
Final Transcript

STATE OF FLORIDA: Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee

January 24, 2013/3:00 p.m. EST

PRESENTATION

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

J. Orange Thank you. This is Julie Orange. I just wanted to start by welcoming our Teacher and Leader Implementation Committee. We will do some introductions here in just a moment. I did want to clarify that we also have participants on the line. They are joining us to listen only, that we do not have a question and answer timeframe at the end of this. This is just

a listen only for those participants. Only the Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee members should be speaking during the call.

We do have the information posted on the web site at www.fl DOE.org/committees/tlp.asp. That will have the information that we're sharing through the webinar, which is the agenda and a PowerPoint. I wanted to go ahead and introduce the folks that are here in the room: myself, Julie Orange.

C. Peterson Cheryl Peterson.

K. Kaster Kaye Kaster.

E. McDaniel Eileen McDaniel.

M. Fike Mindy Fike.

J. Orange We'll have a few others joining us throughout the presentation. First, I wanted to start with introductions from the group on the line. For time's sake, the ones that I know are on the line I'm going to go ahead and mention their names, the institutions and districts they represent, and then I will provide an opportunity for anyone that I have not mentioned that has joined us to please introduce yourselves if you're a Committee member.

I have Vivian Posey from Barry University, Alisa Calabrese from Broward County, Mark Howse from FAMU, Adriana McEachern from FIU, Valerie Storey from Lynn University, Debbie Cook – Professional Association, Gloria Palaez from University of Miami, Lance Tomei from UCF, and Jasmine Ulmer from Union County. Are there other Committee members that have joined us?

J. Joyner Joe Joyner is here.

J. Orange Great, thank you.

V. Storey Julie, Valerie Storey speaking. I'd like to say that I represent UCF now, and not Lynn University.

J. Orange Thank you for that correction. I'm sorry about that. I need to correct that on the web site. Thank you. Any others that have joined us from the Committee?

M. Pankiewicz I don't know if you heard me. Megan Pankiewicz from Seminole County.

J. Orange Great. Thank you, Megan. Operator, Susan McEachin from Dade County is on the other line. Can you please add her to the speaker line?

Coordinator Yes, ma'am.

J. Orange Ana Blaine from Daytona State College is another speaker. Lizzie Peeples from Duval County, Erin Harrel from Edison State College, as well, Susan Moxley from Lake County, Greg

Adkins from Lee County, and Tamara Perry from Marion County. All of those individuals should be on the speaker line.

Coordinator Thank you.

J. Orange And, Cathy Boehme from Escambia County. Others from the TLPIC, if you're not on the correct line, please notify the operator and if you could make sure that those are able to join us. Feel free to interrupt, Caris, if you need to ask a question on any of those that need to join. I want to make sure that they're able to participate throughout the meeting.

Coordinator ...

J. Orange ...Thank you. We're going to go ahead and get started with the agenda review. You'll see here on the agenda we have follow-up from our last meeting, some information from Placement Data Chair for your requests. Then, we're going to have some time for the Committee to discuss and come to a consensus. Retention Data, the same. Information will be presented and

then you'll have time to discuss that and come to a consensus on how you'd like to use that.

Also, the Rule of 10 survey results. We'll be able to share those back with you. Kathy Hebda will be joining us to share with you statewide teacher evaluation data. Then, you'll have an opportunity for some discussion there. Then Juan Copa will also be joining us for information on the VAM data that you requested. There'll be an opportunity for some consensus with that data. Then, we'll round out the discussion and discuss our upcoming face-to-face meetings.

We're moving on to the PowerPoint now. Going back to our primary goal with the TLPIC, we always want to put this at the beginning just to remind folks on what the charge was when the Committee members were selected by the Commissioners to serve on this Committee of the four years. The primary goal was for the TLPIC to provide input, feedback, and recommendations on the development and implementation of performance standards and targets for the continued approval

of state approved teacher and school leadership preparation programs.

Today's meeting; we're focusing again on the teacher preparation programs and specifically on those targets because we've already recommended those metrics. So, we're going to be focusing specifically on setting those targets. This is the same timeline that we used in our last meeting. Just wanted to remind folks where we are in our timeline.

We're in the process in our first phase here under Fall/Winter. We are still at the point where we're analyzing the data that you've requested so that you can recommend performance targets. Those targets are going to be used for the pilot annual report.

You'll notice under the Summer part of the requirements for the Department is to release these annual progress reports. That will be the information that we need from you for the targets to be able to produce those reports. We also have a note here

that some of these things may be affected by legislation during the March to May period. So, we understand that some of the timeframe may be moved around. But, we're anticipating to have draft continued approval standards in the summer and then have rule revision workshops. Obviously, we have a full agenda in order to get there.

Just as a reminder for the proposed metrics that you recommended to the Commissioner back in September – Placement: On that particular metric, this was for ITP and EPI only. So, the DACPs were not included in this placement. When you see data today, you will not see DACP because that was a decision that the Committee made earlier.

Retention, again with the metrics, VAM data, unit performance by sub-group, and teacher evaluation results. Those were the four metrics. Then you decided on the bonus metric of critical teacher shortage area data. The two things at the last face-to-face meeting the Committee decided that in order to qualify for the bonus, you must score a Level 3 or 4 to be eligible. In order to meet this bonus, you have to have an increase

completed by 20%. Those are the metrics that were previously agreed upon.

Now, our specific focus for today: Again, we're going to be looking at performance targets for three of our metrics – placement, retention, and VAM data. You also have an opportunity to review the state level teacher evaluation data. You'll be able to review the Rule of 10 survey results. The other metrics that won't be covered today, you've already determined how you wanted to use those metrics.

We're going to go ahead and move into placement data. Mindy is going to go ahead and share with us the information.

M. Fike Thanks, Julie. Hello, everyone. Earlier, the TLPIC defined placement as being employed in a Florida public school within one or two years of completion of a Florida state approved program. We based our calculations, charts, and graphs on data from program years 2007-2008, 2008-2009, and 2009-2010. Per your request, we also broke down the data to

indicate if the program was from the State University System, state colleges, or a private institution.

For example, the graph shown here is a breakdown of all qualifying ITP programs and their placement and their placement rates. The green represents a program coming from the State University System. Red represents a program coming from one of the state colleges. Blue represents a program coming from a private institution.

Per your request, we calculated the mean for this data set, which came out to be 77.68%. We also calculated one standard deviation and two standard deviations above and below the means. One standard deviation below and above the means is 15.43%. Two standard deviations below and above the means is 30.85%.

What does this mean when proposing performance targets for each level? If we use one standard deviation above and below the means for guidance in setting the performance targets, this

would result in the following: Using 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10 data, Level One would include any program with a placement rate up to one standard deviation below the means, which in this case would be 62.25% and below. Thirteen programs within eleven institutions were identified. There were 389 completers over this three year period in Level one, of which 207 were placed within the first or second year after completion of the programs. Or, 53.21% were placed in Level One.

We calculated the same information for Levels Two, Three, and Four. You can also see the green chart below provides an indication of what institution type is represented within each level. Are there any questions regarding this slide or ITP placement in general?

J. Orange Again, these questions are for the TLPIC members to ask.

M. Fike Okay. Let's go ahead and take a look at EPIs. They were calculated using the same method as ITPs. We based our

calculations, charts, and graphs on the data from the program years 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10. We also broke down the data to indicate if the program was from the State University System, state colleges, or community college. The mean for this data set was calculated at 73.43%. One standard deviation above and below the mean is 9%. Two standard deviations above and below the mean is 18.01%.

Taking a look at the chart, the same method we used for ITPs we still used '07-'08, '08-'09, and '09-'10 for our program years. Level One would include any program with a placement rate up to one standard deviation below the means, or 64.42% and below. Three programs were identified using this proposed method for Level One. There were 456 completers over this three year period, of which 251 were placed within the first or second year after completion of the program. Or, 55.04% were placed within Level One.

We calculated the same information for Levels Two, Three, and Four. Again, the green chart below provides an indication of what institution type is represented within each Level.

Are there any questions about this slide or EPI placements? I think you guys made a decision not to include the placement metric for district or alternative certification programs. We'll turn it over to the chair for Committee discussion and consensus on the performance metric and targets for placement.

A. Calabrese Julie, this is Alisa. Do we agree with the cut point, or do we want to change that? Any comments, questions?

G. Palaez Could you repeat that question?

A. Calabrese Yes. Are we agreeing with the cut point of the standard deviation?

G. Palaez For EPI or for everything?

A. Calabrese For the placement data; for EPI, for ITP.

G. Palaez Can we go back to the ITP slide, please?

J. Orange Is this the one?

G. Palaez No, the other one; the one where you have the summative.

M. Fike Okay.

A. Calabrese Slide seven?

G. Palaez Yes, thank you. This particular slide, are you saying the level to maintain the levels at they are stated that our standard deviation is 62.25% and below. Is that the question on the table?

A. Calabrese Correct.

G. Palaez Okay.

L. Tomei This is Lance. I'm going to again express my concern that we need to be very cautious about how we apply this metric because I'm convinced it's not a level playing field for all the institutions here. I'd be a lot more comfortable if we used the two standard deviation as the breakpoint for Levels One and Four, below and above the main, respectively.

G. Palaez I would also like to know how the Rule of 10 will impact both of us who have programs below the Rule of 10. How this...is going to impact us.

L. Tomei I don't think they're included in this, Gloria. I think they're exempt.

A. Calabrese That's my understanding.

G. Palaez I understand we would be exempt. But, what would take place of it? ...?

L. Tomei Yes, I think if the Rule of 10 is not met for any metric. That metric just doesn't apply and the remaining metrics would be reweighted proportionally based on which ones...

G. Palaez Do apply. Okay, got it.

M Julie, we had a state superintendent's meeting at our last face-to-face, so I couldn't be there. Could I get Lance to elaborate on the inequity?

L. Tomei Well, I think we've discussed in a couple of meetings that there's probably a difference in what expectations should be because we're talking about placements in public schools in Florida. I think there's probably a difference in what the expectations should be based on, for example, SUS and state college versus private institutions, and also based on

geography. More competition across state borders may be keener.

So, I'm not convinced that this is a solid metric as retention may be once they're employed. I think that may be a better metric or more reflective of program quality. We don't necessarily control who gets hired. I guess there is some relationship there, obviously, between hiring rates and program quality. But, I'd just like a more conservative approach because I don't think that connection is as strong as it is with a lot of the other metrics that we're using.

D. Cooke Lance, this is Debbie. I have a question. I'm trying to remember; I understand what you said that in terms of the retention data may be a stronger metric. One of the things I'm not sure that we've decided yet is what weighting or what value we're going to give our metrics anyway. We haven't necessarily agreed that they will all be rated equal. Regardless of which standard deviation we choose, if as a Committee we think that some of our information is better, more true, more equitable, then there may be also an opportunity for us to

consider that when we ultimately determine if all metrics are going to be created equally. So, I think we do have a mechanism in place if we want to; to help give those that we feel give more solid information a better consideration.

L. Tomei I agree. I think that we have to do that as well. But, what I'm trying to avoid is putting a Level One label on institutions in a system that may not be, again, a level playing field for everybody. If we're going to do that, I think we need to be just more conservative and that means –

D. Cooke Two standard deviations.

L. Tomei – two standard deviations as...my recommendations.

W Two standards, yes, yes.

W I agree.

J. Orange If you did the two standard deviations, that would put two programs in Level One, and zero Programs in Level Four, which would be the approved with distinction level.

D. Cooke For this particular metric?

J. Orange Correct.

D. Cooke Right.

J. Orange Right.

W ...

L. Tomei Well, we don't necessarily have to go to two for Level Four. We could use two below for Level One, and between one and two below for Level Two. Then, go from one below to one above for Level Three, and more than one above for Level Four. We've used that breakout in other metrics already.

W Yes.

J. Orange Correct. That's definitely an option as well.

L. Tomei I just personally prefer a very conservative approach in this particular metric. It's just my personal feeling on this one.

G. Palaez I second that feeling. This is Gloria.

A. Calabrese Lance, are you –

W That's a motion?

A. Calabrese Are you going to make a motion, Lance?

L. Tomei Yes. I'll make a motion that the way we utilize this metric to establish levels would be based on Level One would be more

than two standard deviations below the main. Level Two would be from one to two standards deviations below the main. Level Three would be less than one standard deviation; that ranged less than one below to less than one above. Level Four would be one standard deviation or more above the main.

W Second.

A. Calabrese All in favor?

W Aye.

W Aye.

W Aye.

W Aye.

Final Transcript
STATE OF FLORIDA: Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee
January 24, 2013/3:00 p.m. EST

W Aye.

A. Calabrese Okay.

J. Orange Is there anybody opposed? Were there any additional
Committee members that have joined us since we started the
call?

S. McEachin Julie, do you have me on line? Susan McEachin.

J. Orange Great. I didn't have you. Thank you.

A. Blaine Julie, it's Ana Blaine. I'm on.

J. Orange Okay, great. Anyone else? All right. So, we have full
consensus here.

A. Calabrese All right.

J. Orange We're going to go ahead move on. Let's go to retention.

M. Fike Earlier, the TLPIC defined retention as being continuously employed in a Florida public school for three years after completion of a Florida state approved program. We based our calculations, charts, and graphs on data from program years 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09. Per your request, we also broke down the data to identify if each program was from the State University System, state colleges, or private institutions.

For example, the graph here shows a breakdown of all qualifying ITP programs and their retention rates. The green represents a program coming from the State University System. Red represents a program coming from one of the state colleges. Blue represents a program coming from one the private institutions.

Per your request, we calculated the means for this data set, yielding 64.50%. One standard deviation above and below the

mean is 15.96%. Two standard deviations above and below the mean is 31.91%.

Using the 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09 data, under this proposal Level One would include any program with a retention rate up to two standard deviations below the means, which in this case would be 32.57% and below. Five programs within five institutions were identified. There were 89 completers over this three year targeted period, of which 22 were continuously employed for three years after completion of the program. Or, 24.72% were retained.

We calculated the same information for Levels Two, Three, and Four. Of course, the green chart below provides an indication of what institution type is represented within each level. Are there any questions about this slide or IPT retention in general?

M I have a question. The definition of retention doesn't give any reason at all. It's just simply not being continuously employed in a public school three years later. Is that correct?

W That is correct.

M So, it includes people who moved and also people who have
been non-reappointed for performance.

W They've moved. If they're employed anywhere in Florida, they
will still be considered continuously employed.

M Thank you.

M. Fike Any more questions?

L. Tomei This is Lance. I just have one nit. We need to make sure that
when we mathematically define the breakpoints that we don't
have the possibility of right at one standard deviation would
actually fit into two levels here. So, we need to just kind of
clean that up.

M. Fike EPIs were calculated using the same method as ITPs. Per your request, we based our calculations, charts, and graphs on data from program years 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09. We also broke down the data to identify if each program was from the State University System, state colleges, or a community college. We calculated the means for this data set yielding 60.07%. One standard deviation above and below the mean is 7.64% and two standard deviations above and below the mean is 15.27%.

So, using these program years for '06-'07, '07-'08, and '08-'09, and also the same method for ITP, Level One would include any program with a retention rate up to two standard deviations below the means, which in this case would be 44.79% and below. In this case, no EPI programs were identified. We calculated the same information for Levels Two, Three, and Four. Then, we gave you the breakdown of the institution type in the green chart.

Are there any questions about this slide or EPI retention in general?

A. Blaine Mindy, I have a question. This is Ana.

M. Fike Yes, Ana?

A. Blaine Does the retention for EPI include if they were under a
temporary certificate prior to completing the program?

W No, it's at the point of completion and then employed.

A. Blaine Okay, thank you.

M. Fike Any more questions? THE DACPs were calculated using the
same method as ITPs and EPIs. We based our calculations,
charts, and graphs on data from the program years 2006-07,
2007-08, and 2008-09. We calculated the main for this data
set yielding 80.71%. One standard deviation above and below
the main is 10.89%. Two standard deviations above and below
the main is 21.78%.

So, using 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09 data in the same method that we used for ITPs and EPIs, Level One would include any program with a retention rate up to two standard deviations below the means, which in this case would be 58.92% and below. Here, DACPs have no programs that were identified in Level One. We calculated the same information for Levels Two, Three, and Four.

Are there any questions about this slide or DACP retention?

W Julie, were these completers; these were already employed...district the first year?

E. McDaniel No. This is still most of the EPI question. Because they were employed prior to completing the program, does it have anything to do with this metric? It would be at the point that they completed the program or they employed the following year, and then for three years continuously.

W Then, three years at the time they entered the program. Thank you.

E. McDaniel No, not at the time they entered the program; at the time they completed the program and three years after that. So, they completed the program in January of 2007, it would be employment for 2007-08, '08-'09, '09-'10.

W All right. Thank you.

G. Palaez How about those districts that have contracts with Teach for America?

E. McDaniel If they were completing a district alternative certification program and they happen to be contracted for Teach for America, they would be included in here. But, they're not included separately. We have no way of knowing who those individuals are.

G. Palaez That's an issue because that's not fair because they are contracted for at least two years. You know what I mean? That would be Jacksonville and Dade County.

E. McDaniel Gloria, here's where we come in again. Remember, if they were contracted for Teach for America, they're under a temporary certificate. Then, if they happen to complete the program while they're under the contract, that's fine. But we don't count employment until the following year, and they have to be employed two more years after that to be counted as retention.

G. Palaez Yes, now I understand much better why they're recruiting our program completers; because they're the ones who stay, increasing their staff.

E. McDaniel Could be.

G. Palaez So, have to make the point, people.

J. Orange We'll now turn it over to the chair for the Committee to
discussion and consensus.

A. Calabrese Discussion?

W I have another clarification question. Does the retention data
include completers who were employed beyond one year out;
like if they got employed their second year out of completing
the program?

E. McDaniel Yes, we did. If they would have been employed within two
years of completion, either the first or the second year.

W My second question is for any of the retention data, especially
for EPI and ITP, are institutions going to be permitted to add
their own data if they are aware of private school employment?

E. McDaniel That's something we'll need to look into.

W Okay, thank you.

A. Calabrese Discussion, any other questions?

L. Tomei Yes. I have a question on why we're not looking at combined statistics for all three paths.

A. Calabrese You mean for a...institution?

L. Tomei Right. These ratings are calculated internally within each of the three categories. But, this is a metric that I think the statistics could be aggregated and all programs compared to performance, compared in the grand pool of all of these preparation paths. I'm trying to figure out what the logic would be for only comparing DACP retention to other DACP programs, and so on.

A. Blaine Lance, this is Ana. Do you mean like reporting an institutional number of completers and retention? Is that what you mean?

L. Tomei I'm talking about reporting all programs in a single population as opposed to disaggregating the population by method, by pathway.

W Lance?

L. Tomei Yes?

W One of the things that we talked about was the difference in the population. If you're in ITP, then you're probably in your first year when you get your VAM scores for your students and everything else. If you're DACP, then you are at least past your first year, year after. In our county, often it's the third year before you ever even complete a program. So, it wasn't comparing the experience levels. You know apples and apples.

L. Tomei I understand that for when you're looking at VAM data. But, I'm not sure how that applies to retention. I think Eileen just said

that you don't start the clock until the program is completed, including for DACP.

E. McDaniel Correct, right.

L. Tomei So, to me, as I said earlier, retention to me – there's a closer potential tie here to program quality. The better prepared you are to meet the challenges of teaching today, I think the more likely it is that you'll stay in this profession longer. But, I think that if we're not looking at this as a common metric, with common expectations for all routes, since the clock starts at an equivalent time for all three pathways, then I'm not sure why we're not just putting this all in one population.

W See, I would disagree that it's an equivalent pathway. Because if you're DACP, what we don't measure, which I wish we did, was how many people we hired that never complete a DACP. That's a significant number in our county are the people that never complete. In fact, they don't even start an...program until sometimes their third year.

L. Tomei But, then they don't show up in the data.

W Yes, that's exactly right. So, if you have an ITP kid that comes out and starts, and they decide that's not the career for them, then they leave in a year and it reflects on the institution. But, if you have an EPI or DACP that hasn't completed, there's no reflection of the quality of the candidate because they haven't completed the program yet.

L. Tomei So, the implication is that the completers are less likely to have the retention issues because some would have already attrited out. But, honestly, that's true in ITPs. We have students that enroll in a program that don't graduate in that major as well.

W I hope that that's true.

L. Tomei It is true.

W Well, I do...myself. I hope that that does happen.

L. Tomei Yes. It happens both because of candidate choice, student choice, and because of our role of gatekeepers for the profession. There are times when we counsel people out of that pathway because they really ought to pursue a different career. That's part of our responsibility I think, if we're in this preparative, preparation program....

W Absolutely. I think that's a really important job.

L. Tomei So, again, I'm really just asking the question here. Does the Committee – do other members of the Committee think that these should be looked at separately? I'd like to back up and look at what the percentage statistics are and how they compare. But, we're looking at the DACP slide and we know that Level One –

W It seems like for all of the three different pathways, they all seem to fall under Level Three. Most of the majority falls under Level Three. Right?

L. Tomei But, what are the percentage ranges for Level Three? Are they comparable? Let's just look at Level One. We've got 58.92% for DACP. Can we back it up and see what's two standard? See the difference here?

EPI, you're not two below unless it's 44.79%. Look; an EPI could be at that same retention rate, 58%, and they'd be Level Three where DACP would be Level One. That's my concern. Why is it that significant a difference in what the expectations should be that we should not be looking at these as a collective population?

D. Cooke Lance, let me just ask a question. This is Debbie. Are you recommending what we do then is look at the aggregate data across programs and then apply whichever metrics we talked about among programs against that aggregate data? I...

L. Tomei You'd have one standard deviation for the whole population and then you'd assign the metrics the same way. More than two below would be Level One, and so on.

D. Cooke No matter how they came in or went out?

L. Tomei Exactly. I'm asking the question.

D. Cooke I know. Exactly. It sounds logical and it sounds reasonable. I'm sitting outside of the higher education arena and I know that often the theme in our conversation are you can't judge apples and oranges. From the perspective of somebody who doesn't live in this world, are we doing that if we aggregate the data and then hold individual programs accountable for aggregate data?

If we aren't, I say great; that's an awesome suggestion. I'm just wondering if among the rank and file of higher ed, you guys see that as viable and equitable. If so, I think it's a great idea. But, I'm just wondering how we, if that makes sense?

L. Tomei Yes, can we back up and see again? I'd like to take a look at –
there it is – ITP.

W ...ten thousand.

L. Tomei Well, what I'd really like is to see what the data looked like, and
I don't know that we have time for that. So, I'll have to defer to
Julie and DOE folks to determine whether or not we even have
the ability to combine the numbers and look at the data through
that lens.

E. McDaniel We can do that. Not right now, but we'll get back to you.

L. Tomei Yes. It would help to make a more informed decision about
whether that's something we should consider or whether we
should keep this as apply separate metrics for the three
different pathways.

Final Transcript
STATE OF FLORIDA: Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee
January 24, 2013/3:00 p.m. EST

W Lance, do you think the data would be significantly different if it was all aggregated?

L. Tomei I do based on how dramatically different the standard deviations are.

W Yes.

J. Orange I agree. I think it would look really different.

A. Calabrese Yes. So, would we like to make that recommendation to hold off on making a decision right now until we have another set of data to look at?

W Yes.

W Yes.

W Yes, let's take a look at the aggregated data and see if there are some significant differences.

A. Calabrese All right. Is anyone opposed to that? All right.

J. Orange We can do that and we will post that on...Street and continue that discussion there.

A. Calabrese Okay, great. Thank you.

J. Orange All right. We'll move on to Rule of 10.

M. Fike Based on our discussion at the last TLCIP meeting, we shared with you that we planned to survey institutions which had programs that did not meet the Rule of 10. Today, we wish to share the results of the survey with you for information purposes. We will take up this topic again at a future meeting.

We sent out a survey to 36 institutions regarding their programs that did not meet the Rule of 10 for 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11 combined. This included 207 programs. As of today, 24 institutions have responded, which included 141 of these 207 programs.

Based on the information we received from the 24 institutions, we created a pie chart that depicts reasons the institutions continue to maintain or discontinue these programs. Based on their feedback for reasons, 80% of the programs fall under critical teacher shortage. Six percent are considered start-up programs which mean the program began in 2008, 2009, or 2010. Two percent of the programs are programs that are inactive and the institutions need to notify DOE. Another 2% are programs that are phasing out, meaning they have notified DOE they will no longer provide this program and the last few candidates are still in the program. They are not accepting new candidates into the program.

Then, 10% have other reasons why their numbers are so low. Some of these examples include "This program has recently

been restructured under the College of Education and efforts are ongoing to increase enrollment.” “Number of students and interest is increasing. High demand by districts, high rate hire ability.” “Need to maintain the program’s academic accreditation.” Again, we will discuss implications of this survey and programs affected by Rule of 10 in conjunction with the accountability system at a later date.

We will now turn over the meeting to Kathy Hebda, who will discuss statewide teacher evaluation results.

K. Hebda ...members. Good afternoon. This is Kathy Hebda. I have three slides to share with you and then also a web site to refer you to for more detail.

We updated our data this week. ...districts reporting final results from teacher evaluations, school leader evaluations, and non-classroom instructional personnel evaluations. The data you see in front of you are some results that we provided through some baseline analyses that we did with the '11-'12

data, and that we have...results in comparing a couple of things.

The first thing we decided to look at, and some of these were requested by the State Board of Education and others, we wanted to see a couple of things. First, how well is the Value Added Model that was developed by the Student Growth Committee that Lance is a member of, how well is that model working and how well is it related and fitting with the results in teacher evaluation systems?

One of the things that we did was compare. As you can see, across the bottom of the slide the categories that teachers were rated in from highly effective to unsatisfactory; compared them with their aggregate VAM score. There are a couple of things you need to know.

The aggregate VAM score, if you remember from the presentations we've...in the past, is converted into a proportion of an average year's growth. We know for each grading

subject what the average year's growth is for the students in the state and relate the VAM results to that. What you see, then, for example under highly effective where you see 0.078, that's pretty close to the 10%. On average, teachers that were teaching reading and language arts courses associated with FCAT received VAM scores. On average, their students grew 10% higher than the state average.

You can see the same thing for effective. You see that's about typical. It's around zero, which is typical performance for students across the state. You can see for needs improvement and developing how that was about 20% lower for their students on average. Then, from teachers that were rated unsatisfactory who taught reading, on average their students performed about a third lower than a typical year's growth for students in that grade and subject.

One of the things that we thought was very positive about that is that when districts determine what final ratings or what these summative ratings were for those teachers who taught those courses, there is a relationship overall across the state with

their student growth results. That doesn't mean we don't have outliers and things we need to further investigate. But, for us this is a good test to see where people are using the results of the Model.

Julie, if you slip to the next slide. This is the same thing for mathematics. So, on average, teachers who were rated highly effective, their students did about 20% greater than average growth. Effective is, again, around zero. Then, you can see needs improvement and unsatisfactory. That was a good thing for us. We felt like districts in setting their own cut points, but really good cut points using the value added results for those teachers and that it relates really well to their overall summative ratings on a statewide basis.

S. McEachin Wait. This is Susan McEachin and I have a question.

K. Hebda Sure.

Final Transcript
STATE OF FLORIDA: Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee
January 24, 2013/3:00 p.m. EST

S. McEachin Are these numbers not misleading because half of my teachers evaluations are coming from VAM?

K. Hebda It could be half. It could be 40%. ...

S. McEachin You're saying that the numbers are matching up to the VAMs pretty consistently. But, the VAM is up to 50% of the actual rating, which would make them very similar.

K. Hebda Well, it depends on where the district sets the cut point for classification.

S. McEachin But, what is the variance between 40 and what percent?

K. Hebda I think the highest percentage anybody uses is Gilchrist County, which is 60%. ...

S. McEachin And the lowest is 40?

K. Hebda Right, the lowest is 40. Nobody uses less than 40.

S. McEachin So, if you're telling me that between 40 and 60% of that rating, either highly effective or effective or needs improvement is coming from a VAM score, these numbers would look like this, I think statistically speaking.

K. Hebda Well, as I said, it would depend on where the district sets their cut point.

S. McEachin Okay. But, we've got to take into consideration, yes, 19% I'm looking at the math more growth. But, we've got to understand that in my...where a large number of teachers reside or work that is 50% of this highly effective evaluation is coming from the VAM.

K. Hebda Again, you're right about the percentage. It's mostly 40% from most districts. But, if the district has set really, really lax cut points, then you wouldn't see that average probably that high.

S. McEachin All right. Just a point. Thanks.

K. Hebda The other thing we did was look at, because it shouldn't be identical, but we had a request to look at how the evaluation results overall, the...take in consideration VAMs specifically. This was overall evaluation results from here to school grade. Again, it's a two different accountability system, but Board members wanted to know whether on average across the state these things were starting to align to each other.

We can see even in the first year of evaluation, although we still have a really high percentage of teachers that were rated either effective or highly effective, when you break them up into those two separate parts, those that were related in the top two categories going across the top of the page and those that were rated in the bottom two categories going across the bottom of the page, "A" schools through "F" schools, you can see that overall districts rated folks that were teaching in those schools, this is all teachers, not just the reading, language arts, mathematics teachers, but overall rated teachers more higher percentages in the top two categories in the "A" schools and

slightly lower percentages of effective and highly effective in “F” schools. You can see how those go towards the center as you go across the page.

One of the things that we have provided on Eileen’s web site is the breakdown of evaluation results by district and by school. We don’t publish individual teacher results, of course, but we do publish by school and we publish by district. In fact, you’re looking at the web site right now. These slides that I just showed you are available on this web site as well. Do you see where it says “New” and “New” on there?

W Yes.

K. Hebda Those are the two places where you’d find the information. The first one is the actual breakdown by district; then, breakdown by school. So, if you want to click on that, Julie.

W You want to make it really big.

K. Hebda We can make that bigger.

W Good.

K. Hebda Unless members brought their magnifying glasses.

W That's okay.

K. Hebda The first document is the numbers. We did numbers and percentages for each of the categories: classroom teachers, non-instructional personnel, and school administrators. So, if you actually go to the next page, Julie. Page over one.

Thanks. That's where you see percentages by district and you can see the percentage that were rated in each category. By district, you can see that as you scroll down because the last category on the right is percent of folks that did not receive an evaluation in '11-'12. You can see there were two districts that

had not reported yet as of January 18. But, otherwise we have data from all the other districts.

Beyond this, again, you can page through. You can see non-classroom instructional numbers and percent, school administrators' numbers and percent. Then, you get to the school level pages as well. If the school had less than ten teachers in it, then we didn't report that data. We just put an asterisk there. Same thing for school administrators; so, there are lots of asterisks under the school level data for administrators, as you might well imagine. But, you can see what's provided here at the district level.

I provide that for your information. We also have, if any of you want them, like Lance or anybody who wants to mess around with the data, we have this in Excel format – this same information. So, you're welcome to it. If you want it for any reason and you want to look at those types of things. But, we still have to do for your purposes, for TLPIC purposes, is now that we have a fairly complete data set, we need to run the completers against this information to give that to you. But, I

wanted to at least give you what we had so far and let you know that we have the numbers in and give you some food for thought.

G. Palaez Kathy, this is Gloria.

K. Hebda Gloria?

G. Palaez Why are so many teachers not evaluated?

K. Hebda In the two districts that didn't report, you'll see pretty much 100% were not evaluated yet because they have not returned those data to us.

G. Palaez Like Florida Virtual?

K. Hebda On this list it still looks like it's Florida Virtual. But, it's really Hardee County and Saint Lucie County.

G. Palaez Okay.

K. Hebda Hardee has now reported. They just haven't reported on time to go on this spreadsheet. So, we keep updating as we go through. ...

G. Palaez Did Dade report; because their line is empty?

K. Hebda Go back, Julie, because this is non-classroom. Go to the classroom teachers.

G. Palaez Yes, page 1.

K. Hebda Right. There you go.

G. Palaez Okay, thank you.

K. Hebda Yes, you can see...results there.

G. Palaez Yes. Still, a lot not evaluated. Who would those teachers be that are not evaluated?

K. Hebda There are about 10% of teachers overall that didn't have evaluation in '11-'12. Some of the data that we have on file actually can point us in the direction of why that is. But, that is something we actually have under further investigation.

 About one-third of the teachers who weren't evaluated were exited from the district before they got evaluated. But, they were on the books.

G. Palaez All right. Interesting.

K. Hebda That happens, especially in...

G. Palaez Yes, of course.

K. Hebda – in the first couple of years of teaching. Then, there are two-thirds, though, that we still need to identify in the district what are those things? We know that we've talked with a few small districts that say, "Well, we have to keep..." that received confirmation that these data are reported with the compensation files; and, they really aren't employees anymore by the time it was time for evaluation. There are lots of different things going. But, that is something we need to investigate further. It really is only about 10%.

G. Palaez Thank you, Kathy.

K. Hebda Are there other questions about these data? One final thing I would say is that even though we're really pleased about the Model results and we're pleased about how overall districts did, how they used the new categories even if it's a really high percentage, and for two we're pleased they're using all five categories now and it's not just satisfactory and unsatisfactory. We also know the districts exercised an abundance of...in the first year.

We implemented statewide in '11-'12. Some districts started later than others. If they had some principals or some peer evaluators that didn't work out as well as they thought they would, they gave their folks the benefit of the doubt. We know a number of districts have made some changes for '12-'13 as they were supposed to do. We'll see what the results are at the end of this school year.

J. Orange Any other questions here? We'll share the follow-up data with you at our next meeting. Were there any comments about the Rule of 10 information? We'll go ahead and move forward. Juan has joined us.

D. Cooke Did he bring his caterpillar charts with him?

J. Orange I could not travel with a...

J. Copa Actually, I had a caterpillar chart out. That was a last minute call. ...hit the delete button.

D. Cooke You can't start disappointing us now, Juan.

W Really.

G. Palaez We're used to it.

J. Copa All right. The slides that begin on slide 21, these slides you've seen before. I put them in there as background just to get everybody on the same wavelength again. Just to recap, of course, we're looking at the VAM information for institutions and programs. It's aggregated across three years' worth of completers, where we have in-field and in-program data for ITPs. Specifically, that's what we used. For ratings, they must have been trained in-field and teaching in that field. Of course, we also used standard error to help us with these classification decisions.

So, if you move to slide 24, this is just a recap of the general framework we've been talking about over the last several

meetings for the classifications along the four Levels.

Basically, Level Four, the highest category, would be a score above the standard, whatever the standard may be. That's what we're going to look at here today; possibly a different standard, but above that standard and with statistical confidence of 95%. You're at that range of those two standard errors out, all clears your hurdles. The caterpillar chart's not here but think of that caterpillar, those long lines. It's that whole line clearing the bar.

Level Three would be the area that you cannot conclusively conclude. That's the score in the highest category, but you can't conclude that the scores in those lower categories. So, it's sort of a benefit of the doubt. The data do not give you a compelling picture of great performance versus not so great performance. On those avenues, the decision lies here in Level Three, which is very similar to what districts did across the state with their teacher evaluation results thinking that Level Three category equates like to the effective category where if you don't have data to compellingly say that a teacher is highly effective, or in this case a program is highly effective in terms of

student growth or unsatisfactory, it lies in that Level Three category.

Level Two was below the bar, but with some degree of statistical confidence. The minimum, based on AIR's recommendations to this Committee back several months ago that that minimum statistical confidence of 68%, which is the one standard error confidence interval. Then, the lowest category is below the bar with a high degree of statistical confidence. So, it's the flipside of Level Four. It's below the bar and that entire caterpillar line falling below the bar.

Slide 25 just shows that in graphical form. Basically what I've described just showing again those hairs on the caterpillar.

D. Copa See? You couldn't resist.

J. Copa But, it's not the same as caterpillars...

D. Cooke Yes, I know. It's just like a little piece of the segment. I get it.

J. Copa All right. Now if we move to slide 27. This recaps where we were in November where we presented impact data on what if the standard was the average teacher's standard. So, that was that score, that typical VAM score of zero. Students performed as typically expected; the average performance.

After looking at that impact data in November, there was a request to look at possibly a different standard; namely, the standard of the average performance of those first year teachers, those program completers that are teaching in the first year. Basically, the teachers included in these data. That average for those first year teachers was actually slightly below that zero bar. It's -0.025. So, basically on average, students grew 2.5% below average; not a surprising finding with first year teachers.

We wouldn't necessarily expect first year teachers on the whole, of course there are exceptions to the rule, but on the

whole wouldn't necessarily expect first year teachers to perform on par with the average of all teachers. It's not surprising that that standard's a little lower than the average.

The next two slides show the comparison of that initial standard that was shared in November, which is your slide 28, at the institution level. Then, slide 29 is what the classification would look like if the bar was the alternative standard of -0.025. Slides 28 and 29 show the institution level data with reading and math combined.

Slides 30 and 31 show it's split out by reading and math at the program level. This is slide 30. Go back one, please, Julie. Slide 30 was what we shared in November with the standard of zero. Slide 31 is the rerun of analysis if we had an alternate bar of the -0.025.

With that, that concludes these slides. Any discussion? Clearly, you would expect, and the impact data clearly show, that when we provide this alternative bar, which of course is a

little lower than the first bar that was shared in November, you see fewer programs in that Level One category, more moving into the higher levels. That would be the clear expected finding. That's what the data prescribed.

J. Orange At this point, I want to turn it over to the Committee chair for leading any discussion and consensus here.

A. Calabrese Discussion?

W It's a lot to process....

L. Tomei Yes. This is Lance. I'm a whole lot more comfortable. I've given this a lot of thought since our last conversation. We had a good conversation about it in our last meeting philosophically. I'm a lot more comfortable now comparing all first year teachers against the first year teacher average VAM score. I think our rationale for going the other way initially was to try and set the bar high. But, I think that's going to create problems, unintended consequences.

The biggest one is I'm a lot more comfortable identifying preparation programs as performing at Level One if they're only being compared against other preparation programs. I think that's a much easier case to make from an accountability perspective, and to set expectations for those programs to put improvements in place. I think it's a much stronger case. So, I'm appreciative that we were able to look at the new data. I strongly support that we use this as our benchmark.

W Yes, I agree.

D. Cooke I have a question and it's not necessarily about program approval or continued program approval. But, now I'm thinking in terms of our bonus category. Does a comparative analysis against folks across the board rather than just new teachers – and maybe no, it's fine – would it be a way to recognize exemplary programs? Or, would that not be a good idea? I just was wondering if it could be useful in terms of

commendable without putting anybody in a negative kind of category. Just a thought.

W Debbie, don't you think a Level Four would take care of that?

D. Cooke Yes, I do. I'm also thinking that if we're comparing first years against first years, and we're getting information and we look and we see there are certain places that we have first years that are really holding their own right up there with veterans. Is that something that's a commendable thing? That's all I'm wondering.

L. Tomei But, you don't need to set the bar at zero.

D. Cooke No, no. I'm not suggesting that we do that at all. I think the idea – I'm only thinking of it in terms of it being something we look at for a bonus, but maybe not. It doesn't matter. It doesn't have anything to do with critical shortage. It was just one of those random meanderings my mind took. So, it's okay.

J. Copa This is Juan. Let me take a quick shot at what I think you're trying to convey. For example, on slide 31 using the standard of first year teachers, just look at the top table where it's reading. There are six programs across all program types that are in the Level Four category. Now if you go back to slide 30, two of those six cleared the zero bar. So, I think what you're saying is that is there a way for us to build in the accountability system. The standard would be the first year teacher standard where you see in this particular example six programs would be a Level Four. But, of those six, perhaps you could provide an additional commendation to those two that cleared this other standard.

D. Cooke That's all I'm saying is those six above the bar we set and two of those six would have cleared the other bar had we chosen to go with a more rigorous standard. Thank you. I knew that somebody that understood statistics could say it better than me. But, it may or may not be something we want to comment on. That's all.

V. Storey Lance, this is Valerie. Can I ask a question? In your reflection on this issue, what are your thoughts? If we spec on a different cutoff point in VAM score for first year teachers, how does that impact then the employment of our first year teachers if we're already working on an assumption that overall we're not expecting them to get the same value added to that student as a more experienced teacher?

L. Tomei It's not what we're expecting. It's what the data are saying is taking place. It's reality. Unless you think that a teacher, a practicing teacher doesn't continue to acquire knowledge and skills that makes that person a more effective teacher with practice, then this is not surprising that first year teachers would not perform at the same level as the average for all teachers, many of whom have decades of experience in the classroom.

V. Storey I agree. That's what the empirical research shows. But, I'm wondering if that is we shouldn't have an aspiration. I'm just concerned about having a different cutoff point and how's that going to be interpreted.

L. Tomei Well, remember this cutoff point is only being used for accountability for preparation programs. So, I think what we need to do is what makes the most sense within that context. Actually, I like the idea of maybe having some way to provide special recognition to any program that's more than two standard deviations above the average VAM score for all teachers. But, I think in terms of what benchmark we used for the basic accountability, I'm much more comfortable using the first year teacher average VAM score.

D. Cooke Right. I wasn't suggesting anything less than that.

W Right.

V. Storey I understand that. My concern is that if it gets out into generally the public domain. I think it could be an issue.

W Why?

L. Tomei Why? If we just say that we're talking about variance from the average of all first year teachers. What that number is; what that main score is and that it's below average for all teachers doesn't even need to be part of the metric. If we just establish the base line is the average VAM score for all first year teachers. One thing that I would hope, in the long run, is that we do start to close that gap. One of the ways we'll do that is to identify those programs that are operating at the lowest level, those preparation programs, and provide assistance and lessons learned from those operating at the highest level to help them improve their preparation program. So, I would hope that over time you'd see the difference between the average of first year teachers and all teachers. Hopefully we'll close that gap over time.

V. Storey Thank you.

A. Calabrese All right. Do I hear there's an agreement for the base line to use the average VAM score for the first year teachers?

W Yes.

W Yes.

W Yes....

A. Calabrese All right. Is anyone opposed? Okay.

J. Orange All right. Great. Moving into the last part of our agenda here is just giving you some information. We agreed to meet February 12 and 13. We're going to meet at Fort Lauderdale, the FAU campus. I'll send you the specific details on that. But, I know several of you are going want to plan your travel soon.

We talked about meeting on the 12th. We're going to start a half a day so many of you can travel in that day. We're going to start at noon. Then, we're going to end on the 13th by three o'clock.

I have a hotel that FAU has provided us some information about. It's close to the location and I'll forward that at the end of the call so those of you that will be staying overnight can have that information.

Our main focus for that face-to-face meeting we are going to dedicate some of the time to wrap up some of the things for teacher preparation. We'll have hopefully the data for teacher evaluations to share with you. Also, we'll, either between...Street between now and then, or at this meeting, we'll share the additional retention data that you've requested because our intent is to have a sample program performance report to get some feedback from you. We have all of your recommendations from the last face-to-face on what you'd like to see in those reports because part of what we're going to have to do between now and June 30 is to develop those reports so that they can be released. Again, this is pilot, so keeping that in mind we'll be communicating with you to get some more input there.

The main focus at the meeting will be to go back to our educational leadership focus. We're going to be able to review some of the data that you've requested from the last meeting. We'll also have a FAPL update from Committee member Valerie Storey. Then, Raoul has agreed to come back and provide some follow-up that was very well received from the last meeting evaluation. So, we do have...agreed to come back.

We also have representatives from FAU and Broward County as well as USF and their partner districts on a Model School Leadership Grant to Race to the Top. They are working on streamlining their Level One and Level Two Leader Preparation Programs. They'd like to share with you information about those programs and also be included on some discussions about potential performance metrics that they would recommend to see an accountability model for school leadership.

So, we have quite a bit to cover on that day and one-half. We hope that everyone will be able to attend. I have gotten a few

comments from a few people that aren't going to be able to attend. But, for the majority of folks that date seems to work out well. Are there any questions about what we'll be doing at the next meeting or any additional information that you'd like us to bring?

D. Cooke No, Julie. But, I have a really quick question. This is Debbie. You mean the Florida Atlantic University campus in Boca Raton, right? It's in Boca?

J. Orange What they sent me was in Fort Lauderdale. It's actually down by where the port is.

D. Cooke Okay, so you're talking about a Fort Lauderdale campus. Okay, great. Thanks. Just wanting to clarify. Thank you.

A. Calabrese Yes, Julie, this is Alisa. I know it's not the Boca campus because you mentioned Fort Lauderdale. But, I didn't know if it was the downtown Fort Lauderdale campus or the Davie campus.

J. Orange It's the downtown.

A. Calabrese It's the downtown campus.

G. Palaez Are they going to have parking?

J. Orange Parking? There will be parking available, but it's going to be similar to what I believe when we were at UCF as far as you would have to pay and then you'll be reimbursed through our travel process. I'm waiting on some follow-up to find out if they have debit cards, machines where you can just put your debit card in for the parking receipt. As soon as I get all of that information I'll let you know.

G. Palaez Okay.

W They do, Julie. I believe they do. I've been up there. Yes.

J. Orange They weren't able to secure parking passes for all of us, so they send their apologies. But, the campus wouldn't allow that. They are agreeing to host us.

W Julie, when you send the hotel information, can you also send the address for the FAU campus location?

J. Orange Absolutely.

W Okay, thanks.

J. Orange This hotel's going to be a little bit more expensive than you're used to spending on these, just to forewarn you. We have looked around extensively and ended up going back to this one that was closest. With it being downtown by the port and the season. Apparently, it's high cruise season. So, this was the best rate that we could get; \$169.00 I believe was the state rate.

Any other questions about our next meeting?

D. Cooke If we can only join you by phone, we'll be able to do that, right?

J. Orange I have secured a line. So, I'll provide that information. I believe
Cathy Boehme and also Debbie.

D. Cooke Right.

J. Orange Great. All right. Thank you so much for your time and we'll be
posting some more information to soon on...Street.

W Thank you.

W Thank You.

W Thanks, Julie.

Final Transcript
STATE OF FLORIDA: Teacher and Leader Preparation Implementation Committee
January 24, 2013/3:00 p.m. EST

W Thanks. Bye, guys.

J. Orange Bye-bye.

W Bye.