level 3, at least 50%, but no more than 74% of sub-groups must exceed the state standard for performance. To receive a Level 2, at least 25% but no more than 50 % of the sub-groups must exceed the state standard for performance. To receive a Level 1, fewer than 25% of the sub-groups exceed the state standard for performance.

The chart on this slide displays Institution X's student performance by sub-group. This institution had seven out of eight sub-groups that met or exceeded expectations resulting in

a Level 4 for this metric. You will notice math has N/As all the way down. This is because this report for Institution X is for reading, meaning no math scores would be available.

The program to receive a bonus of 0.25 of point. The program must be in a critical teacher shortage area and the program must have shown a 20% increase in the number of completers from one year to the next. For this year's report, we compared the number of completers from 2010-11 to 2011-12. The areas for critical teacher shortage are middle and high school science, foreign languages, English and language arts, middle and high school reading, exceptional education, middle and high school math, and English for Speakers of Other Languages, or ESOL.

For Institution X, this program meet one of the critical teacher shortage areas, but it did not have a 20% increase, therefore no bonus would be awarded. We also calculated the statewide aggregate for this program, which resulted in a -12.30% decline. That was across all state approved programs for 2010-11 to 2011-12. While this does not affect whether a

program received a bonus or not, this calculation allows the institution to see how this program compared across all state approved programs. This concludes the sample report.

So, let's go ahead and take a look at evaluation data to determine how this metric might fit into the Annual Program Performance Report.

M. Howse Mindy, can you take any questions, or do you want to wait until you finish this other thing before we ask any questions?

M. Fike Sure, go ahead.

M. Howse Going back, number one – and this is just a suggestion – that it would be helpful for me if the actual standard deviation was included in this report. But, back on the metric related to the Value Added Model, the VAM data: Are we imposing the Rule of 10 to that?

M. Fike If they did not meet the Rule of 10, they will not receive an individual report. We calculate the statewide, yes. If they did have completers, but did not meet the Rule of 10, they are configured in the statewide aggregate.

M. Howse Good. Then, one other question: On the student performance by sub-group in the tables, the blue table has the percentages based on sub-groups that exceed, but in your language you talk about meet or exceed. I want to make sure I'm drawing the distinction between. Are we including the meet or exceed or are we only talking about exceeding?

K. Hebda Hey, Mark, this is Kathy. It looks like the last language we have is meet or exceed.

M. Howse Okay.

K. Hebda Again, this is just a sample for ...

Final Transcript

STATE OF FLORIDA: Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee Meeting and Webinar

May 8, 2013/3:00 p.m. EST

M. Howse Yes, I know.

K. Hebda ... we've got a long way to go on all this, but unless anybody had a major objection to that, that's where we had the last language from. If that's okay.

M. Howse Yes. No, I think that's important to meet or exceed, I just didn't see in in the leveling table, though.

K. Hebda Okay.

M. Fike We'll be sure to add that.

M. Howse Thank you.

W Good point, Mark. Thank you.

M. Fike Any more questions on the Performance Report or do you want to go ahead and move to Evaluation Data?

J. Joyner This is Joe Joyner. Kathy, can I ask you a question? On the VAM data, obviously the new State Board rule is going to have an impact on the percentage of effective and highly effective. I the institution is going to be using an aggregate report of three years because there was a likelihood a big dip in '12-'13 data on highly effective?

K. Hebda That's a great question. We are looking at three years of data for institutions. Also, I know that one of the things the Committee had discussed, which Mindy will talk about a little bit in a second, as opposed to a Value Added score, which we think ... look at statewide, etc. on cut point for the purposes of program approval, the evaluation rating is really more related to the district in which the teacher is teaching. Even after the state standards are set, the district still has control over the instructional practice rating and those kinds of things. I remember thinking back to the Committee's discussion about this a while back as to whether or not there would be some way

for purposes of continued approval to relate that individual completer's evaluation result to how other teachers in that district were rated as opposed to how people were rated across the state. So ... we still need to work on, but that's where I think the Committee was talking.

J. Joyner ... I think if I remember, the State Board rule is regardless of the individual district's evaluation data or observation data, if a certain cut score wasn't met a teacher couldn't be highly effective regardless. If a certain VAM level wasn't met regardless of what the district's teacher evaluation showed.

K. Hebda That is part of the rule. So, in that State Board of Education rule that's out there for comment right now, which of course we also have to revise based on the information from Legislative Session, there are standards that would need to be implemented so that people calculated student learning growth across the state. But, then also that standard that you're talking about that if not met with results in an automatic unsatisfactory would provide the floor for effective and highly effective.

Based on the suggestions we got during the Rule Workshop, we're looking at perhaps setting the cut point for the automatic unsatisfactory differently than we'd set them for just how people would normally go about calculating performance of students. Then, also we had already set some conditions in the proposed rule under which those cut points where they become the automatic evaluation would even be considered. For example, if the teacher's in the first or second year of teaching and doesn't have three years-worth of data yet, then those automatic cut points would not apply.

So, there'll be a lot of those things to consider as far as using evaluation data, but also for using it for program approval purposes. You may even think about what we talked about at the beginning of the call about the legislation how the Bill was amended for how to use evaluation data in the ... approval system where there was some language added about in accordance with the timeline for the evaluation system that's in the law. As evaluation systems get built out across districts, the

TLPIC and the State Board can consider that kind of timeline when using evaluation data for program approval as well.

So, there are lots of things we can consider. You're right about that one aspect of the rule. We're going to have to figure out how to use the data that makes sense in relation to where the teacher is teaching and in consideration of that rule.

J. Joyner Thank you.

M. Fike We'll go ahead and move on to look at evaluation data. If you're following along in the PowerPoint, we'll start on slide 25. Or, you can refer to the evaluation data handout. The charts are identical. One would just be larger than another.

The first slide or the first sheet on the handout showed completers in 2008-09 that were employed in 2011-12. The statewide data of all those employed in 2011-12 are shown across the first line. Over 160,000 teachers were evaluated across the state. Of those evaluated, over 36,000 or 22.6%

were highly effective. Almost 120,000 or 74.6% were effective. Over 3,000 or 2.1% were given needs improvement. Eight hundred forty-one or 0.5% was given developing, and 314 or 0.2% were unsatisfactory. Again, that's statewide. That's teachers across the state.

So, looking at the completers in 2008-09 that completed a state approved program, 21.8% were rated highly effective in 2011-12; 74.8% were rated effective in 2011-12. 2.2% were rated needs improvement. One percent was rated developing or employed three years or less. And, 0.2% was rated unsatisfactory.

We then broke that down, the state approved programs, by ITP, ETI, DACP, Ed Leadership, and PTOs. If we look at ITPs, 20.2% were rated highly effective in 2011-12. 76.1 were rated effective, 2% were rated needs improvement, 1.5% were rated developing, 0.2% was rated unsatisfactory. We then broke out the ITPs by SUS or State University Systems, state colleges, and Private Institutions. Of those ITP completers that were rated highly effectively, 78% came from SUS, 3.5% came from

state colleges, and 18.6% came from a private institution. We then did the same for effective, needs improvement, developing, and unsatisfactory. So, I'll give you a moment to look over this chart before moving on to the 2009-2010 completers.

We'll go ahead and move on to the 2009-2010 completers that were employed in 2011-12. Just like the last chart, the statewide data of all those employed in 2011-12 is shown across the first line. Looking at the 2009-10 completers that completed a state approved program, 20.7% were rated highly effective in 2011-12; 76.7% were rated effective, 1.2% were rated needs improvement, 1.4% were rated developing, and 0.1% was rated as unsatisfactory.

We then broke down the state approved programs by ITP, ETI, DACP, Ed Leadership, and PTOs. Looking ITPs, 20% were rated highly effective; 77.3% were rated effective, 0.7% was rated needs improvement, 2% were rated developing, and 0.1% was rated unsatisfactory. Then, we broke down the ITPs again by State University System, state colleges and private

institutions. Of those ITP completers that were rated highly effective, 83.3% came from the State University System, 4.1% came from state colleges, 12.6% came from a private institution. Again, we did the same for effective, needs improvement, developing, and unsatisfactory. So, I'll give you another moment to look over this chart before moving on to the 2010-2011 completers.

J. Joyner Mindy, this is Joe. You have to follow me.

M. Fike Okay.

J. Joyner But, when you look at the ITP break out, you know the SUS is always going to have the lion's share of each category. It doesn't really tell me the ratio of SUS completers that actually are highly effective compared to state colleges compared to private. Do you know what I'm saying? I mean this is good information. It shows where the teachers are coming from. But, it doesn't say as a percentage or as a ratio State University

System graduates actually have more highly effective. I don't know that that's important. I just –

M. Fike If that's something that you're interested in seeing, we can definitely provide that.

J. Joyner I know it'll probably be broken out by institution eventually in the end. But, as an overall State University System, I don't know if that's of an interest of anybody to compare state universities versus state colleges versus private or not.

E. Haller I would be very interested in that data, Joe. This is Erin. I'd be very interested in seeing what that looks like.

M. Fike ...

M. Howse This is Mark. I would be interested in doing it as well. It probably would be nice if we could put a column in this chart that breaks that out.

W Yes, that's a great point, Joe. Thank you.

M. Fike Okay, we'll definitely get that for you. Other than that are we ready to move on to '10-'11?

A. Blaine Can I ask you, do we have this handout?

D. Cooke We have it as an attachment in the e-mail from Julie that we got earlier today, Anie.

A. Blaine I' just wondering why we're reading each number?

M. Fike We're just trying to orient you to the chart just to make sure that everybody's clear where we're at.

K. Hebda Right. When we do '10-'11, we'll just hit the highlights and then show you the aggregate.

Final Transcript

STATE OF FLORIDA: Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee Meeting and Webinar

May 8, 2013/3:00 p.m. EST

A. Blaine Okay, great. Thanks.

M. Fike So, looking at '10-'11, completers that were employed in 2011-12, just like the last two charts, the statewide data for all those employed in '11-'12 are shown across the first line. Second section is for those working out in a state approved program. Then, of course, we broke out those state approved programs by ITPs, EPIs, DCAPs, Ed Leadership, and PTOs. Then, towards the bottom we then broke out the ITPs by State University System, state colleges, and private institutions.

K. Hebda While everybody's looking at that, this is Kathy. One of the things I found interesting in looking at this data is of course as '10-'11 completers, all these folks are people who are teaching in '11-'12. If we kind of go on the assumption that people that completed in the earliest years stayed in the classrooms during all this time, and didn't just show back in '11-'12 for the first time, it is interesting to look at the numbers overall of completers and how they track with the oldest set of completers

or most experienced set of completers how they track a little bit more closely the overall state numbers. You can see just a teeny bit of difference in the '10-'11 completers after just one year of experience or in their first year of experience. It's not a huge difference because the categories are what they are from '11-'12, and almost everybody ended up in effective. But, you can see a little bit of difference from the completers in their first year of experience and assuming that the older completers have been in the classroom all those three years.

M. Fike

The last slide shows the three year aggregate where we took completers in 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11 that were employed in '11-'12. Just like the last three charts, the statewide data for all those employed are shown across the first line. Looking at the aggregated completers that completed a state approved program, 20.2% were rated highly effective, 76.5% were rated effective, and so on down the line. We then broke out the state approved programs by ITP, EPI, DACP, Ed Leadership and PTOs and then broke out the ITP completers at the bottom by State University System, state colleges, and private institutions.

Final Transcript

STATE OF FLORIDA: Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee Meeting and Webinar
May 8, 2013/3:00 p.m. EST

Does anyone have any questions, any comments? We can open up the floor for discussion about the evaluation data, how you feel. You may want it to look with the sample report card keeping in mind no decisions have to be made today, but you can certainly discuss.

J. Orange

This is Julie. I just wanted to point out that our chairperson, Elisa Calabrese couldn't join us on the call today, but we do have Co-chair, Jasmine Ulmer representing. We do have now thirteen of our members on the line. I know at the beginning we had just a handful. Any comments or discussions?

We realize that seeing this for the first time you're going to need some time to digest the data and questions will come. So, we definitely encourage you to submit those questions via Hope Street and keep that discussion going. We'll make sure that we provide some answers for you.

GP

Thank you, Julie.

Final Transcript

STATE OF FLORIDA: Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee Meeting and Webinar

May 8, 2013/3:00 p.m. EST

J. Orange I'm going to move on to the last slide here and just orient you to the next step for our Committee. Again, as we've been talking about through the course of this call, the sample performance report that's used for feedback purposes, that's going to be done by June 30th. So, this will be done at the program level. Also in the summer, July and August, we're going to be considering the recommendations for continued approval standards for teacher prep. Up to that point, there'll be ongoing discussions between UF and representatives from various institutions, so please continue to be involved in that. Then, as Kathy mentioned earlier, the summer and fall we'll be doing that rule revision workshop.

Again, you'll see pretty soon that notice for the rule development, but that's the first step. So, this is really going to be a culmination of several years of work that you've done. We are, again, grateful for all of the long hours that you've put into this process. It's really coming full circle and we're appreciative of that.

Final Transcript

STATE OF FLORIDA: Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee Meeting and Webinar
May 8, 2013/3:00 p.m. EST

Any questions about our next steps? Great. We appreciate everybody setting aside time and we will definitely be in touch.

(Some general thank yous in the audio.)

M. Howse Thank you, Julie. Everybody, this was a very informative meeting. Thank you very much.

(General ending comments in the audio.)

Coordinator Ladies and gentlemen, this concludes today's conference. You may all now disconnect and have a great day.